

**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**

15 October 2021

English only

Nineteenth Meeting
The Hague, 15-19 November 2021
Item 10 of the provisional agenda
Consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention

Oslo Action Plan – Status of Implementation



Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #1	1	24 ¹	17 ²			
	2	76% ³	55% ⁴			
Action #2	1	76% ⁵	63% ⁶			
Action #3	1	60% ⁷	50% ⁸			
	2	52% ⁹	49% ¹⁰			
Action #4	1	7 ¹¹	36% ¹²			
	2	0	0			

¹ 24 States Parties - Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

² 17 States Parties— Afghanistan, Algeria, Cambodia, Colombia, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

³ 25 of the 40 States Parties implementing Article 5 and victim assistance: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. (same as the footnote 1, there are no indicators for VA for 2020)

⁴ 23 States Parties implementing Article 5 and Victim Assistance - Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁵ 25 of the 33 States Parties implementing Article 5: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁶ 21 of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Mauritania, Oman, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁷ 20 of the 33 States Parties implementing Article 5: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁸ 20 of the 40 States Parties implementing Article 5 and Victim Assistance - Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁹ 45 of the 86 delegations of States Parties registered to attend the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings registered women on their delegations.

¹⁰ 41 of the 84 States Parties registered to attend the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings registered women on their delegations.

¹¹ 7 of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Serbia, South Sudan and Sudan

¹² 21 of 40 States Parties implementing Article 5 and Victim Assistance - Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Serbia, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

	3	13 ¹³	63% ¹⁴
Action #5	1	76% ¹⁵	61% ¹⁶
Action #6	1	25 ¹⁷	17 ¹⁸
Action #7	1	6 ¹⁹	
	2	19 ²⁰	24 ²¹
	3	11 ²²	5 ²³
Action #8	1	19 ²⁴	17 ²⁵
	2	18 ²⁶	30 ²⁷

¹³ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan and Thailand.

¹⁴ 19 out of 30 States Parties implementing Victim Assistance - Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe

¹⁵ 12 of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5 - Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, and the United Kingdom - reported having national mine action standards based on IMAS in place and 13 States Parties of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5 - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe - reported that they were in the process of updating National Mine Action Standards during the reporting period.

¹⁶ 20 of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5 - 6 States Parties – Colombia, Mauritania, Oman, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan and Thailand - reported having national mine action standards based on IMAS in place and 14 States Parties - Afghani-stan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Iraq, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe- reported that they were in the process of updating National Mine Action Standards during the reporting period.

¹⁷ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

¹⁸ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

¹⁹ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Croatia, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

²⁰ Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United Kingdom.

²¹ Austria, Australia, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United Kingdom.

²² Belgium, Canada, Estonia, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

²³ Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom.

²⁴ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

²⁵ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ecuador, Iraq, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe

²⁶ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkey, United Kingdom, Ukraine and Yemen.

²⁷ Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #9	1	24 ²⁸	29 ²⁹
Action #10	1	74% ³⁰	70% ³¹
	2	19 ³²	15 ³³

Universalisation

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #11	1	0	0			
	2	30% ³⁴	36% ³⁵			
	3	3% ³⁶	3% ³⁷			

²⁸ 24 States Parties of 33 States Parties implementing Article 5: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

²⁹ Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

³⁰ 122 States Parties have paid their assessed contributions: – Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cook Island, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niue, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, United Kingdom, Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

³¹ Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, UK, Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Venezuela.

³² Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey

³³ Algeria, Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and United Kingdom.

³⁴ India, Kazakhstan, Korea, Republic of, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United States of America registered to attend the 2020 Intersessional Meetings.

³⁵ Armenia, Azerbaijan, Israel, Republic of Korea, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, the United States and Viet Nam registered to attend the 2021 Intersessional Meetings.

³⁶ In 2020, Morocco submitted a voluntary Article 7 Report.

³⁷ In 2021, Morocco submitted a voluntary Article 7 Report.

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #12	1	21% ³⁸	21% ³⁹
	2	169	TBD

Stockpile destruction and retention of anti-personnel mines

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #13	1	0	1 ⁴⁰			
	2	1 ⁴¹	0			
	3	216'252 ⁴²	41'653			
Action #14	1	1 ⁴³	1 ⁴⁴			
Action #15	1	0 ⁴⁵	1% ⁴⁶			
Action #16	1	32%	33% ⁴⁷			
Action #17	1	0	0 ⁴⁸			

Survey and Clearance of mined areas

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
--------	-----------	------	------	------	------	------

³⁸ Egypt, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Korea, Rep. of, Morocco and Singapore reported having moratoria in place.

³⁹ Egypt, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Korea, Rep. of, Morocco and Singapore reported having moratoria in place.

⁴⁰ Sri Lanka

⁴¹ Sri Lanka has presented a timebound plan for implementation.

⁴² Ukraine reported destruction since the Fourth Review Conference.

⁴³ Ukraine reported progress in implementation but has not submitted a timebound plan.

⁴⁴ Ukraine reported progress in implementation but has not submitted a timebound plan.

⁴⁵ Gambia has reported the identification of previously unknown stockpiled mines but has not reported on their destruction.

⁴⁶ Montenegro has reported the identification of previously unknown stockpile mines but has not reported on their destruction.

⁴⁷ 22 of 67 States Parties retaining mines - Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden and Turkey

⁴⁸ Iraq, Slovenia, Sudan and Zimbabwe reported efforts to explore alternatives to using live anti-personnel mines for training and research purposes.

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #18	1	79% ⁴⁹	73% ⁵⁰
	2	21% ⁵¹	18% ⁵²
Action #19	1	76% ⁵³	58% ⁵⁴
Action #20	1	73% ⁵⁵	33% ⁵⁶
	2	2 ⁵⁷	0
Action #21	1	7 ⁵⁸	9 ⁵⁹
Action #22	1	73% ⁶⁰	60% ⁶¹
	2	55% ⁶²	61% ⁶³

⁴⁹ 26 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁰ 24 of 33 States Parties- Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Nigeria, Oman, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁵¹ 7 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Cambodia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Serbia, Somalia and Zimbabwe.

⁵² 6 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Serbia, South Sudan and Sri Lanka.

⁵³ 25 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁴ 20 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Mauritania, Oman, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁵ 24 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁵⁶ 11 out of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe

⁵⁷ 1 State Party – Chile and the United Kingdom.

⁵⁸ 7 States Parties – Afghanistan, Colombia, Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia, Ukraine, Yemen.

⁵⁹ Afghanistan, Colombia, Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen.

⁶⁰ 24 of 33 State Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

⁶¹ 20 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

⁶² 18 of 33 State Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁶³ 20 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #23	1	75% ⁶⁴	83% ⁶⁵
	2	25% ⁶⁶	33% ⁶⁷
Action #24	1	50% ⁶⁸	33% ⁶⁹
Action #25	1	100% ⁷⁰	0
Action #26	1	55% ⁷¹	45% ⁷²
	2	18% ⁷³	24% ⁷⁴
	3	3% ⁷⁵	2% ⁷⁶
Action #27	1	24 ⁷⁷	12 ⁷⁸

Mine Risk Education and Reduction

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #28	1	64% ⁷⁹	39% ⁸⁰			

⁶⁴ 6 of 8 State Parties - Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Niger, Senegal and South Sudan.

⁶⁵ 5 of 6 requests for extension - the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mauritania, Nigeria, Somalia and Turkey.

⁶⁶ 2 of 8 State Parties – Colombia and South Sudan.

⁶⁷ 2 of 6 request for extension – Cyprus and Turkey.

⁶⁸ 4 of 8 State Parties - Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ukraine.

⁶⁹ 2 of 6 request for extension – Nigeria and Turkey.

⁷⁰ 1 State Party - Chile

⁷¹ 18 of 33 State Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Peru, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁷² 15 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

⁷³ 6 of 33 States Parties – Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Peru, Turkey and United Kingdom.

⁷⁴ 8 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Colombia, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe

⁷⁵ 1 State Party – Mauritania.

⁷⁶ 3 States Parties - Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, and Nigeria

⁷⁷ 24 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁷⁸ 12 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Serbia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

⁷⁹ 21 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Mauritania, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁰ 13 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #29	1	39% ⁸¹	42% ⁸²
	2	36% ⁸³	9% ⁸⁴
Action #30	1	11 ⁸⁵	8 ⁸⁶
Action #31	2	8 ⁸⁷	13 ⁸⁸
Action #32	1	25 ⁸⁹	21 ⁹⁰

Victim Assistance

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #33	1	18 ⁹¹	24 ⁹²			
	2	15 ⁹³	18 ⁹⁴			
Action #34	1	13 ⁹⁵	21 ⁹⁶			

⁸¹ 13 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

⁸² 14 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

⁸³ 13 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁴ 3 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Cambodia and Iraq.

⁸⁵ 11 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁶ 8 of 33 States Parties – – Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, South Sudan, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

⁸⁷ 8 of 33 States Parties – Cambodia, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁸ 3 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁸⁹ 25 of 33 States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁹⁰ 21 of 33 States Parties - Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Mauritania, Oman, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁹¹ Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

⁹² Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

⁹³ Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Zimbabwe.

⁹⁴ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

⁹⁵ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Thailand.

⁹⁶ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #35	1	4 ⁹⁷	14 ⁹⁸
	2	5 ⁹⁹	19 ¹⁰⁰
Action #36	1	7 ¹⁰¹	18 ¹⁰²
Action #37	1	7 ¹⁰³	16 ¹⁰⁴
	2	7 ¹⁰⁵	10 ¹⁰⁶
Action #38	1	15 ¹⁰⁷	19 ¹⁰⁸
	2	5 ¹⁰⁹	18 ¹¹⁰
	3	6 ¹¹¹	7 ¹¹²
Action #39	1	15 ¹¹³	19 ¹¹⁴
Action #40	1	7 ¹¹⁵	16 ¹¹⁶

⁹⁷ Afghanistan, Colombia, Ethiopia and Thailand.

⁹⁸ Afghanistan, Algeria, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Turkey.

⁹⁹ Afghanistan, Angola, Colombia, Sudan and Thailand.

¹⁰⁰ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe

¹⁰¹ Angola, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Peru, Sudan and Thailand

¹⁰² Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰³ Afghanistan, Angola, Colombia, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Sudan and Thailand.

¹⁰⁴ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Iraq, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe

¹⁰⁵ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand.

¹⁰⁶ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Peru, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰⁷ Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰⁸ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰⁹ Angola, Cambodia, Croatia, Sudan and Colombia.

¹¹⁰ Algeria, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

¹¹¹ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Jordan, Tajikistan and Thailand.

¹¹² Algeria, Cambodia, Colombia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Jordan, Tajikistan and Thailand.

¹¹³ Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan and Thailand.

¹¹⁴ Algeria, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

¹¹⁵ Afghanistan, Angola, Colombia, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Sudan and Thailand.

¹¹⁶ Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

Best Practices for implementing the Convention

Action #45	1	19 ¹³¹	26 ¹³²
	2	5 ¹³³	14 ¹³⁴
	3	16 ¹³⁵	21 ¹³⁶
Action #46	1	6 ¹³⁷	11 ¹³⁸
Action #47	1	9 ¹³⁹	9 ¹⁴⁰

Measures to ensure compliance

Action	Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Action #48	1	3 ¹⁴¹	2 ¹⁴²			
	2	100%	100%			
Action #49	1	0	11% ¹⁴³			
Action #50	1	68% ¹⁴⁴	68% ¹⁴⁵			

¹³¹ Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United Kingdom

¹³² Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, and United Kingdom.

¹³³ – Austria, Belgium, Canada, New Zealand and Norway

¹³⁴ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland.

¹³⁵ Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

¹³⁶ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

¹³⁷ Belgium, Canada, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

¹³⁸ Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

¹³⁹ Afghanistan, Argentina, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Croatia, Ecuador, Estonia, Lithuania, Spain, Thailand and Turkey.

¹⁴⁰ Australia, Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Japan, Finland, Serbia, Tajikistan and the United Kingdom.

¹⁴¹ Sudan, Ukraine and Yemen.

¹⁴² Sudan and Yemen.

¹⁴³ 3 of 26 States Parties with Article 3 and Article 5 obligations – Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau and Nigeria.

¹⁴⁴ 111 of the 164 States Parties

¹⁴⁵ 112 out of 164

Annex II

Universalization

Table 1: States Position vis-à-vis the Convention

<i>State not Party</i>	<i>Position vis-à-vis the Convention</i>
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.” (<i>Signing Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, 4 December 1997</i>)
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 Convention as a full member.” (<i>16MSP, 2017</i>)
Bahrain	No official information submitted.
China	The Government of China accepts the principles of the Convention and abides by its humanitarian aspects. China is not a party to the Convention but it has not ceased cooperating and ensuring exchanges with States Parties. (...) China supports the efforts of the international community to resolve the humanitarian problems caused by landmines. (...) In 1996, China established a moratorium on the import of landmines not conforming to CCW amended protocol II. (...) China also trains demining personnel. (<i>17MSP, 2018</i>)
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.” (<i>Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2016</i>)
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. However, Egypt views this convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian considerations related to anti-personnel mines and their legitimate military use for border protection. Most importantly, the convention fails to acknowledge the legal responsibility of States for demining anti-personnel mines 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 anti-personnel mines 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 the 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.” (<i>Explanations of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2010 and 2012</i>)

<i>State not Party</i>	<i>Position vis-à-vis the Convention</i>
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.” (<i>Information sent to the ISU, 15 October 2009</i>)
India	“We support the vision of a world free of the threat of landmines and we believe that the availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform, cost-effectively, the defensive function of anti-personnel mines will facilitate the achievement of this goal. India believes that AP II of the CCW strikes the right balance between humanitarian concerns on landmines and legitimate defence requirements, particularly of States with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under AP-II, related to non-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. India remains committed to providing capacity building and assistance to countries upon their request. (<i>Fourth Review Conference, 2019</i>)
Iran	Anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly and have claimed many innocent lives, a trend Iran wants to stop. However, the Convention does not consider the realities of long borders and the need to defend some territories. In some situations, mines are needed and can be used under strict control, he said, pointing out that new alternatives to mines could be explored. (<i>Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2019</i>)
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.” (<i>Signing Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, 4 December 1997</i>)
Kazakhstan	“Kazakhstan completely supports the humane orientation of the Convention (...) There are a lot of objective reasons for which Kazakhstan is not ready to liquidate anti-personnel mines: 1) Kazakhstan has a big border with 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.” (<i>International Seminar “Confidence Building Measures and Regional Cooperation through Mine Action”, Almaty, 25-27 March 2007</i>)
Korea, DPR of	No official information submitted.
Korea, Republic of	The Republic of Korea aligns itself with the objectives and purposes of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, although we have not yet acceded to the Convention owing to our unique security situation on the Korean peninsula. Demining operations are under way along the demilitarized zone of the Korean peninsula under the military agreement signed in Pyongyang on 19 September 2018 and annexed to the Pyongyang Joint Declaration. As President Moon Jae-in declared in his address to the General Assembly last month, the cooperation of the international community in that regard will be all the more valuable in enabling us to move towards demilitarizing the demilitarized zone and bring lasting peace to the Korean peninsula. The

	Republic of Korea has also joined the international efforts to support those affected by landmines by contributing to global mine action and will continue to work closely with the international community. (<i>UNGA First Committee, 2019</i>)
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.” (<i>First Review Conference, 2004</i>)
Lao PDR	Recognizing the importance of the Convention, Lao PDR has always been a strong supporter of the humanitarian spirit of the Convention. This has been further reflected in our continued active engagement in all relevant regional and international efforts to promote the spirit of the Convention, including voting in favour of all relevant Resolutions tabled at the United Nations. (...) Moreover, the Lao PDR has previously voluntarily submitted a national report under Article 7 of the Convention in 2011 and is now in the process of preparing the second voluntary report. Being a least developed country with limited resources and capacity, it remains challenging for the Lao PDR at this stage to fully fulfil international obligations under various international conventions as we need to prioritize and maximize our national capacity focusing on the areas that pose greatest constraints to and severely hampered our national social-economic development efforts. Nevertheless, we are confident that with the consistent support and assistance from the international community, Lao PDR would be able to accede the Convention in the near future.” (<i>Fourth Review Conference, 2019</i>)
Lebanon	The Government of Lebanon has adopted a national mine action policy to deal with landmines and explosive remnants of war which affirms its aspiration “to become a State Party to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.” The Minister of Defence, head of the national mine action authority, for the first time, sent a letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 2019 stating that the Ministry of Defence has no objection to sign the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. The Lebanese Army is committed to humanitarian mine action and therefore thrives to clear all contaminated areas, and does not use, stockpile, produce and transfer anti-personnel mines. (...) The Lebanon Mine Action Centre (LMAC) recognises the 2025 objective of a mine free world and works in a spirit of compliance with the Convention and with the IMAS. (<i>Fourth Review Conference, 2019</i>)
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 regards 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.” (<i>Explanation of vote, UNGA First Committee resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2015</i>)
Marshall Islands	“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. 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

State not Party	Position vis-à-vis the Convention
Micronesia, Fed.States of	<p>legislation. We have also informed of the potential for remaining UXO from the WWII era. (...) 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)</p> <p>“The Government of the FSM has indicated its full support to 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).</p>
Mongolia	<p>“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. Let me underline that Mongolia seeks to accede to the Convention in the near future. Therefore cooperation, assistance and support through both bilateral channels and international organisations are appreciated for accelerating the process of Mongolia’s accession to the Convention.” (10MSP, 2010) “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)</p>
Morocco	<p>Morocco has never produced, exported or transferred anti-personnel mines. It stopped importing them and using them way before the elaboration of the Convention. Since 2006, Morocco regularly and voluntarily submits a national transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention. In accordance with Article 3 of the Convention, mines in storage only serve for training, especially on demining. The mines of the Defence Line are catalogued and monitored according to pre-established laying plans held by military engineering units. These mines were laid before the entry into force of the Convention and will be eliminated as soon as the artificial regional conflict imposed to Morocco is resolved. The issue of mines and remnants of war in the southern provinces of Morocco is greatly due to the separatists of “polisario” who indiscriminately and voluntarily undertook the propagation of multiple and diverse deadly devices all over the territory of the Moroccan Sahara. Morocco’s accession to the Convention is momentarily delayed because of the sole issue related to the settlement of the regional dispute on the Moroccan Sahara and to Morocco regaining its full territorial integrity. (Fourth Review Conference, 2019)</p>
Myanmar	<p>Myanmar recognizes the importance of the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention in putting an end to the suffering and human casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, in saving lives and in returning hope and human dignity. We also believe that universalization of the Convention is vital in reducing humanitarian harms. “The Myanmar Government has been very active in the mine action sector and has expanded the space for humanitarian mine action operators active in the country.” (...) Commitments and efforts in line with the spirit of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention include: a) participating as an observer in meetings of the State Parties since 2003 with an aim to increase our understanding of the convention and its works, b) hosting a workshop in March 2019 with key ministries and the Presidency of the Convention to strengthen the knowledge and the implication of the various articles of the convention in a Myanmar context, c) hosting an international workshop to discuss how Myanmar can establish a National Mine Action Authority to lead and manage a humanitarian mine action programme, d) undertaking various exchange visits to other mine affected states to familiarise various ministries on the process of becoming a signatory, the conventions obligations and how to organise humanitarian mine action in</p>

	general and e) working closely with the ASEAN Regional Mine Action Centre (ARMAC), with the country's first annual financial contribution to the Centre since 2018-2019 financial year and enhancing technical cooperation in mine action." (<i>Fourth Review Conference, 2019</i>)
Nepal	Though Nepal has not yet become a state party to the Convention, we are fulfilling most of the obligations of the Treaty. (...) Nepal does not produce landmines. Nepal has constituted a high-level taskforce to study and evaluate the opportunities and liabilities of the treaty and it will submit a report in near future. In the taskforce, there are representative from different ministries. We have, for the first time, allocated budget for mine action program through Nepal Peace Trust Fund (NPTF) where there are funds from donors and Government of Nepal as well. (<i>Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, June 2010</i>)
Pakistan	"Pakistan supports the humanitarian objectives of this 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 anti-personnel mines, which addresses the humanitarian concerns while also taking into account legitimate security requirements of states and the military utility of landmines. (...) While our security needs necessitate the use of anti-personnel mines, 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 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 anti-personnel mines. Such an instrument will help in preventing the acquisition of landmines by non-state actors and terrorists as a majority of civilian casualties 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, militarily and cost-effective alternate technologies." (<i>17MSP, 2018 and Fourth Review Conference, 2019</i>)
Russian Federation	Russia does not exclude its possible accession to the Convention in the future and in the meantime 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. (<i>UNGA First Committee, Thematic debate on conventional weapons, 20 October 2017</i>)
Saudi Arabia	"Saudi Arabia has always supported the Convention (...) 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." (<i>First Review Conference, 2004</i>)
Singapore	As in the past years, Singapore supports and 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. (...) 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." (<i>Explanation of vote, UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention, 2016 and 2018</i>)

State not Party	Position vis-à-vis the Convention
Syria	<p>“To achieve the goal of clearing the world of mines and the success of the efforts aimed to achieve universalization, the treaty requires addressing the existing concerns and challenges, foremost among them translate political pledges into financial resources to support the achievement of these goals. The Syrian Arab Republic believes in the humanitarian goals of the Convention and if it did not become a party, it is the result of the current circumstances and the surrounding regional conditions. Providing international support, financial and technical resources in good faith away from politicization and conditionality in direct coordination with national authorities would be key for successful mine clearance efforts in Syria. In the same context, the current illegal foreign presence over parts of Syrian territory, and the use of mines and improvised explosive devices by armed terrorist groups. And the continuation of the Israeli occupation of the Syrian Golan, where the population is exposed and Syrians are there at the risk of being hit by mines in their homes and around their fields. <i>(Fourth Review Conference, 2019)</i></p>
Tonga	No official information submitted
United Arab Emirates	<p>“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.” <i>(Information sent by the Permanent Mission of the United Arab Emirates in Geneva to the ISU, 25 September 2009)</i></p>
United States of America	<p>Effective January 31, 2020, the Administration rescinded the Presidential Policy concerning anti-personnel landmines (APL), in favour of a new United States landmine policy that will be overseen by the Department of Defense. The United States remains committed to working to minimize risks to civilians posed by landmines and explosive remnants of war. The United States also remains fully committed to complying with its treaty obligations regarding landmines and explosive remnants of war, as contained in Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, annexed to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.</p> <p>Landmines, including APL, remain a vital tool in conventional warfare that the United States military cannot responsibly forgo, particularly when faced with the risk of being overwhelmed by enemy forces in the early stages of combat. Withholding weapons that give our ground forces the ability to deny terrain temporarily and therefore shape an enemy’s movement to our benefit irresponsibly risks American lives. The United States will not sacrifice American servicemembers’ safety, particularly when technologically advanced safeguards are available that can allow landmines to be employed responsibly to ensure our military’s warfighting advantage, while also limiting the risk of unintended harm to civilians. These safeguards require landmines to self-destruct, or in the event of a self-destruct failure, to self-deactivate within a prescribed period of time.</p> <p>The Department of Defense’s new policy allows planning for and use of APL in future potential conflicts, including outside the Korean Peninsula, while continuing to prohibit the operational use of any “persistent” landmines (landmines without a self-destruct/self-deactivation function). Under this policy, if combatant commanders authorizes the use of landmines in a major combat situation, those landmines will include the aforementioned safeguards that will prevent them from being a threat to civilians after a conflict ends.</p> <p>The United States will continue to lead in international humanitarian demining efforts that locate and remove landmines and explosive remnants of war that pose persistent threats to civilians living in current and former conflict areas around the world. The rescission of the previous policy does not reduce this national commitment, and it does not exacerbate the problems associated with unexploded munitions.</p> <p>(US State Department: https://www.state.gov/key-topics-office-of-weapons-removal-and-abatement/) and US Department of Defense: https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/2071692/landmine-policy/, 31 January 2020)</p>

<i>State not Party</i>	<i>Position vis-à-vis the Convention</i>
Uzbekistan	No official information submitted
Viet Nam	“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 Viet Nam.” (<i>Meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, June 2008</i>).

Table 2: Participation of States not party in the work of the Convention

	<i>State not party</i>	<i>Participation in meetings of the Convention</i>					<i>Moratorium in place</i>
		<i>Voted in favour of 2020 UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention</i>	<i>2021 voluntary Article 7 report</i>	<i>2021 IM</i>	<i>19MSP [to be completed]</i>	<i>Latest participation in an MSP/Review Conference</i>	
1	Armenia	√		√		9MSP (2008)	
2	Azerbaijan	√		√		17MSP (2018)	
3	Bahrain	√				2RC (2009)	
4	China	√				18MSP (2020)	
5	Cuba					2RC (2009)	
6	Egypt					4RC (2019)	√ ¹⁴⁶
7	Georgia	√				2RC (2009)	√ ¹⁴⁷
8	India			√		18MSP (2020)	√ ¹⁴⁸
9	Iran						
10	Israel			√		18MSP (2020)	

¹⁴⁶ Moratorium on landmine production and export since the 1980s.

¹⁴⁷ In 1996, the President of Georgia declared a moratorium on producing, importing and using anti-personnel mines.

¹⁴⁸ India is observing a moratorium on the export and transfer of antipersonnel mines (2018).

		<i>Voted in favour of 2020 UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention</i>	<i>2021 voluntary Article 7 report</i>	<i>Participation in meetings of the Convention</i>			
	<i>State not party</i>			<i>2021 IM</i>	<i>19MSP [to be completed]</i>	<i>Latest participation in an MSP/Review Conference</i>	<i>Moratorium in place</i>
11	Kazakhstan	√				16MSP (2017)	√ ¹⁴⁹
12	Korea, DPR of						
13	Korea, Republic of			√		18MSP (2020)	√ ¹⁵⁰
14	Kyrgyzstan	√				7MSP (2006)	
15	Lao PDR	√		√		18MSP (2020)	
16	Lebanon	√				18MSP (2020)	
17	Libya	√		√		18MSP (2020)	
18	Marshall Islands					9MSP (2008)	
19	Micronesia, Fed.States of	√				11MSP (2011)	
20	Mongolia	√				11MSP (2011)	
21	Morocco	√	√	√		18MSP (2020)	√ ¹⁵¹
22	Myanmar			√		18MSP (2020)	
23	Nepal					10MSP (2010)	
24	Pakistan					4RC (2019)	
25	Russian Federation					10MSP (2010)	
26	Saudi Arabia					4RC (2019)	
27	Singapore	√				17MSP (2018)	√ ¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ In 1997, a moratorium on export of anti-personnel mines, including their re-export and transit, entered into force in Kazakhstan.

¹⁵⁰ The Government of the Republic of Korea is enforcing a moratorium on their export for an indefinite extension of time (2009).

¹⁵¹ Morocco enforces a moratorium on the use of anti-personnel mines

¹⁵² Singapore declared a two-year moratorium in May 1996 on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium indefinitely (2016).

		<i>Participation in meetings of the Convention</i>					
<i>State not party</i>	<i>Voted in favour of 2020 UNGA resolution on the implementation of the Convention</i>	<i>2021 voluntary Article 7 report</i>	<i>2021 IM</i>	<i>19MSP [to be completed]</i>	<i>Latest participation in an MSP/Review Conference</i>	<i>Moratorium in place</i>	
28	Syria				18MSP (2020)		
29	Tonga	√			12MSP (2012)		
30	United Arab Emirates	√			4RC (2019)		
31	United States of America		√		18MSP (2020)		
32	Uzbekistan						
33	Viet Nam		√		12MSP (2012)		
	Total (33)	16	1	11		7	

Annex III

Article 4 - Stockpile destruction and retention of anti-personnel mines

Table 1 – Status of Implementation

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Total number of anti-personnel mines destroyed</i>	<i>Total number of anti-personnel mines destroyed since the Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties</i>	<i>Total number of anti-personnel mines remaining to be destroyed</i>	<i>Article 4 projected completion date</i>
Greece	1,224,754	0	343,413	As soon as feasible ¹⁵³
Sri Lanka	114,066	12,000	0	Completed
Ukraine	3,438,948	456	3,364,433 ¹⁵⁴	Unknown ¹⁵⁵
Total	4,777,768	12,456	3,707,846	

Table 2: Anti-personnel mines reported retained by 67 States Parties for purposes permitted by Article 3 of the Convention

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Angola		1304	1304	1304	Train deminers in rapid detection and destruction of mines. Training and testing of Animal detection (Rats) to accompany manual clearance methods. All operators conduct in-house training courses for detection and clearance techniques. Refresher training is conducted according to IMAS and available NMAS chapters.
Bangladesh	12050 (2018)			12050	
Belarus		4505	4505		
Belgium		2066	2044	2021	Education and training of EOD specialists and deminers with live ammunition Training militaries in "Mine Risk Education". The use of M35Bg mines takes place during different sessions of courses organized by the Belgian Armed Forces.

¹⁵³ Statement delivered by Greece at the Fourth Review Conference, 27 November 2019.

¹⁵⁴ Article 7 report submitted by Ukraine in 2021.

¹⁵⁵ The contract between Ukraine's Ministry of Defence and the NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA) dated 1 February 2015 expired in 2020. With a view to revitalize the process, the NSPA initiated an international tender. The completion plan for Ukraine's stockpile destruction will be finalized after the completion of all necessary tender procedures. Statement delivered by Ukraine at the intersessional meetings, 22 June 2021.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Benin	16 (2008)				
Bhutan	211 (2018)				
Bosnia and Herzegovina		834	834	834	Training mine detection dogs, testing demining machines and education.
Bulgaria		3318		3485	
Burundi	4 (2017)			4	
Cambodia		1235	3730 ¹⁵⁶	927	For supporting operation, Demolition and Museum. For Training and Display.
Cameroon	1885 (2009)				
Canada ¹⁵⁷		1878	1649	1540	Objective: Force Protection Evaluation. Canada 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. 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 members of the Canadian Armed Forces or other organizations might encounter during demining operations. The Department of National Defence retains a maximum of 2000. This number is to ensure we have a sufficient number of mines for training and for valid testing in the area of mine detection and clearance. 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.
Cape Verde	120 (2009)				
Congo Brazzaville	322 (2009)				
Cote d'Ivoire	290 (2014)				

¹⁵⁶ This number includes anti-personnel mines as well as other devices.

¹⁵⁷ In 2018, Canada reported that 57 of the 1878 anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 are without fuses.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Croatia		4973	4851	3858	In 2019, anti-personnel mines were used by CROMAC CTDT Ltd. used for testing and by the training company of the Engineering Regiment for trainings.
Cyprus		435	435	435	
Czech Republic		2180	2155	2155	Used for the training in mine detection, mine clearance and mine destruction techniques by the Army of the Czech Republic. The regular special courses to train and/or educate current and new Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) personnel. The EOD specialists are trained to detect and to destroy anti-personnel mines.
Denmark		1748	1736	1730	Research and development by Danish Defense Research Establishment and training in mine detection.
Djibouti	2996 (2005)				
Ecuador		90	90	90	Will be used for training and training and research of demining personnel. Ecuador plans that 10 anti-personnel mines will be destroyed annually in training activities, as well as their potential use in investigation tasks.
Eritrea	101 ¹⁵⁸ (2014)				
Finland	16192 (2018)		15982	15851	
France		3941	1842	1841	
Gambia	100 ¹⁵⁹ (2013)				
Germany		583	583	543	Retained for research and testing purposes, for training of mine and explosive ordnance detection dogs, vehicle mine protection programme, accident research and regular dog training.
Greece		5599	5585	5570	Anti-personnel mines have been retained for training soldiers in mine detection, clearance and canine detection.
Guinea Bissau	9 (2011)				
Guyana	0			80	
Honduras	815 (2007)				

¹⁵⁸ In its reports submitted in 2013 and 2014, Eritrea indicated that 71 of the 101 mines were inert.

¹⁵⁹ In its report submitted in 2013, the Gambia indicated that it retains 100 anti-personnel mines under Article 3. While a report was submitted in 2020, it did not contain information on antipersonnel mines retained under Article 3.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Indonesia		2148	2050		
Iraq		20	Unclear	Unclear	Retained for training mine detection dogs, testing demining machines and studying the effect of the blast of various types of anti-personnel mines on demining equipment at a rate of approximately 20 mines as mentioned in previous Article 7 reports. Following the 2019 annual review of the number of mines retained, the Republic of Iraq has concluded that the number retained mines do not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes and we destroyed all anti-personnel mines that were discovered or removed by clearance operations.
Ireland		55	54	53	1 x SB33 used in a Mine Awareness demonstration.
Italy		617	617	563	Warfare mines are used for bomb-disposals and pioneers training courses.
Japan		898	803	719	During the reporting period, Japan used anti-personnel mines for education and training. In 2020, Japan plans to use anti-personnel mines for education and training in mine detection and clearance.
Jordan		100	100	100	
Kenya	3000 (2008)				
Mali	600 (2005)				
Mauritania		728	728	728	For training of demining personnel in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques.
Mozambique ¹⁶⁰		900		No info	
Namibia	1634 (2010)				
Netherlands		889	868	270	
Nicaragua		448		448	
Nigeria	3364 (2012)				
Oman	2000 (2017)	No info	No info	2000	
Peru		2015	2015	1705	

¹⁶⁰ In its report submitted in 2018, Mozambique indicated that 90 of the 1355 anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 are inert without explosive and detonator.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Romania		2395	2249	2020	Training the personnel specialized in EOD or detection and demining. Mine awareness training. Activity/project: Regular training cycles of the EOD personnel or engineers formation. Specific preparation of the troops leaving in operational theatres. The mines retained were used only for practicing detection and demining in the regular training cycles of the EOD and engineer troops and for the specific preparation of the personnel undertaking mission in operational theatres abroad. Mines are only presented to the personnel. Detection, marking and demining techniques are demonstrated and practiced. Mines are not regularly armed or destroyed during this process. In 2020, a limited number of mines (229 pcs) were blasted, as they were not safe due to their ancient age. Due to the relatively small retained anti-personnel mines amount, it was not issued a strategy or a program to use and progressively destroy these mines, which are expected to attain the end of their life cycle and to be destroyed for safety reasons as part of the old ammunition destruction process.
Rwanda	65 (2008)				
Senegal ¹⁶¹		50		50	
Serbia ¹⁶²		3134			
Slovakia		1035	1035	874	
Slovenia		272	256	249	
South Africa	576 (2014)				
Spain		1349	1357	1121	Surveillance tests - samples are regularly collected from the mine stock for training in order to subject a battery of tests to its various elements - fuse, explosive, body, etc. - to guarantee its good condition and the safety of its manipulation.
Sri Lanka		21153		16718	
Sudan		739	528	327	Training and reach. The objective is to improve the demining capacity and to innovate new methodologies which are effective, efficient and saver. Currently the programme retained some of PMN Plastic and Type 35 Plastic mines. The programme plans to destroy all live mines and replace them with the training's mines.
Sweden		6009	6009	5964	

¹⁶¹ In its report submitted in 2019, Senegal indicated that 13 of the 50 mines retained have been defused.

¹⁶² In its report submitted in 2018, Serbia indicated that all fuses for 494 PMA-1 type and 540 PMA-3 type had been removed and destroyed. While Serbia submitted reports in 2020 and 2021, no updated information on anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 was provided.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Tanzania, United Rep. of ¹⁶³	1780 (2009)				
Togo	436 (2004)				
Tunisia		4405	4375		
Turkey		9259	6552	6439	Dummy training mines/items are used mostly for demining and military trainings in Turkey. However, a limited number of retained mines are also required to conduct efficient training. The Turkish Mine Action Centre plans to reduce number of retained mines for training to a total of 3000 by 2021.
Uganda	1764 (2012)				
Ukraine	605 (2013)	No info	No info	No info	
Venezuela	4874 (2012)				
Yemen ¹⁶⁴	3760 (2017)	No info	No info on numbers		Before 2014 Yemen submitted information on the quantity and types of anti-personnel mines for permitted purpose. After this period, Yemen did not use any anti-personnel mines for training and research activities. Under the current operating procedures forced upon YEMAC by the current conflicts, at any given time there are a number of anti-personnel mines, including improvised anti-personnel mines held at YEMAC storage locations whilst awaiting destruction. This is caused by the lack of access to explosives or other means to destroy items in place and the need to conduct large scale demolitions once coordination with relative contacts and approval of access to explosives besides burning items such as thermite is allowed. The numbers and types vary and are kept only for so long as it takes to organise their destruction. The conflict created a complex environment and currently Yemen is not performing any plan of development of mine detection, detection techniques for further training of the use of mines retained under Article3. Yemen is commitment to give updates about all status and information on it is transparency report. At this stage, anti-personnel mines, including those of an improvised nature are also presented in Yemen in large numbers.

¹⁶³ In its report submitted in 2009, the United Republic of Tanzania indicated that it retains 1780 anti-personnel mines under Article 3, including 830 deactivated anti-personnel mines.

¹⁶⁴ In its Article 7 reports submitted in 2020 and 2021, Yemen indicated that before 2014 Yemen submitted information about quantity and types of anti-personnel mines for permitted purpose in accordance with Article 3 after that Yemen did not use any anti-personnel mines for training and research activities. Under the current operating procedures forced upon YEMAC by the current conflicts, at any given time there are a number of AP mines (and AP mines of an improvised nature) held at YEMC storage locations whilst awaiting destruction. This is caused by the lack of access to explosives or other means to destroy items in place and the need to conduct large scale demolitions once coordination with relative contacts and approval of access to explosives besides burning items such as thermite is allowed. The numbers and types vary and are kept only for so long as it takes to organize their destruction. The conflict created a complex environment and currently Yemen is not performing any plan of development of mine detection, detection techniques for further training of the use of mines retained under Article3. Yemen is commitment to give updates about all status and information on it is transparency report (Article 7). At this stage landmines especially Ap-mines and the Ap- improvised nature are also presented in Yemen in large numbers.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2018 and earlier</i>	<i>2019</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2021</i>	<i>Current and planned use of retained stockpiled anti-personnel mines</i>
Zambia		907			
Zimbabwe		450	450	450	
Total	140,259				

Table 3: Anti-personnel mines reported transferred by one State Party for purposes permitted by Article 3 of the Convention

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Recipient of transfer</i>	<i>Number of anti-personnel mines transferred</i>	<i>Additional information</i>
Bulgaria	Italy	9,059	In 2020, 8927 M2A4-type and 132 M3-type anti-personnel mines previously owned by the Bulgarian private company “EXPAL BULGARIA” JSC, have been successfully transferred to Italy.
Netherlands	Italy	606	In 2020, 606 DM31-type anti-personnel mines previously retained for training by the Ministry of Defence of the Netherlands were transferred for the purpose of destruction to Italy on 30 November 2020. The transferred mines are in secured storage until the reactivation of the factory following an accident which led to its total lockdown.

Annex IV

Article 5 - Survey and Clearance of Mined Areas

Table 1: Progress reported in Implementation

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Number of areas released</i>	<i>Cancelled area (square metres)</i>	<i>Reduced area (square metres)</i>	<i>Cleared area (square metres)</i>	<i>Total area released (square metres)</i>	<i>Number of anti-personnel mines destroyed</i>	<i>Number of other explosive items destroyed</i>
Afghanistan	186	12,319,408	538,083	24,240,605	37,098,096	5,159	161,408
Angola		4,908,344	1,781,380	1,774,820	8,464,544	452	2,321
Argentina							
Bosnia & Herzegovina ¹⁶⁵				3.83			
		13.03	2.57		19.43	1,357	361
Cambodia	590	13,456,263	17,450,872	46,418,072	77,325,162	10,085	23,466
Chad	19	155,328		214,167	369,495	39	1,358
Colombia	181 ¹⁶⁶	86,891	115,371	1,078,529	1,280,791	144	47
Croatia ¹⁶⁷				49.24			
		11.39			60.32 ¹⁶⁸	493	4,047
Cyprus							
Democratic Republic of Congo ¹⁶⁹			2,477	10,562	13,039		
Ecuador ¹⁷⁰							
Eritrea							
Ethiopia ¹⁷¹							
Guinea-Bissau							
Iraq ¹⁷²	17	80,502,021	1,031,859	7,667,621	89,201,501	1,633	2,934
Mauritania							
Niger							

¹⁶⁵ Bosnia and Herzegovina in its 2021 Article 7 reported on progress in implementation in square kilometers.

¹⁶⁶ Colombia reported it released 181 'polygons'.

¹⁶⁷ Croatia in its 2021 Article 7 reported on progress in implementation in square kilometers.

¹⁶⁸ Croatia also reported 415,756 square metres of mined area under the authority of the Ministry of Defence was surveyed and cleared, resulting in the destruction of 70 anti-personnel mines, and 184 items of explosive ordnance.

¹⁶⁹ The figures for progress in implementation for the Democratic Republic of the Congo are sourced from its extension request submitted 9 July 2021 for consideration at the 19MSP.

¹⁷⁰ Ecuador reported that in 2020, no humanitarian demining operations were carried out due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁷¹ Ethiopia reported that in 2020, no humanitarian demining operations were carried out due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁷² The progress reported for Iraq are cumulative figures reported by DMA and IKMAA.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Number of areas released</i>	<i>Cancelled area (square metres)</i>	<i>Reduced area (square metres)</i>	<i>Cleared area (square metres)</i>	<i>Total area released (square metres)</i>	<i>Number of anti-personnel mines destroyed</i>	<i>Number of other explosive items destroyed</i>
Nigeria							
Oman ¹⁷³					739,467		
Peru ¹⁷⁴							
Senegal ¹⁷⁵					11,288		
Serbia	1				269,280		1,587
Somalia							
South Sudan	20	4,876,183	11,564	708,164	5,595,941	231	286
Sri Lanka					4,591,489		
						43,157	42,141
State of Palestine							
Sudan	9			353,799	353,799	42	21,909
Tajikistan					1,722,688		
	34	422,258	651,894	648,536		5,103	267
Thailand					157,070,446		
	147	127,307,011	28,845,511	917,924		9,355	497
Turkey	20	4,668,325	505,972	142,073	5,316,370	9,781	3
Ukraine							
Yemen	32 ¹⁷⁶					4,398	199,175
Zimbabwe	115 ¹⁷⁷	28,947	8,105,935	2,410,672	10,545,554		

¹⁷³ Oman reported progress in implementation for the period; April 2017 to December 2020.

¹⁷⁴ Peru reported that in 2020, no humanitarian demining operations were carried out due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁷⁵ Senegal reported that in 2020, it undertook non-technical survey (NTS) of 26 localities and that NTS was suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that no humanitarian demining operations were carried out due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁷⁶ Yemen reported that 40 non-technical surveys were conducted during the reporting period and awaiting verification.

¹⁷⁷ Zimbabwe reported it released 115 'sectors' of mined area.

Table 2: Remaining challenge reported by States Parties

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Article 5 Mine Clearance Deadline</i>	<i>Number of areas known to contain anti-personnel mines</i>	<i>Number of areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines</i>	<i>Total number of areas</i>	<i>Amount of area known to contain anti-personnel mines (square metres)</i>	<i>Amount of area suspected to contain anti-personnel mines (square metres)</i>	<i>Total amount of area (square metres)</i>
Afghanistan	1 March 2023	2,073	189	2,262	148,455,471	38,852,031	187,307,502
Angola	31 December 2025	1,053	90	1,143	82,517,128	2,911,642	85,428,771
Argentina	1 March 2023						
Bosnia and Herzegovina ¹⁷⁸	1 March 2027	478	1,421	1,899	95	956.36	1,051.36
Cambodia	31 December 2025		8,923	8,923		801,641,652	801,641,652
Chad	1 January 2025	72	50	132	56,016,433	22,726,573	78,743,006
Colombia	31 December 2025	232	187	419	1,852,590	1,092,909	2,945,499
Croatia							249,421,616 ¹⁷⁹
	1 March 2026	42	32	74	166,758,961	82,662,655	
Cyprus	1 July 2022						
Democratic Republic of Congo ¹⁸⁰	1 July 2022	29	4	33	81,613.8	35,416.9	117,030.7
Ecuador	31 December 2022	2	1	3	32,535	7,521	40,056
Eritrea	31 December 2020						
Ethiopia	31 December 2025	29	123	152	3,519,538	722,548,937	726,068,475
Guinea-Bissau ¹⁸¹		9	43	52	1,093,840		1,093,840
Iraq ¹⁸²	1 February 2028	3,391	170	3,561	1,481,081,115	313,764,000	1,794,845,115
Mauritania ¹⁸³	31 January 2022	20		20	16,183,490		16,183,490
Niger ¹⁸⁴	31 December 2024						
Nigeria	31 December 2021						
Oman	1 February 2025			89			410,400
Peru	31 December 2024			108			369,212

¹⁷⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina in its 2021 Article 7 report provided its remaining challenge in square kilometres.

¹⁷⁹ The total amount of area remaining to be addressed by Croatia includes additional mined areas under the authority of the Ministry of Defence measuring 30.14 square kilometres.

¹⁸⁰ Figures for the remaining challenge of Democratic Republic of the Congo are sourced from its extension request submitted 9 July 2021 for consideration at the 19MSP.

¹⁸¹ Figures for the remaining challenge of Guinea-Bissau are sourced from its extension request submitted 11 August 2021 for consideration at the 19MSP and include 43 suspected mined areas of unknown size.

¹⁸² The remaining challenge reported for Iraq are cumulative figures reported by DMA and IKMAA.

¹⁸³ Figures for the remaining challenge of Mauritania are sourced from its extension request submitted 1 June 2021 for consideration at the 19MSP.

¹⁸⁴ The figures reported for Niger are sourced from their 2020 extension request.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Article 5 Mine Clearance Deadline</i>	<i>Number of areas known to contain anti-personnel mines</i>	<i>Number of areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines</i>	<i>Total number of areas</i>	<i>Amount of area known to contain anti-personnel mines (square metres)</i>	<i>Amount of area suspected to contain anti-personnel mines (square metres)</i>	<i>Total amount of area (square metres)</i>
Senegal	1 March 2026	37	9	46	491,086,374		491,086,374
Serbia	1 March 2023		5			856,030	856,030
Somalia	1 October 2022						
South Sudan	9 July 2026	63	55	118	2,828,870	4,449,636	7,278,506
Sri Lanka	1 June 2028	295	9	304	11,444,129	1,353,764	12,797,893
State of Palestine	1 June 2028						
Sudan	1 April 2023	56	41	97	2,255,389	10,835,546	13,090,935
Tajikistan	31 December 2025	145	84	229	7,021,103	4,778,852	11,799,955
Thailand	31 October 2023	183	43	226	23,276,882	39,676,628	62,953,510
Turkey	1 March 2022	3,834		3,834	145,082,038		145,082,038
Ukraine	1 December 2023						
Yemen ¹⁸⁵	1 March 2023			326			12,995,161
Zimbabwe ¹⁸⁶	31 December 2025			101	34,116,225		34,116,225

Table 3: Milestones for 2021 reported by States Parties

<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Number of Areas to be addressed</i>	<i>Total area to be addressed (in square metres unless otherwise indicated)</i>
Afghanistan	1,245	103,019,127
Angola ¹⁸⁷	164	17,210,199
Argentina		
Bosnia & Herzegovina ¹⁸⁸		142.4
Cambodia ¹⁸⁹		109.6 ¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁵ The figures reported for Yemen are sourced from Yemen's 2019 extension request.

¹⁸⁶ Zimbabwe reported a remaining challenge of 101 'sectors' of mined area.

¹⁸⁷ The milestone for Angola is sourced from its updated work plan submitted 25 November 2018.

¹⁸⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina in its 2021 Article 7 report, provided annual milestones in square kilometres.

¹⁸⁹ The milestone for Cambodia is taken from its extension request submitted 27 March 2019.

¹⁹⁰ Cambodia in its 2021 Article 7 report, provided annual milestones in square kilometres.

<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Number of Areas to be addressed</i>	<i>Total area to be addressed (in square metres unless otherwise indicated)</i>
Chad ¹⁹¹		
Colombia ¹⁹²	101	1,328,253
Croatia ¹⁹³		55.5
Cyprus		
Democratic Republic of Congo ¹⁹⁴		4,370
Ecuador		12,250
Eritrea		
Ethiopia		175,807,352
Iraq		178,610,341
Guinea-Bissau		
Mauritania		
Niger ¹⁹⁵		
Nigeria		
Oman ¹⁹⁶		52,800
Peru		
Senegal	28	413,846.66
Serbia	1	294,230
Somalia ¹⁹⁷		
South Sudan	20	1,478,400
Sri Lanka		

¹⁹¹ Chad reported milestones for the period 2020-2021, including NTS of suspected mined areas in Tibesti and Ouaddaï, to clear the mined areas identified through NTS, make necessary updates to the HCND database, and handover land to the beneficiaries.

¹⁹² The figures for Colombia's annual milestone are sourced from its extension request submitted 19 March 2020.

¹⁹³ Chad in its 2021 Article 7 report, provided annual milestones in square kilometres.

¹⁹⁴ The figures for annual milestones reported by the Democratic Republic of the Congo are sourced from its extension request submitted 9 July 2021 for consideration at the 19MSP.

¹⁹⁵ Niger in its 2020 extension request included a work plan for the period 2020-2024. The work plan outlines activities to clear the mined areas located in the Madama military post and the possibility of identifying other suspected areas. The work plan indicates that the training of 50 deminers would take place in 2020 and the actual demining work would be taking place during 2020-2024.

¹⁹⁶ Oman reported that it aims to complete its work plan by February 2025.

¹⁹⁷ Somalia reported that it will continue to survey mine, ERW, and IED impacted communities throughout Somalia and recode all of these hazardous areas in the national database.

<i>States Parties</i>	<i>Number of Areas to be addressed</i>	<i>Total area to be addressed (in square metres unless otherwise indicated)</i>
State of Palestine		
Sudan ¹⁹⁸		15,746,491
Tajikistan	49	1,506,709
Thailand		30,584,267
Turkey	4,017 ¹⁹⁹	10,719,823
Ukraine ²⁰⁰		
Yemen ²⁰¹		
Zimbabwe		9,343,166

¹⁹⁸ Sudan in its 2021 Article 7 report, provided milestones for the period 2020-2021.

¹⁹⁹ Turkey reported that it will conduct non-technical survey on an estimated 3,834 mined areas and address 183 mined areas measuring 10,719,823 square metres through mine clearance, including the following 27 mined areas measuring 1,058,000 square metres to be addressed as part of the Mardin Province Clearance Project in the period 2022-2023, 96 minefields measuring 4,242,577 square metres located in 4 Eastern border provinces as part of the Phase 3 Eastern Borders Mine Clearance Project in 2022-2025 and 60 mined areas measuring 5,418,669 square metres in areas located on the Iraq and Syrian Borders will be addressed by Military Demining Units.

²⁰⁰ Ukraine reported in its 2020 extension request included an activity plan on Humanitarian Demining of the Liberated Territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions for 2020. The plan includes two purposes and 4 key objectives.

²⁰¹ Yemen indicated in its 2019 extension request that aim of the interim extension request is to carry out activities that would allow the mine action sector to recover and to carry out a resurvey of areas, where the security situation allows, and establish a new baseline that will allow Yemen to develop a realistic plan to address the drastic change in the situation by 1 March 2022.

Annex V

Article 6 - Victim Assistance

Table 1: Overview of information provided by the 30 states parties that have indicated having a responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Article 7 report submitted in 2021</i>	<i>Information on victim assistance contained in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided through means other than the Article 7 report</i>
Afghanistan	X	X	X	
Albania				
Angola	X	X	X	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	X	X		
Burundi	X	X	X	
Cambodia	X	X	X	
Chad	X	X	X	
Colombia	X	X	X	
Croatia	X	X	X	
Democratic Republic of the Congo				
El Salvador				
Eritrea				
Ethiopia	X			
Guinea-Bissau				
Iraq	X	X	X	
Jordan	X	X	X	
Mozambique	X	X	X	
Nicaragua	X	X	X	
Peru	X	X	X	
Senegal	X	X	X	
Serbia	X			X
Somalia				

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Article 7 report submitted in 2021</i>	<i>Information on victim assistance contained in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided through means other than the Article 7 report</i>
South Sudan	X	X	X	
Sri Lanka	X	X	X	
Sudan	X	X	X	
Tajikistan	X	X	X	
Thailand	X	X	X	
Uganda				
Yemen	X	X	X	
Zimbabwe	X	X	X	

Table 2: Overview of Information provided by other States Parties on Victim Assistance efforts

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Article 7 report submitted in 2021</i>	<i>Information on victim assistance contained in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided in the Article 7 report</i>	<i>Information on Oslo Action Plan victim assistance commitments provided through means other than the Article 7 report</i>
Algeria	X	X	X	
Chile	X	X	X	
Turkey	X	X	X	
Ukraine	X			

Table 3: Overview of latest information (concerning coordinating entity, Action Plan, database and mine survivors) provided by States Parties with Victim Assistance commitments

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Government entity to coordinate victim assistance integration into broader frameworks</i>	<i>National action plans on victim assistance/ disabilities</i>	<i>Database on mine casualties, survivors/ persons with disabilities</i>	<i>Registered Mine victims²⁰²</i>
Afghanistan	State Ministry for Martyrs and Disabled Affairs (SMOMDA, also known as MMD)	National Disability Strategy (2020-2030) ²⁰³	National disability database at the MMD	35,332
Albania	Albanian Mine and Munitions Coordination Office (AMMCO)	Victim Assistance Action Plan & National Action Plan for Persons with Disabilities (2016-2020)		1,003
Algeria	National Council of Persons with Disabilities	Victim Assistance is integrated into relevant health, disability and social development plans.	Database on mine victims, including on indirect mine victims	7,246
Angola	The Mine Action Centre (CNIDAH) and the Ministry for Social, Family of Women Affairs (MOSFWA)	Victim Assistance Plan (annual)	Database on mine victims at the CNIDAH	9,309
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Victim Assistance Coordination Body at the Bosnia-Herzegovina Mine Action Centre (BHMIC)	Victim Assistance Action Plan (2019- 2025) ²⁰⁴	Mine Victims Database at the BHMIC	1,76
Burundi	Ministry of Public Security and Disasters Management (MOPSDM) & Humanitarian Action against Landmines and unexploded ordnance	National Action Plan for Assistance of Mines/ERW Victims and other Persons with Disabilities		Approx. 6,000
Cambodia	Ministry of Social Affairs Veteran and Youth Rehabilitation (MOSAVYR) and Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA)	National Disability Strategic Plan (2019-2023) & Victim Assistance Action Plan (annual)	National Centralised Database under the CMAA	Approx. 65,000

²⁰² Note: The figures are based on the latest information provided by the respective States Parties such as through their Article 7 report, statements or information provided directly to the Committee on Victim Assistance in 2021 or in recent years. In several cases the information provided is deemed to not be incomplete due to challenges faced in data collection, and in some cases identification of mine victims has been reported to be in progress. Majority of the figures represent mine survivors and those that have been killed only – not affected families. In most cases, the figures include survivors of anti-personnel mines as well as other types of explosive ordnances. Taking these into account, the figures will continue get updated or adjusted.

²⁰³ The plan was being developed in 2019/2020.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Government entity to coordinate victim assistance integration into broader frameworks</i>	<i>National action plans on victim assistance/ disabilities</i>	<i>Database on mine casualties, survivors/ persons with disabilities</i>	<i>Registered Mine victims²⁰²</i>
Chile	National Demining Commission (CNAD) through its Executive Secretariat			
Chad	National Mine Action Commission (HCND) & Ministry of Women, Social Action and Children (MOWSAC)	National Victim Assistance Action Plan (2018-2022)	Database on Mine Victims at the HCND, limited capacity to collect casualty data	2,840
Colombia	Mine Action Authority & Ministry of Health and Social Protection (MOHSP)	Action Plan of the Technical Secretary for Disabilities (annual)	Anti-personnel Mine Survivors Information Service (SISMAP)	11,986
Croatia	Mine Action Centre at the Civil Protection Directorate within the Ministry of the Interior (MOI)	Victim Assistance has been integrated into relevant national plans	Database on Mine Victims	599
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Ministry of Humanitarian and Social Affairs (MOHSA) & National Mine Action Centre (CCLAM)			2,743
El Salvador	Protection Fund for War Victims (FOPROLYD) & National Disability Council (CONAIPD)			4,500
Eritrea				Approx. 5,750
Ethiopia	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA)	National Disability Action Plan (2012-2021)	National Database on Persons with Disabilities	16,616
Guinea-Bissau	Secretary of State of Homeland Freedom Fighters			Approx. 1,300
Iraq	Directorate of Mine Action (DMA) & Commission for Persons with Disability Care and those with Special Needs	National Victim Assistance and Disability Action Plan (2019-2021)	Mine Victims Database at the DMA	34,081
Jordan	High Council on Affairs of Persons with Disabilities (HCD) & National Demining and Rehabilitation Authority (NCDR)	Victim Assistance has been integrated into several disability related plans and policies	National Database on Mine Victims at the NCDR	1,018

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Government entity to coordinate victim assistance integration into broader frameworks</i>	<i>National action plans on victim assistance/ disabilities</i>	<i>Database on mine casualties, survivors/ persons with disabilities</i>	<i>Registered Mine victims²⁰²</i>
Mozambique	Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Affairs (MOGCSA)	National Action Plan for People with Disabilities including Mine Victims ²⁰⁵		Approx. 10,000
Nicaragua	National Council for the Promotion and Enforcement of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (the National Council)			1,276
Peru	Peruvian Centre for Action against Anti-personnel Mines (CONTRAMINAS) & National Council for the Integration of Persons with Disabilities (CONADIS)	Comprehensive Reparation Plan	National Registry of Persons with Disabilities	348
Senegal	National Centre for Mine Action (CNAMS)	National Action Plan for Victim Assistance (PANAV) ²⁰⁶	Mine Victims Casualty Database at the CNAMS	847
Serbia	Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Policy (MOLEVSP)		Database on Civilian Victims of War at the MOLEVSP	1,123
Somalia	Somalia Explosive Management Authority (SEMA)	National Action Plan for Assistance to Survivors of Mines and Explosive Remnants of War (2020 – 2025) ²⁰⁷	Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database	Approx. 1,300
South Sudan	Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Work (MOGCSW) & National Mine Action Authority (NMAA)	National Disability/Victim Assistance Action Plan (2020-2025) ²⁰⁸	Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database	6,116
Sri Lanka	National Mine Action Centre (MAC)	National Action Plan on Equalisation of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and National Mental Health Strategy	Mine Victims Database at the MAC and Injury Surveillance System at the MOH	1,716

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁶ Senegal reported that the PANAV was initially developed for 2012-2014 and while aiming to develop a new action plan, Senegal continued to pursue achieving the objectives of the PANAV as they are deemed to be valid in reflecting the ongoing needs of mine victims.

²⁰⁷ The plan was being developed in 2019/2020.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Government entity to coordinate victim assistance integration into broader frameworks</i>	<i>National action plans on victim assistance/ disabilities</i>	<i>Database on mine casualties, survivors/ persons with disabilities</i>	<i>Registered Mine victims²⁰²</i>
Sudan	National Mine Action Centre (NMAC) & National Council of Persons with Disabilities (NCPWD)	National Disability Strategy 2020-2030 & National Victim Assistance Strategy ²⁰⁹	Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database	2,225
Tajikistan	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW) & National Mine Action Centre (TMAC)	Victim Assistance has been integrated into disability related plans	Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database	882
Thailand	Ministries of Social Development, Human Security and Public Health (MOSDHSPH); National Institute for Emergency Medicine (NIEM) & Mine Action Centre (TMAC)	Victim Assistance has been integrated into several disability related plans and strategies	National Disability Database	799
Turkey	Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (MOFLSS) & Turkish Mine Action Centre (TURMAC)	MOFLSS's Strategic Plan (2018-2022)	Database on Mine Victims at the TURMAC	
Uganda	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MOGLSD)	National Comprehensive Action Plan on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2020-2025)		Approx. 2,000
Yemen	Mine Executive Action Centre (YEMAC)			7,795
Zimbabwe	Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MOPSLSW) & Zimbabwe Mine Action Centre (ZIMAC)	National Policy on Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Mine Victims Database at the ZIMAC	269

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*