Status of Universalization of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention[1]

Submitted by the President of the Seventeenth Meeting of the States Parties

I. Introduction

In 1997, 133 States determined to put an end to the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, committed to a total ban of anti-personnel mines by signing the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. As of 1 June 2018, the Convention has 164 States Parties, placing it amongst the most universal disarmament instrument. Nonetheless, 33 States remain outside of the scope of the Convention.

Pursuing universal adherence to the Convention and acceptance of its norms is essential to fulfilling the promise of the Convention. At the Third Review Conference in 2014, States Parties made several commitments in adopting the Maputo Action Plan including promoting "formal adherence to the Convention by States not party to the Convention, regularly inviting them to participate in the Convention's meetings and inform States Parties of practical steps taken, such as formalised commitments not to use, produce or transfer anti-personnel mines, or to destroy stockpiles" (*Action #1 of the Maputo Action Plan*). Since 2014, the President is mandated to promote the universalization of the Convention and its norms, including in relevant multilateral and regional fora, as well as at the national level.

II. Activities of the President

In 2018, the President wrote to each of the 33 States not party to the Convention, inviting them to provide updated information on their accession status, as well as to participate in the work of the 7-8 June 2018 intersessional meetings and in the Seventeenth Meeting of the States Parties. The following States not party provided a written response to the letter: China and the United States of America.

In 2018, the President held bi-lateral meetings with the following States not party: Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to emphasise the importance of adhering to the norms of the Convention and acceding to it as well as to encourage these States to participate in Convention-related meetings and provide more detailed information on their position vis-à-vis the Convention and the steps they are taking to move closer to accession.

In addition to these efforts, on 27 March 2018, the President convened a meeting of the *Informal Working Group on Universalization.* The Group discussed some initial ideas for coordinating the approach of the States Parties to promoting universalization. Members were invited to take the floor and offer updates concerning activities carried out in the area of universalization of the Convention as well as upcoming opportunities for coordinated universalization efforts.

III. Support to the Convention by States not party

Many States not party acknowledge and support to various degrees the humanitarian goals of the Convention and highlight the grave consequences of the use of anti-personnel mines. Some States

[1] Information as of 21 August 2018.

not party, while acknowledging the disastrous humanitarian consequences of anti-personnel mines, still see that anti-personnel mines have a military utility. For some States not party, proceeding with accession is dependent on the accession of another State, generally a neighbouring State, for others accession is tied to sovereignty issues. And finally, accession to the Convention for some States is just one of many competing priorities for the limited internal resources available.

A number of States not party indicated that they have put in place **moratoria on the use, production, export and/or import of anti-personnel mines**. Very few States not party have officially indicated **stockpiling anti-personnel mines** or the extent of their stockpiling, if relevant. As long as States not party possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines and have not indicated an intention to destroy them, these mines could potentially be used.

States not party can submit **voluntary Article 7 reports** to communicate information about the key areas of implementation of the Convention. Those States that have expressed support for the object and purpose of the Convention have been particularly encouraged to provide voluntary transparency reports. In 2018, Morocco submitted such a report. Other States not party have submitted reports previously including Azerbaijan (2008 and 2009), Lao PDR (2011) and Mongolia (2007). Most States not party that have submitted a voluntary report have only provided some of the information required under Article 7.

A number of States not party express acceptance for the Convention's norms by choosing to vote every year in favour of the **UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention**.

2017 UNGA First Committee Convention Resolution: Voting by States not party

In favour (14)	Abstained (16)	Not present (3)
Armenia	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan
Azerbaijan	Egypt	Lebanon
Bahrain	India	Tonga
China	Iran	
Georgia	Israel	
Kazakhstan	Korea, DPR of	
Lao PDR	Korea, Republic of	
Libya	Myanmar	
Marshall Islands	Nepal	
Micronesia, Federated States of	Pakistan	
Mongolia	Russian Federation	
Morocco	Saudi Arabia	
Singapore	Syria	
United Arab Emirates	USA	
	Uzbekistan	
	Vietnam	

All States not party to the exception of four - Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Republic of Korea and Uzbekistan - have **participated at least once in a Convention-related meeting**, with some States not party regularly delivering statements to provide information about their State's position on the Convention and/or on their activities to implement certain provisions of the Convention as well as their contribution to mine action activities.

Participation in Convention-related meetings since the 2014 Third Review Conference

State not Party	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018
	IM[2]	3rd RevCon	IM	14MSP	IM	15MSP	IM	16MSP	IM
Azerbaijan								√	
China		√		√		√		√	
Egypt	√	√							
India		√		√		√		√	
Kazakhstan				√				√	
Lao PDR								√	√
Lebanon	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Libya	√	√	√	√					
Morocco	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√
Myanmar	√				√			√	
Pakistan	√		√		√			√	
Saudi Arabia	√	√			√	√	√	√	√
Singapore		√		√		√		√	
Syria								√	
UAE					√				
USA	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

The Convention's States Parties are at the mid-point of the implementation of the Maputo Action Plan which calls for continuing to pursue universal adherence and acceptance of the Convention's norms. States Parties should spare no effort in inviting the 33 States that remain outside this Convention to join it and should continue engaging them at every possible occasion.

The President has prepared an updated overview of the official information[3] available on the views and practices of the 33 States not party as relates to the Convention. In some cases, official information is not available and in other cases the information is quite old and would benefit from being updated and/or corrected in order to more accurately reflect the positions of the States not party.

Finally, the President would like to thank those States not party which regularly communicate information on their position either at meetings of the Convention or through the submission of a voluntary transparency report and participate and engage in the work of the Convention despite not being party to it.

[2] Intersessional meetings.

[3] Sources of information: statements delivered at Convention-related meetings, voluntary Article 7 reports, responses to questionnaires sent by the ISU and/or the 16MSP and 17MSP Presidents. The table has been prepared by the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit.

IV. Information provided by the 33 States not party to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
Armenia	Armenia supports the Convention, and is ready to take measures consistent with the provisions of the treaty. But to assume legally binding obligations, Armenia expects clearly observed readiness to reciprocate on the part of its regional neighbours. Therefore, Armenia's full participation in the Convention is contingent upon a similar level of political commitment by other parties in the region to adhere to the treaty and comply with its regime (*Signing Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, 4 December 1997*) Despite the fact that Armenia is not a member of the Ottawa Convention due to security threats persistent in the region, we full adhere to the goals and objectives of the Convention. (*60th UNGA First Committee, 7 October 2005*)	9MSP in 2008
Azerbaijan	"Azerbaijan supports the solution of humanitarian mine problems on a global level. Azerbaijan fully supports the principles and philosophy of the Ottawa Convention. (…) The Government of Azerbaijan expressed its hope that in the future, when the armed conflict is settled and the Azerbaijani territories are liberated, the country will be able to accede to the Ottawa Convention as a full member. "(*16MSP, 2017*)	16MSP in 2017
Bahrain	No official information submitted.	Second Review Conference in 2009
China	"Given its national conditions and the national defence needs, China could still not accede to the Convention at this stage. However, China ascribes to the goal and principles of the Convention and highly appreciates the humanitarian spirit embodied in the Convention. (…) In an effort to improve stockpile management, the Chinese army has conducted comprehensive assessment of its mine inventory and destroyed several hundred thousand old and dysfunctional anti-personnel mines over the last two decades. (…) China has not made any new deployment of landmines over the past ten years." (*Third Review Conference, 2014*)	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	In reply to a letter sent by the 17MSP President requesting updated information on China's views and practices as concerns the Convention, China indicated that China's position towards anti-personnel mines remained unchanged.[4]	
Cuba	"Cuba shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of mines. (..) It is not possible for Cuba to renounce the use of mines for the preservation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity, corresponding to the right of legitimate defence, recognised in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2016*)	Second Review Conference in 2009
Egypt	"Egypt acknowledges the humanitarian considerations which the Ottawa Convention attempted to embody and had actually imposed, based on the same considerations, a moratorium on its landmine production and export since the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention itself. However, Egypt views this convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian considerations related to APLM and their legitimate military use for border protection. Most importantly, the convention fails to acknowledge the legal responsibility of States for demining APLM they themselves have laid, in particular in territories of other States, making it almost impossible for affected States to meet alone the Convention's demining requirements. This is particularly true in the case of Egypt which still has millions of APLMs on its territories, planted by Second World War powers, requiring vast demining resources (…) The mentioned weaknesses are only complemented by the weak international cooperation system of the Convention which remains limited in its effect and much dependent on the will of donor States. The mentioned weaknesses of Ottawa convention have kept the largest world producers and some of the world's most heavily affected States outside its regime, making the potential for its universality questionable and reminding us all of the value of concluding arms-control and disarmament agreements in the context of United Nations and not outside its framework."*(Explanations of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2010 and 2012*)	Third Review Conference in 2014
Georgia	Georgia "has never produced anti-personnel mines and doesn't retain the option to produce them. In 1996, the President of Georgia declared a moratorium on producing, importing and using anti-personnel mines. Due to existing circumstances, it is not reasonable to join the Convention (…) The main reasons for not acceding to the Convention are the occupied territories and unstable environment surrounding them. (…) This situation will prevent Georgia from the fulfilment of Convention obligations." (*Information sent to the ISU, 15 October 2009*)	Second Review Conference in 2009

[4] Email from the Permanent Mission of China in Geneva, 6 May 2018.

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
India	"India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel mines. Our presence as an Observer in this meeting, and at other MSPs and Review Conferences since 2004 is a demonstration of our support towards this goal. We believe that the availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform, cost-effectively, the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel mines will considerably facilitate the goal of their complete elimination. India is party to AP II of the CCW which takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under AP-II, including ceasing the production of non-detectable mines as well as rendering all our anti-personnel mines detectable. India is also observing a moratorium on the export and transfer of antipersonnel mines. (…) India has taken a number of measures to address humanitarian concerns arising from the use of anti-personnel mines. Increasing public awareness is an integral part of India's efforts to avoid civilian casualties." (*16MSP, 2017*)	16MSP in 2017
Iran	Iran "shares the humanitarian concerns of the States parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention for sponsoring the resolution. (…) However, the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not adequately take into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, for responsible and limited use of mines to defend their territories. Due to the difficulties of monitoring sensitive extensive areas by established and permanent guarding posts or effective warning systems, unfortunately landmines continue to be the effective means, for those countries, to ensure the minimum security requirement of their borders. While this defensive device should be used under strict established rules to protect civilians, more national and international efforts also should be made to explore new alternatives to landmines." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2012*)	Has never participated
Israel	"Israel joins all those countries in supporting international efforts to resolve the problem of indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines (…) Due to our unique situation in the Middle East involving an ongoing threat of hostilities as well as terrorist threats and actions along the borders, we are still obliged to maintain anti-personnel mines as necessary for self-defence in general and along borders in particular (…) At this juncture, Israel, regrettably, is unable to sign the Convention until effective alternative measures are available to ensure the protection of civilians threatened on a daily basis by terrorists and to ensure the protection of Israeli forces operating in areas of armed conflict." (*Signing Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, 4 December 1997*)	First Review Conference in 2004
Kazakhstan	"Kazakhstan completely supports the humane orientation of the Convention (…) There are a lot of objectives reasons on which Kazakhstan is not ready to liquidate anti-personnel mines: 1) Kazakhstan has a big border with	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	the neighbouring countries which should be covered and protected by armed forces, including by the use of anti-personnel mines in frontier areas of the country at the certain cases of conditions, 2) Full destruction or non-use of anti-personnel mines is unacceptable in the absence of alternative systems to defend the overland borders of the country (…) At the same time, in 1997, a moratorium on export of anti-personnel mines, including their re-export and transit, entered into force in Kazakhstan." (*Statement by the Chief of Special Troops Department of the Chief of Staff Committee of the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Kazakhstan at the International Seminar "Confidence Building Measures and Regional Cooperation through Mine Action", Almaty, 25-27 March 2007*)	
Korea, DPR of	No official information submitted.	Has never participated
Korea, Republic of	"The Republic of Korea fully sympathises with the spirit and objectives of the Ottawa Convention. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korea Peninsula, we cannot but to place our priority on security concerns and are unable to accede to the Ottawa Convention at this point. (…)The Republic of Korea is fully committed to mitigating humanitarian suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. In this regard, the Government of the Republic of Korea is exercising tight control over anti-personnel landmines and enforcing a moratorium on their export for an indefinite extension of time." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2009*) The Republic of Korea is fully committed to the objectives and purposes of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions associated with humanitarian concerns caused by their uses, by actively participating in the related CCW discussion as well as trying to make further contributions on international cooperation for those affected by landmines and cluster munitions. (*Statement by the Republic of Korea, UNGA First Committee, Thematic debate on conventional weapons, 18 October 2017*)	Has never participated
Kyrgyzstan	"Along with speaking in favour of a complete landmine ban, our country advocates step-by-step advance to this goal. (…) Kyrgyzstan has never produced or exported landmines. All supplies that we have were left after the collapse of the Soviet Union. (…) Today the problem of mine clearance cannot be considered because of demarcation and delimitation of neighbouring countries' borders. Our border issues with some neighbouring countries remain unsettled." (*First Review Conference, 2004*)	7MSP in 2006
Lao PDR	"Despite Lao PDR is not yet a state party to this Treaty, we have already implemented a number of its obligations, especially in terms of clearance, victim assistance and voluntary transparency report pursuant to	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	Article 7. Furthermore, we have participated in all undertakings held under this Convention to make sure there is full understanding of the obligations and to show the Lao PDR's intention towards becoming a state party to the Convention. All those engagements and activities undertaken by the Lao Government reflected its true commitment that it will accede to the Convention as it has announced some time ago and it will continue to work towards this goal." (*Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, May 2012*)	
Lebanon	Lebanon has not yet acceded to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention but it adheres to its noble causes and tries to work along with the 2010-2014 Cartagena Action Plan and the Maputo 2014-2019 action plan. Lebanon has never produced or exported antipersonnel mines and doesn't use or stockpile or transport any antipersonnel mines, however the Lebanese army retains very few numbers for training purposes. Lebanon previously stated that we are unable to join the Mine Ban Treaty due to the continuing conflict with Israel." (*16MSP, 2017*) Lebanon "has not taken any additional steps to join the Convention because the reasons that prevented Lebanon from doing so are still valid. Regarding the question of stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, Lebanon indicated that it is a matter related to the sovereignty of Lebanon. Lebanon indicated that the Lebanese Government does not produce or manufacture any type of anti-personnel mines and does not transfer anti-personnel mines." (*Response to 16MSP President letter, 31 October 2017*)	16MSP in 2017
Libya	"The interim Government is not in a position to ratify the Convention for the time being. However, Libya shares the international community's humanitarian concerns with regard to anti-personnel landmines because of their tragic impact on human lives and the environment, which impedes development, particularly since Libya has suffered from mines and war remnants since the Second World War. However, the Convention does not address the damage inflicted on States by the remnants of war and explosives resulting from occupation, or whose territories were the theatre of fighting between foreign countries. The Convention also does not establish a mechanism to assist affected countries suffering from mines placed by colonial States, or commit colonial States to removing, at their own expense, the mines they placed on the territories of other States." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2015*)	14MSP in 2015
Marshall Islands[5]	"Although we still have not yet ratified the treaty, we have not taken any action which is contrary to the goals, objectives and principles and we have provided an unambiguous message of support for the treaty. (…) The Republic of the Marshall Islands government has never produced, used or stockpiled such landmines.	9MSP in 2008

[5] The Marshall Islands are signatory to the Convention.

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	We have very limited financial and technical resources, as well as the need to respond to some complex and immediate environmental situations. We value closely our relationship with the United States of America as defined under the Compact of Free Association, in which the USA provides primary assistance in our defence, in addition to other commitments. While ratification and implementing actions may be possible by our government, doing so may require an approach which exceeds the level of efforts needed to merely adopt "one size fits all" model legislation. We have also informed of the potential for remaining UXO from the WWII era. The international community has repeatedly asked why we have not moved forward with ratification and implementing activities. We ask that member states note the cumulative effect of treaty participation upon small nations. (…) We are aware that the treaty offers both technical assistance and appropriate reporting procedures. (…) We recognise that this treaty represents an urgent international goal deserving our attention. However we cannot move forward on our cumulative treaty obligations in a piecemeal fashion – an appropriately coordinated approach to all treaties is needed (…) It will not be until we complete an internal review of all signed and unsigned treaties that we can provide member states with an updated timeline for future activity. Until the moment when we are able to take our next steps – and that moment will occur – please understand that we remain supportive of this treaty as an original signatory and that our national policies are aligned with this treaty overarching goals and principles." (*9MSP, 2008*)	
Micronesia, Fed. States of	"The Government of the FSM has indicated its full support of the concept of universalization and full implementation of the Convention (…) The FSM considers itself as a mine-free State. Regardless, the aspiration of the Government of the FSM to accede to the Convention remains intact. (…)The Government of the FSM is very close to fulfilling its internal legal requirements in order to accede to the Convention. Presently there is a draft resolution before the Congress of the FSM seeking approval to accede to the Convention. It is expected that Congress will take favourable action on the resolution in the upcoming January 2009 regular session." (*Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, 2 June 2008*).	11MSP in 2011
Mongolia	"Mongolia fully supports the noble purpose and humane principles of the Convention and firmly denounces the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines. (…) The Government's policy has laid the groundwork for accession via a step-by-step approach that involved amending legislation to allow release of the amount of stockpile, starting the destruction of stockpile and securing funding for stockpile destruction (…) Mongolia has a stockpile of 206,317 anti-personnel mines and it will destroy 380 mines in 2011." (*10MSP, 2010*)	11MSP in 2011

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	"Mongolia continues to pursue a step-by-step (or phased) policy towards accession to the Convention due to a range of security and economic concerns." (*Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, 20 June 2011*)	
Morocco	"Morocco retains a stockpile of anti-personnel mines for training purposes. No details have been provided on types or quantities of mines. Military schools and training centres are authorised to retain inert mines. (…) Morocco will clear all the mines as soon as the conflict with Western Sahara is resolved." (*Voluntary Article 7 report covering calendar year 2016*) "Although Morocco is not a party to the Convention, it supports it and is attached to its humanitarian aims. (…) Since 1987, Morocco has stopped stocking and using anti-personnel mines for respect of the Convention's principles and in solidarity to the universal impetus to eliminate these weapons. (…) Morocco only retains inert mines for training the Engineering Units and the Moroccan contingents deployed in the framework of peace under the auspices of the United Nations. Morocco does not have stockpiled anti-personnel mines and the anti-personnel mines laid along defence lines are maintained, monitored and listed according to mine laying maps. (…) Accession to the Convention is a strategic objective for Morocco only deferred by considerations linked to the artificial conflict imposed to Morocco by the opponents to its territorial integrity will disappear." (*Intersessional meetings, 2018*) Morocco is one of the few countries that has never produced, exported or transferred anti-personnel mines. In addition, Morocco no longer imported or used mines before the development of the Convention even begun. Morocco also enforces a moratorium on the use of anti-personnel mines and destroyed its stockpiled anti-personnel mines in 2008, in the framework of an agreement signed with MINURSO in 1999. (*Intersessional meetings, 2018*)	Intersessional meetings in 2018
Myanmar	"Myanmar recognises that the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention is the cornerstone of the effort to end the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines. Despite not joining the convention yet, Myanmar supports the norms of the Convention. Myanmar Armed Forces is no longer using the landmines while safeguarding the life and property of its people in internal conflicts."	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	"Myanmar foreign policy consistently supports disarmament and opposes arms race, production and sales. In line with this policy, we do not lose sight of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and closely follow the progressive activities related to it. Myanmar has participated in the meetings of the States Parties to the Convention and other relevant activities." (…) "A National Ceasefire Agreement was signed between the Myanmar armed forces and 8 ethnic armed groups in October 2015. Ceasefire includes demining. That opens the windows of opportunities for the expansion of mine actions in Myanmar." (*16MSP, 2017*)	
Nepal	"Nepal remains fully committed to the humanitarian objectives of the Convention." (*8MSP, 2007*)	10MSP in 2010
Pakistan	"Given our security compulsions and the need to guard our long borders, not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. The objective of total elimination of anti-personnel mines can be best promoted inter alia, by making available non-lethal, militarily and cost effective alternate technologies."(*Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2016*) "Pakistan supports the humanitarian objectives of the Ottawa Convention and is guided by humanitarianism and respect for International Humanitarian Law and protection of civilian life." (…) "Pakistan supports the balanced approach of the Amended Protocol-II on APLs, which addresses the humanitarian concerns while also taking into account legitimate security requirements of states. Pakistan is fully compliant with the provisions of AP-II. While our security needs necessitate the use of APLs, this is done in accordance with international norms, safety parameters and humanitarian considerations. The use of landmines is exclusively by the military for defence purposes. Furthermore, Pakistan continues to scrupulously adhere to a policy of ban on all exports of mines, and ensures that the private sector is not allowed to manufacture or to trade in landmines. (…)Pakistan has produced only detectable anti-personnel mines since January 1, 1997. (…) Pakistan has itself been a victim of the use of landmines, including as IEDs, by terrorists and non-state actors. Notwithstanding their use by terrorists, Pakistan's security forces do not use mines for the maintenance of internal order and law enforcement or in counter-terrorism operations. Pakistan is supportive of an international legal instrument banning the *transfer* of APLs. Such an instrument will help in preventing the acquisition of landmines by non-state actors and terrorists as a majority of civilian causalities result from use of landmines by such actors. We believe that the objective of the total elimination of anti-personnel mines can be promoted, inter alia, by making available non-lethal,	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	militarily and cost effective alternate technologies." (*16MSP, 2017*)	
Russian Federation	"Russia is against the creation of forums where ones already exist. The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons is the appropriate forum for the issue." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution, 2009*) "The Russian Federation is committed to the noble goal of creating a world free of anti-personnel mines (….) Russia is well aware of the seriousness of the humanitarian consequences of the use of antipersonnel mines (….) At the same time, in addressing the "mine" problem, we consider it is necessary to take a realistic approach and take into account the interests of all members of the international community, especially the states that historically and by virtue of their geostrategic position are forced to rely on this type of defensive weapons to ensure their security. Therefore, in practice, we proceed with the assumption that the movement towards a complete and universal ban on APM should be carried out step by step. Russia supports the objectives of the Convention and does not exclude the possibility of acceding to it within a reasonable time in the future. This timing will depend on the completion of the work on a number of technical, financial and other problems associated with the implementation of the Convention in the case of the Russian accession. The accelerated preparation for the functional replacement of anti-personnel mines is among those problems. (…) I would like to draw your attention to the fact that Russia has completely stopped the production of the most dangerous types of antipersonnel mines - high explosives. Over the past ten years, about 10 million mines, including anti-personnel mines, have been destroyed in Russia." (*10MSP, 2010*) Russia does not exclude its possible accession to the Convention in the future and in the meantime it continues to work to address a number of technical, organisational and financial issues related to implementation of the Convention. Russia also is undertaking effective measures to minimise the mine threat. (….) Russia has ceased production of the most dangerous blast-type anti-personnel mines. (*Statement of Russia, UNGA First Committee, Thematic debate on conventional weapons, 20 October 2017*)	10MSP in 2010
Saudi Arabia	"Saudi Arabia has always supported the Convention (…) The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia observes and respects the spirit of this Convention. It has never used anti-personnel mines, nor has produced them. Such mines have never been transferred to or from the Kingdom to any destination, be it governmental or otherwise. Saudi law forbids all authorities other than the armed forces from stockpiling mines." (*First Review Conference, 2004*)	16MSP in 2017
Singapore	"Our position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. As in the past years, Singapore supports and	16MSP in 2017

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With this in mind, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium in May 1996 on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralising mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralising mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely. We also support the work of the Convention by regularly attending the Meetings of the States Parties to the Convention. (…) At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions may therefore be counter-productive." (*Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2016*)	
Syria	No official information submitted.	16MSP in 2017
Tonga	No official information submitted	12MSP in 2012
United Arab Emirates	"Yes, we have a stockpile of anti-personnel mines. We do not produce anti-personnel mines. We do not transfer antipersonnel mines to any party or any other country. We believe that the question of acceding to the Convention still needs further study and consultations before taking any decision." (*Information sent by the Permanent Mission of the United Arab Emirates in Geneva to the ISU, 25 September 2009*)	12MSP in 2012
United States of America	"In 2014, the United States announced several important changes to our policy with respect to anti-personnel mines to align our policy outside the Korean Peninsula with the key requirements of the Ottawa Convention. This announcement included a commitment to continue to work to find ways that would allow us to ultimately fully comply with and accede to the Ottawa Convention while ensuring our ability to respond to contingencies on the Korean Peninsula. This process is ongoing." (*15MSP, 2016*). In reply to a letter sent by the 17MSP President and requesting updated information on the United States of America's views and practices as concerns the Convention, the United States of America indicated that they had no update of the information provided in 2016.[6]	16MSP in 2017
Uzbekistan	No official information submitted.	Has never participated
Vietnam	"We therefore have joined the world community to welcome various bans, moratoria and other restrictions	5MSP in 2003

[6] Email from the Permanent Mission of the United States of America in Geneva, 9 May 2018.

State not party	Stated support for the aims of the Convention and stated circumstances for not acceding to the Convention	Last participation in Meetings of the States Parties (MSP) or Review Conference
	already declared by States on anti-personnel mines as well as the growing consensus against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines against civilians. (…) In the security concern, we are of the view that any efforts to ban landmines should take into account the legitimate national security concerns of states as well as their legitimate rights to use appropriate measures for self-defence. We support the humanitarian aspects of the Ottawa Convention but we could not sign it yet as it regrettably does not duly take into account the legitimate security concerns of many countries including Vietnam." (*Meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, June 2008*)	