

James Madison University  
**JMU Scholarly Commons**

---

Global CWD Repository

Center for International Stabilization and Recovery

---

12-2011

# 11th Meeting of the States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention

*AP Mine Ban Convention*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd>

 Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

"11th Meeting of the States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention" (2011). *Global CWD Repository*. 72.  
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd/72>

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global CWD Repository by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [dc\\_admin@jmu.edu](mailto:dc_admin@jmu.edu).

---

**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**

16 February 2012

Original: English

---

**Eleventh Meeting  
Phnom Penh, 28 November – 2 December 2011**

**Final report**

The Final Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction consists of two parts and six annexes as follows:

**I. Organization and work of the Eleventh Meeting**

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

**II. Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: the Phnom Penh Progress Report, 2010-2011**

Introduction

- I. Universalizing the Convention
- II. Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines
- III. Clearing mined areas
- IV. Assisting the victims
- V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims

**Appendices**

- I. Stockpiled anti-personnel mines
- II. Mines reported retained for purposes permitted under Article 3 of the Convention
- III. Legal measures taken in accordance with Article 9

**Annexes**

- I. Agenda of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties
- II. Report on the consideration of requests for extensions to Article 5 deadlines, 2010-2011
- III. Rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees
- IV. Report on the activities, functioning and finances of the Implementation Support Unit and preliminary 2011 financial report
- V. Implementation Support Unit 2012 work plan and budget
- VI. List of documents of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties

## **I. Organization and work of the Eleventh Meeting**

### **A. Introduction**

1. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction provides in Article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2 that the States Parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention. At the 30 November to 4 December 2009 Second Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to hold annually, until a Third Review Conference in 2014, a Meeting of the States Parties. In addition, at the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties agreed to hold the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties in Phnom Penh the week of 28 November to 2 December 2011.

2. To prepare for the Eleventh Meeting, in keeping with past practice, at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, a provisional agenda and provisional programme of work was presented. Based upon discussions at that meeting, it was the sense of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that these documents were generally acceptable to the States Parties to be put before the Eleventh Meeting for adoption. To seek views on matters of substance, the President-Designate convened an informal meeting in Geneva on 5 September 2011 to which all States Parties, States not parties and interested organizations were invited to participate.

3. The opening of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties was preceded on 27 November 2011 by field visits for delegates and the press to mined areas and post-clearance sites in northwest Cambodia, to the Kien Khleang Rehabilitation Centre and to the Oudong Demining Training Institute. In the evening an opening ceremony took place at the Peace Palace in Phnom Penh featuring the participation of Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme Helen Clark, Minister Attached to the Prime Minister of Cambodia and Vice President of the Cambodian Mine Action Authority Prak Sokhonn, and landmine survivor and youth activist Song Kosal.

### **B. Organization of the Meeting**

4. The Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties was opened on 28 November 2011 by H.E. Gazmend Turdiu of Albania, President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties. H.E. Gazmend Turdiu presided over the election of the President of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. The Meeting elected, by acclamation, H.E. Prak Sokhonn of Cambodia, Minister attached to the Prime Minister of Cambodia and Vice-President of the Cambodian Mine Action Authority, as its President in accordance with rule 5 of the rules of procedure.

5. At the opening session, His Majesty King Norodom Sihamoni of the Kingdom of Cambodia delivered a message via video to the meeting and a message was delivered by Jarmo Sareva, Director of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (Geneva Branch), on behalf of the Secretary General of the United Nations. In addition, a message was delivered by Denise Coghlan on behalf of the Nobel Peace Prize co-laureates the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and Jody Williams. As well, a message was delivered by Olivier Vodoz, Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, on behalf of the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross and by Dr. Barbara Haering, President of the Council of Foundation of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining.

6. At its first plenary session on 28 November 2011, the Eleventh Meeting adopted its agenda as contained in Annex I to this report. On the same occasion, the meeting adopted its programme of work as contained in document APLC/MSP.11/2011/2.

7. Also at its first plenary session, Albania, Australia, Canada, Colombia, Lithuania, Philippines, Switzerland, Thailand and Uganda were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the Eleventh Meeting of States Parties. Accordingly, the rules of procedure for Meetings of the States Parties<sup>1</sup> were amended given that the rules indicate that Meetings of States Parties shall elect eight Vice-Presidents, because traditionally there have been eight Co-Chairs and currently with the establishment of a new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance with one Co-Chair, there are nine.

8. Also at its first plenary session, the Meeting unanimously confirmed the nomination of H.E. Prum Sophakmonkol of Cambodia as Secretary-General of the Meeting. The Meeting also took note of the appointment, by the United Nations Secretary-General, of Peter Kolarov of the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs as Executive Secretary of the Meeting, and the appointment, by the President, of Kerry Brinkert, Director of the Implementation Support Unit, as the President's Executive Coordinator.

### **C. Participation in the Meeting**

9. The following 82 States Parties participated in the Meeting: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

10. The following State that has acceded to the Convention but for which the Convention has not yet entered into force attended the meeting as observer: Tuvalu. The following signatory that has not ratified the Convention participated in the Meeting as an observer in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: Poland. In addition, the following 14 other States not parties to the Convention participated in the Meeting as observers, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: China, Finland, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, and Vietnam.

11. In accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Rules of Procedure, the following international organizations and institutions, regional organizations, entities and non-governmental organizations attended the Meeting as observers: European Union, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Federation of the Red Cross and Red

---

<sup>1</sup> APLC/MSP.8/2007/5, dated 27 August 2007.

Crescent Societies, Organization of American States (OAS), Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), and United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

12. In accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure, the following other organizations attended the Meeting as observers: APOPO, Centre for International Stabilization and Recovery (CISR), Cleared Ground Demining, the HALO Trust, and International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF).

13. A list of all delegations and delegates to the Eleventh Meeting is contained in document APLC/MSP.11/2011/INF.1.

#### **D. Work of the Meeting**

14. The Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties held ten plenary sessions from 28 November to 2 December 2011. During the first plenary sessions, several States Parties and observer delegations delivered general statements or otherwise made written statements of a general nature available.

15. At its second plenary session, the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties presented a report on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines. In addition, during this plenary session, the States Parties that had submitted requests for extensions in accordance with article 5.4 of the Convention: Algeria, Chile, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Eritrea, presented their requests, the executive summaries of which are contained in documents APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.2, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.4, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.5, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.9 and APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.15. In addition, the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties presented an analysis of the requests submitted by four States Parties, as contained in documents APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.1, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.3, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.7, APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.11, and a paper containing observations on a fifth State Party's request, as contained in document APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.16 and Corr.1.

16. During its second through ninth plenary sessions, the Meeting considered the general status and operation of the Convention, reviewing progress made and challenges that remain in the pursuit of the Convention's aims and in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan 2010-2014. In this regard, the Meeting warmly welcomed the Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011, as contained in Part II of this report, as an important means to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan by measuring progress made since the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties and highlighting priority areas of work for the States Parties in the period between the Eleventh Meeting and the 2012 Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

17. Also in the context of the consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting discussed advances that had been made since the Tenth Meeting in the pursuit of the universalization of the Convention, noting with appreciation the accession to the Convention by Tuvalu on 13 September 2011, the deposit of notification of succession to the Convention by South Sudan on 11 November 2011 and the announcement that accession to the Convention by Finland is imminent. The Meeting also expressed its deep concern about new use of anti-personnel mines by States not parties and armed non-State actors since the Tenth Meeting. The Meeting noted the value of engagement of States not parties and all levels, including at a high level. In this regard, the Meeting requested that the Convention's depository, the United Nations Secretary General, write to each State not

party to the Convention to strongly encourage these States to ratify or accede to the Convention.

18. Also in the context of the consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting discussed advances that had been made since the Tenth Meeting in destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, clearing mined areas and assisting the victims, noting in particular the announcement by Turkey that it had completed the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4 and the declarations of completion of Article 5 mine clearance obligations by Burundi and Nigeria. The Meeting also took stock of challenges that remain in the pursuit of these core aims of the Convention and the importance of cooperation and assistance in overcoming these challenges. In this context, the Meeting took note of and encouraged action on the concrete ideas suggested by the in-coming Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance as well as by others, to make the best possible use of this new Standing Committee. The Meeting also called on all States Parties to recommit, even in difficult financial times, to realising a world without anti-personnel mines, where the rights of all are respected and where all women, girls, boys and men can live in dignity and prosperity.

19. On the afternoon of 30 November, an informal session entitled *Reflecting on two decades of efforts to end the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines* was held, as proposed by the 11MSP President-Designate in June 2011, to seize the opportunity of the Convention returning to one of the places where the landmine movement was born to reflect on two decades of efforts of a wide range of actors to end the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines.

20. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting recalled that the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties had mandated the 10MSP President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. The States Parties noted the conclusion, on 6 September 2011, of the amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU.

21. Also in the context of the consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting recalled the decision of the Tenth Meeting to task the President of the Tenth Meeting to establish an informal open-ended working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU and present recommendations and draft decisions on the most feasible comprehensive financing model for adoption by the Eleventh Meeting. The President of the Tenth Meeting presented an oral report on the work of the working group and took note and encouraged action on the recommendations made by the President of the Tenth Meeting to preserve the results of the work undertaken by the working group in 2011, to work to improve the present funding model and to ensure sufficient contributions are provided to the ISU as long as the financing model remains unchanged.

22. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention recalling the "Directive from the States Parties to the ISU" adopted by the 10MSP which instructed the ISU to propose and present a work plan and budget for the activities of the ISU for the following year to the Coordinating Committee for endorsement and subsequently to the 11MPS for approval, the Meeting approved the work plan and budget for the activities of the ISU in 2012 which was endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on 3 November.

23. Also in recalling the "Directive from the States Parties to the ISU" which tasked the ISU to report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the State Parties, and, to submit an audited annual financial report for the previous year and a preliminary annual financial report for the present year to the Coordinating Committee and subsequently to the 11MSP for approval, the Meeting

approved the report on the activities and finances of the ISU, contained in Annex IV to this report, and the ISU's 2010 audited financial statement.

24. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting recalled the 10MSP decision to examine the possibility of rationalizing the numbers of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, requested that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit approval to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. The States Parties approved the proposal presented by the 10MSP President which would see four States Parties in leadership position on each Standing Committee being reduced to two per Standing Committee with this proposal implemented in two phases, contained in annex III to this report.

25. The Meeting noted with satisfaction the efforts undertaken pursuant to the decision of the Tenth Meeting to request the Coordinating Committee to organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in 2011 in such a way that time is allocated for Co-Chairs, individual States Parties and others to experiment with the new ways of using the Intersessional Work Programme to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Meeting encouraged the Coordinating Committee to consider similar efforts in 2012.

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

#### **E. Decisions and recommendations**

27. At its tenth plenary session, taking into account the analyses and observations presented by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties of the requests submitted under Article 5 of the Convention and the requests themselves, the Meeting took the following decisions:

(a) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Algeria for an extension of Algeria's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5.1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 April 2017.

(b) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, the proposed extension seemed workable, comprehensive and complete and that, as stated by Algeria in its request, Algeria would be able to complete implementation by April 2017.

(c) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, as Algeria has made it clear that it faces difficulties in giving precise dates for completion of work in three specific minefields with specific characteristics including fragmentation mines set in granite rocks and mined areas that are covered with sand, the Meeting noted that Algeria may benefit from discussion of its situation with other States Parties that have experience in clearing similar terrain and which face similar challenges and that such mutual cooperation could be mutually beneficial and could lead to improved clearance rates. The Meeting also noted the value of Algeria ensuring the use of the full range of technical and non-technical means to release suspected hazardous areas.

(d) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the provision of annual milestones of progress to be achieved, which Algeria included in its request, would greatly assist both Algeria and all States Parties in assessing progress during the extension period. In this regard, the Meeting further noted that both could benefit if Algeria provided updates



relative to the annual milestones of expected progress at meetings of the Standing Committees, Meetings of the States Parties, and at the Third Review Conference.

(e) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Chile for an extension of Chile's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5.1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 March 2020.

(f) The Meeting noted that, while the proposed extension seemed workable, the fact that Chile indicates that it has implemented enhanced processes to release land suggests that Chile may find itself in a situation wherein it could proceed with implementation faster than that suggested by the amount of time requested and that doing so could benefit both the Convention and Chile itself given the indication by Chile of the socio-economic benefits that will flow from demining.

(g) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the timeline contained in the request would greatly assist Chile and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. In this regard, the analysing group noted that both could benefit if Chile provided updates relative to these timelines at meetings of the Standing Committees, Meetings of the States Parties, and Review Conferences.

(h) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by the Republic of the Congo for an extension of Congo's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5.1, agreeing with regret to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2013. In granting the request, the States Parties noted that the Republic of the Congo has been non-compliant with respect to its Article 5.1 obligations since 1 November 2011. The States Parties expressed that the unprecedented failure of the Republic of the Congo to complete implementation of Article 5 by 1 November 2011 or to have requested and received an extension on its deadline prior to that date represents a matter of serious concern.

(i) Also in granting the request, the Meeting expressed concern that the Republic of the Congo had not acted in accordance with the agreed "process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to Article 5 deadlines", which was established at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties. The Meeting expressed regret in particular that the late submission of a request by the Republic of the Congo did not permit the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs to carry out their mandate to analyse the request.

(j) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that since the Republic of Congo submitted its initial transparency report in 2002, the Republic of Congo has provided no appreciable additional information to confirm or deny the presence of mines in the reported suspected area nor has it provided information, in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 7(f) on the status of programmes for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5. The Meeting also noted that the Republic of the Congo had not taken advantage of the repeated offers of support from the Implementation Support Unit and other competent actors to assist it in clarifying the presence or the absence of anti-personnel mines in mined areas nor had it made national resources available to do the same.

(k) The meeting noted that by requesting a 14 month extension, the Republic of the Congo was committing to complete implementation of Article 5, paragraph 1 by 1 January 2013. The meeting further noted that if the Republic of the Congo believed it would be unable to complete implementation by that date, it must submit a second extension request no later than 31 March 2012 in order that it could be analysed and considered in an orderly manner at the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

(l) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the commitments made by the Republic of the Congo in its request would greatly assist the Republic of the Congo and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. In this regard, the Meeting requested the Republic of the Congo, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates on these commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

(m) In the context of the seriousness regarding non-compliance by the Republic of the Congo with respect to its obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1, the States Parties agreed to work collectively in a spirit of cooperation to correct this situation and to prevent it from occurring again.

(n) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) for an extension of the DRC's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5.1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2015.

(o) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force a State Party is unable to account for what remains to be done, it is positive that such a State Party, as is the case of the DRC, intends to take steps to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to develop plans accordingly that precisely project the amount of time that will be required to complete Article 5 implementation. In this context, the Meeting noted the importance of the DRC requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts.

(p) The Meeting further noted that by requesting a 26 month extension, the DRC was projecting that it would need approximately 2 years from the date of submission of its request to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request. The Meeting noted the importance of the General Mine Action Assessment (GMAA) and the General Mine Action Survey (GMAS) to obtaining clarity and to producing a detailed plan. In this context, the Meeting noted the importance of the DRC keeping the States Parties apprised of efforts to implement the GMAA and GMAS and the outcomes of these efforts.

(q) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted, that given the importance of external support to ensure timely implementation, the DRC could benefit from enhancing its resource mobilisation strategy, in part by providing clarity regarding estimated costs for implementation. In this context the Meeting noted the importance of the DRC keeping the States Parties apprised of steps to fulfill its commitments and of providing further details on the costs associated with implementation of Article 5.

(r) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that both the DRC and all States Parties could benefit if the DRC provided updates on all commitments made in its extension request at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the States Parties.

(s) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Eritrea for an extension of Eritrea's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5.1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 February 2015.

(t) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force a State Party is unable to account for what remains to be done, it is positive that such a State Party, as is the case of Eritrea, intends to take steps to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to develop plans accordingly that precisely project the amount of time that will be required to

complete Article 5 implementation. In this context, the Meeting noted the importance of Eritrea requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts.

(u) The Meeting further noted that by requesting a 3 year extension, Eritrea was projecting that it would need approximately 3 years from the date of submission of its request to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request. The meeting noted that it would be beneficial if Eritrea was able to do so in less than three years given the indication by Eritrea of the socio-economic benefits that will flow from implementing Article 5 and the prediction that survey needed to establish an understanding of the remaining contamination would be finished before the deadline.

(v) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted, as Eritrea has made it clear that external support based on equal partnership is necessary for implementation, the importance of Eritrea developing as soon as possible resource mobilisation strategies that take into account the need to reach out to a wide range of national and international funding sources. In this context, the Meeting noted that Eritrea might benefit from outreach to international mine action operators or advisors in order to take advantage of the latest survey methods, equipment and lessons learned on land release as well as to access additional sources of international funding.

(w) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that both Eritrea and all States Parties could benefit if Eritrea provided updates on progress made in obtaining clarity regarding the remaining challenge and in producing a detailed plan at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the States Parties.

28. Also in the context of considering the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention, the Meeting warmly welcomed the report presented by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, as contained in annex II to this report. In considering this report, the Meeting noted that the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests and in this context recommended that those States Parties mandated to analyse requests in 2012 reflect on the process to date with a view to identifying efficient methods to ensure that high quality requests and analyses are prepared and with a view to recommendations on this matter being submitted for consideration the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

29. Also in the context of considering the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention, in noting the importance of preventing or addressing further potential Article 5 compliance issues, the Meeting recommended that the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance should hold informal consultations with States Parties and that these consultations as a preventative measure should be undertaken well in advance of deadlines. The meeting further urged States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 report as required annually on the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under their jurisdiction or control, progressively improving the information that is provided. The Meeting also urged States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 to report as required on the status of programmes for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5, providing as much detail as possible. Finally, the Meeting agreed that should any other State Party find itself in a potential position of non-compliance with Article 5 obligations, it should act in a committed and transparent way, immediately communicating, preferably in the form of a note verbale addressed to all States Parties, the reasons, which should be extraordinary, for its anticipated failure to comply. Moreover, if relevant, non-compliant States Parties should

submit as soon as possible a request for an extension, adhering to the process agreed to at the 7MSP.

30. The Meeting noted that the Convention is silent on how to address situations where States Parties, which never have reported Article 5 obligations, discover previously unknown mined areas. The Meeting further noted a need to develop a rational response to such situations which is firmly anchored in the object and purpose of the Convention and which does not undermine the legal obligations to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas as soon as possible. In this context, the meeting requested that the President, supported by the Coordinating Committee, consult with all relevant stakeholders to prepare a constructive discussion on this matter at the May 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees with a view to recommendations on this matter being submitted for consideration the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

31. The Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties:

(a) Having noted suggestions to consider whether the interactive character of the annual meeting of States Parties could not be enhanced and its duration shortened while improving its overall effectiveness,

(b) Decided that the Coordinating Committee brainstorm on this theme in the first half of 2012 and that the May 2012 Intersessional meetings discuss it and submit, through the president, recommendations to the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties in this regard. Should any action be taken by the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties on this basis, it would lead to appropriate adjustments to the organization of the Meetings of the States Parties, effective as from its Thirteenth Meeting

32. At its ninth plenary session, pursuant to consultations undertaken by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Meeting agreed to set the dates of 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees from 21 to 25 May 2012 and identified the following States Parties as the Standing Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties:

(a) Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Algeria and Croatia (Co-Chairs); Colombia Co-Rapporteur);

(b) Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Indonesia and Zambia (Co-Chairs); Netherlands (Co-Rapporteur);

(c) Stockpile Destruction: Germany and Romania (Co-Chairs); Nigeria (Co-Rapporteur);

(d) The General Status and Operation of the Convention: Norway and Peru (Co-Chairs); Bulgaria (Co-Rapporteur); and,

(e) Resources, Cooperation and Assistance: Albania and Thailand (Co-Chairs).

33. At its final session, the Meeting agreed to designate His Excellency Matjaž Kovačič, Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations in Geneva, President of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties and decided to hold the Twelfth Meeting in Geneva the week of 3-7 December 2012. In addition, the Meeting adopted cost estimates for the Twelfth Meeting as contained in document APLC/MSP.11/2011/6.

## **F. Documentation**

34. A list of documents of the Eleventh Meeting is contained in annex VI to this report.

**G. Adoption of the Final Report and conclusion of the Meeting**

35. At its final plenary session, on 2 December 2011, the Meeting adopted its draft report, as contained in document APLC/MSP.11/2011/L.1, as orally amended.

## II. Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: the Phnom Penh Progress Report, 2010-2011

### Introduction

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

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

3. To ensure the effectiveness of the Cartagena Action Plan, the States Parties appreciate the need to regularly monitor progress of the application of the actions contained within it. The purpose of the Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011 is to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan by measuring progress made during the period 4 December 2010 to 2 December 2011 and, in doing so, to highlight priority areas of work for the States Parties in the period between the 2011 Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP) and the 2012 Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties (12MSP). It is the second in a series of annual progress reports prepared by the States Parties in advance of the 2014 Third Review Conference.

### I. Universalizing the Convention

4. Since the 2010 Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, Tuvalu, on 13 September 2011, deposited its instrument of accession and South Sudan deposited its notification of succession to the Convention on 11 November 2011. There are now 158 States that have ratified, acceded or succeeded to the Convention. Two (2) of the Convention's 133 signatories have not yet ratified, accepted or approved the Convention: the Marshall Islands and Poland, notwithstanding that, in accordance with Article 18 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, these signatories are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the Convention.

5. Tuvalu and South Sudan are the first two States to have joined the Convention since November 2007. They will likely be followed soon by other States.

(a) At the 11MSP, **Finland** announced that the Parliament of Finland approved Finland's accession to the Convention and that the Government of Finland was in the process of finalizing the decision. In addition, Finland indicated that it would deposit its instrument of accession with the United Nations Secretary General in the coming weeks.

(b) Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee, **Poland** reiterated that it is expected to ratify the Convention in 2012, with Poland's parliament expected to consider a bill in the autumn of 2011.

(c) Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee, **Mongolia** recalled the steps it has taken towards joining the Convention and its commitment to early accession.

(d) Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee, the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** (Lao PDR) expressed confidence that it would become a party to the Convention in coming years.

6. Given their resolve to achieve universal adherence to the Convention and its norms, the States Parties agreed at the Cartagena Summit to seize every opportunity to promote ratification of and accession to the Convention, particularly in regions with low adherence to the Convention and to promote and encourage adherence to the norms of the Convention.<sup>2</sup> In light of the universalisation challenges noted in Cartagena and commitments made to overcome these challenges, the 10MSP President appointed His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein of Jordan to serve as the President's Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. Thanks to enhanced support provided by Norway through the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), Prince Mired visited the capitals of the **Republic of Korea, Tonga and Tuvalu**.

7. In addition to appointing a Special Envoy on Universalization, the 10MSP President took an active interest in promoting universalization, including by meeting in Geneva with the Permanent Representatives of **Finland** and **Poland** and in Vienna with the Permanent Representative of **Kazakhstan**. In addition, the 10MSP President called for all European and Central Asian States to join the Convention at an address to the 650th plenary meeting of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Forum for Security and Cooperation.

8. The 11MSP President-Designate placed a heavy emphasis on promoting acceptance of the Convention in the lead-up to the 11MSP, focusing particularly on South East Asia. In August 2011, the 11MSP President-Designate traveled to Hanoi where he met with Vietnam's Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Deputy Minister of Defence. This was followed by a mission to Singapore in October 2011 to engage Singapore's Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Defence. To both States, the 11MSP President-Designate expressed that the 11MSP presents an opportunity for the Member States of the ASEAN to demonstrate solidarity in their resolve to address the challenges posed by past conflicts and that accession to the Convention by yet another South East Asian State would help strengthen the international movement to eradicate anti-personnel mines.

9. Other States Parties continued their efforts to promote acceptance of the Convention. Canada, while stepping down after a decade of coordinating the work of the informal Universalization Contact Group, was congratulated for both its past efforts and ongoing commitment to universalization. Belgium replaced Canada as coordinator of the Contact Group and called upon States Parties to become champions of universalization in their own regions of the world.

10. The States Parties continued to use the annual United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolution on the universalisation and implementation of the Convention as one measure of States' acceptance of the Convention's norms.<sup>3</sup> On 8 December 2010, this resolution was adopted by 164 votes to none, with 18 abstentions. The following 22 States not parties voted in favour of this resolution: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Lao PDR, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Tonga, Tuvalu and the United Arab Emirates. For **Saudi Arabia**, it was the first time that it had voted in favour of this resolution.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #1 and #3.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations General Assembly Resolution 65/48.

11. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to encourage and support the universalisation efforts of all relevant partners, including international, regional and non-governmental organizations.<sup>4</sup> International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) member organisations in over 60 countries participated in an effort to promote accession to the Convention by the USA. In addition, ICBL member organizations continued to promote the acceptance of the Convention by other States not parties, including in Azerbaijan, Finland, Georgia, Israel, Lebanon, Nepal, Mongolia, Poland and Sri Lanka. The ICRC continued to play a central role in universalisation efforts in every region of the world, including by providing valuable support to the efforts of the Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. In addition, the ICRC and the UNDP supported Cambodia in organizing a regional seminar on addressing the human costs of anti-personnel landmines. On 4 April 2011, the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General again called for the universal adherence and implementation of the Convention. As well, United Nations departments, agencies, funds and programmes continued to promote the Convention.

12. On 3 April 2011, the President of the European Parliament issued a statement welcoming the announcement by the Finnish and Polish governments which have set 2012 as the year when they will join the Convention and noting that this “will further strengthen the credibility of the EU in its fight against landmines.” On 7 July 2011, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on “Progress in Mine Action” which urged all States not parties, in particular those European Union (EU) Member States that have not yet acceded to the Convention, to do so.<sup>5</sup> This resolution also noted that the USA has already complied with most of the provisions of the Convention and therefore encouraged the USA to accede to the Convention. Furthermore, this resolution called for the EU to continue promoting the universalization of the Convention, including in its political dialogue and agreements signed with third countries.

13. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to condemn and continue to discourage in every possible way any production, transfer and use of anti-personnel mines by any actor.<sup>6</sup> Since the 10MSP, three States not parties – Israel, Libya and Myanmar – made new use of anti-personnel mines. In addition, according to the ICBL, armed non-State actors in the following four countries have done the same: Afghanistan, Colombia, Myanmar and Pakistan. A number of States Parties, including the 10MSP President, joined the ICBL in expressing deep concern with new mine use by States not parties and by other actors. In addition, the 10MSP President joined the ICBL in expressing concerns about large weapons stores containing anti-personnel mines in Tripoli remaining unguarded and unsecured weeks after forces aligned to Libya’s National Transitional Council seized control.

14. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to encourage States not parties, particularly those that have professed support for the humanitarian objectives of the Convention, to participate in the work of the Convention.<sup>7</sup> In 2011, in keeping with the States Parties’ tradition of openness, all States not parties were invited to participate in the Intersessional Work Programme and the 11MSP and its preparations. 16 States not parties registered to take part in the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and 15 States not parties were recorded as observers of the 11MSP.

15. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to continue promoting universal observance of the Conventions’ norms, by condemning, and taking appropriate steps to end

---

<sup>4</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #2.

<sup>5</sup> European Parliament resolution of 7 July 2011 on Progress on Mine Action (2011/2007(INI).

<sup>6</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #5.

<sup>7</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #6.



the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors.<sup>8</sup> Since the 10MSP, no additional armed non-State actor signed the Geneva Call's "Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action" leaving 41 the number of armed non-State actors that have made this commitment. Nevertheless, the view was expressed that when engagement by non-governmental organizations of armed non-State actors is considered, vigilance is required to prevent terrorist organizations from exploiting the Ottawa Process for their own goals. Some States Parties continue to be of the view that when engagement with armed non-state actors is contemplated, States Parties concerned should be informed and their consent would be necessary in order for such an engagement to take place. One State Party reiterated its concern regarding the engagement on the basis of one previous signing of the "Deed of Commitment" of Geneva Call as inconsistent with the above view.

## II. Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines

16. At the close of the 10MSP there were four (4) States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained relevant: Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine, with all four of these States Parties having been non-compliant with respect to their stockpile destruction obligation. Hence, 152 States Parties no longer held stocks of anti-personnel mines other than mines that States Parties are permitted to retain under Article 3, either because they never did or because they had completed their destruction programmes. At the close of the 10MSP, together the States Parties had reported the destruction of approximately 44 million mines.

17. At the 11MSP, Turkey informed the States Parties that it had completed the implementation of Article 4. In making its announcement, Turkey indicated that 2,938,060 anti-personnel mines were destroyed at the munitions disposal facility in Turkey by the end of November 2010, the destruction of the remaining 22,716 "ADAM"-type mines (Area Denial Antipersonnel Mines) containing depleted uranium was completed on 21 June 2011 at a facility in a third country. Since that date, Turkey does not hold or possess any stockpiled antipersonnel mines. Since the 10MSP, Belarus, Greece, and Ukraine have continued their efforts to ensure the destruction of their stockpiles. There are 155 States that have joined the Convention that now no longer hold stocks of anti-personnel mines. Given progress in stockpile destruction reported by Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine since the 10MSP, States Parties have now reported the destruction of over 44.5 million mines.

18. The 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report again acknowledged that the complexity of destruction of PFM1-type anti-personnel mines combined with the limited number of entities capable of destroying these mines, the vast numbers of these mines held by Belarus and Ukraine, the inadvisability of transferring these mines for destruction and the high cost of destruction had resulted in a compelling implementation challenge for both States Parties. The Geneva Progress Report also recalled that the destruction of PFM mines is significantly more challenging and complex, technically and financially, than the destruction of other anti-personnel mines.

19. The Geneva Progress Report recorded that at the close of the 10MSP, **Belarus** had 3,370,172 stockpiled PFM-1 type anti-personnel mines that remained to be destroyed. The Geneva Progress Report also recorded that, in June 2010, the European Commission (EC) proposed that Belarus sign the Addendum to the Financing Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Belarus and the European Commission on the implementation of the project "Destruction of PFM-1 Series Ammunition in Belarus", dated 22 January 2008. The Geneva Progress Report further recorded that the Addendum to

---

<sup>8</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #4.

the Financing Agreement was signed by Belarus, that it entered into force on 24 August 2010 and that, on 30 June 2010, the EC announced a new tender to select a contractor to implement the project “Destruction of PFM-1 Series Ammunition in Belarus”.

20. On 20 June 2011, Belarus informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that a sufficient number of qualified bidders participated in the aforementioned tender and that on 19-21 October 2010 the EU Evaluation Committee meeting was held in Kiev where the Evaluation Committee selected an appropriate company as a contractor for the implementation of the project. On 21 December 2010, the European Union signed the contract for the aforementioned project with a company called Explosives Alaveses SA (EXPAL) of Spain. On 19 January 2011, EXPAL was registered as a legal entity of the Republic of Belarus. Belarus further indicated that the tender process has been completed and that currently, EXPAL, in cooperation with Belarus is implementing necessary administrative and technical preparations to start PFM-1 destruction. As well, Belarus informed that under the time frameworks approved by the European Union and Belarus, it is estimated that the Belarusian stockpiles of PFM-1 munitions will be eliminated in 2013. Additionally, Belarus stated that in 2010, the Belarusian private company “Stroyenergo” had destroyed 160 cassettes of CSF-1 type, which contained 11,520 PFM-1 mines during the process of testing its experimental destruction unit. Belarus confirmed as well that by the end of 2010, “Stroyenergo” put an end to its research project.

21. Belarus further informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that, in conducting a scrupulous inventory of all existing stockpiles of PFM-1 mines, the Ministry of Defence revealed that one batch of boxes had been improperly marked, leading to an altered number of stockpiled PFM-1 mines, which decreased the total number of these mines stockpiled in Belarus by 2016 pieces, hence, reducing the total number of Belarusian stockpiled APMs to be destroyed. Accordingly, on 30 April 2011, Belarus provided updated information in accordance with Article 7, paragraphs 1(b) and 2 of the Convention, reporting that as of 1 January 2011, 3,356,636 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remain to be destroyed.

22. Belarus informed the 11MSP that all the necessary administrative procedures have been finalized by EXPAL and the Belarusian authorities and that the PFM-1 destruction was about to start. In July 2011, EXPAL chose the subcontractor – the Russian company Anfacion – to construct the facilities on the site of the destruction. Belarus further informed that the construction work began on 31 October 2011 and that EXPAL had obtained the necessary license to import to Belarus the destruction facility. Since then EXPAL reported that the destruction facility has been assembled and is ready to be delivered and installed at the destruction site. Belarus indicated that the estimated date for the completion of the destruction all stockpiles in accordance with Article 4 was May 2013.

23. The Geneva Progress Report recorded that, at the close of the 10MSP, **Greece** had 951,146 stockpiled anti-personnel mines that remained to be destroyed. The Geneva Progress Report also recorded that Greece had indicated that it had transferred 615,362 mines to Bulgaria for destruction and that Bulgaria had reported deliveries of 614,882 mines. The Geneva Progress Report noted that the difference between the two figures was a matter of ongoing examination between Greece and Bulgaria. In addition, the Geneva Progress Report referred to the termination of Greece’s contract with the Bulgarian munitions destruction firm EAS / VIDEX and indicated that EAS had filed an appeal against the Greek State, which was under consideration by the competent Greek courts.

24. On 20 June 2011, Greece informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that a follow up on the issue of initial difference of (480) mines between Bulgarian and Greek data was investigated by competent Greek authorities. During this investigation, it was acknowledged that the 480 mines were stored in an ammunitions warehouse of the Greek Army and that the discrepancy in numbers was due to an uneven

distribution of mines during packaging for shipment to Bulgaria. The investigation also resulted in the identification that Greece's initial stockpile before the commencement of the destruction process amounted to 1,568,167 mines instead of 1,566,532 mines, which had been previously reported. Greece noted the challenges involved in the accurate accounting of such a vast number of mines and reaffirmed its obligation to submit accurate data. Also on 20 June 2011, Bulgaria confirmed that between 15 December 2008 and 14 May 2010 a total of 614,882 Greek anti-personnel mines had been delivered to and destroyed in Bulgaria. As well, with regard to the findings of the Greek investigation concerning the issue of difference between Greek and Bulgarian data relating to the quantity of delivered mines, Bulgaria considered the case closed.

25. Also on 20 June 2011, Greece indicated, with regard to the remaining 953,285 stockpiled mines, that in April 2011, following a year of judicial processing, EAS won its case and was re-awarded the stockpile destruction project. As a result, on 21 April 2011, EAS submitted a revised proposal with a new timeline and financial conditions for destruction. On 20 June 2011, Greece indicated that this proposal was the subject of ongoing negotiations between Greece's Ministry of Defence and EAS and that the proposal entails re-initiation of the contract within the next six months and the subsequent completion of destruction within twenty-two months.

26. At the 11MSP, Greece indicated that the EAS proposal remained unexecuted pending the completion of a judicial process and budgetary appropriations which are anticipated to come following the adoption of the 2012 budget by the Parliament. Greece further indicated that a future new contract would involve the closer engagement of the Hellenic armed forces in monitoring the process and that the competent authorities were currently examining alternative options to expedite the destruction process, more particularly assessing other offers from certified companies which specialize in the field of destruction/demilitarization of ammunitions.

27. The Geneva Progress Report recorded that, at the close of the 10MSP, **Turkey** had 22,788 stockpiled anti-personnel mines that remained to be destroyed, that these were "Area Denial Anti-Personnel Mines" (ADAM) which require special handling because they contain depleted uranium, and that a contract had been signed on 16 November 2010 with the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) for the destruction of these mines.

28. On 20 June 2011, Turkey informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that a total of 631 ADAM-type mines (each containing 36 sub-munitions, thus totalling 22,716 mines) were transferred to Germany for destruction on 17 February 2011. Turkey further indicated that destruction of these mines began in Germany on 23 March 2011 and that destruction should be completed by 31 August 2011. Also on 20 June 2011, Germany confirmed that, in accordance with a contract between NAMSA and the munitions destruction company "Spreewerke Lübben", 631 projectiles, each containing 36 anti-personnel mines (ADAM-type), entered German territory on 3 March 2011. Germany also indicated that, while the transfer had been authorised by the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, all contracting obligations were solely between NAMSA and "Spreewerke Lübben". In addition, Germany stated that once achieved, the completion of the destruction would be verified by a technical expert of the Office for Procurement of the German Armed Forces and that a certificate of compliance will be given to NAMSA.

29. At the 11MSP Turkey informed the States Parties that the destruction of its remaining antipersonnel mines, namely the 22,716 area denial antipersonnel mines, had been completed on 21 June 2011 and that this information had been confirmed directly by the undertaking company in Germany. Turkey further indicated that, while it had already ensured the destruction of its remaining stockpiles of anti-personnel mines before the end of 2010, the completion of the destruction process at a plant in Germany had been confirmed and that accordingly Turkey has now completed the fulfilment of its Article 4 obligations.

30. The 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report recorded that, at the close of the 10MSP, **Ukraine** had 5,951,785 stockpiled PFM-1 type anti-personnel mines that remained to be destroyed, that the destruction of anti-personnel mines had been identified as a priority that could be financed under the European Union's European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI), and that Norway would provide up to US\$ 1 million in 2010-2011 for Ukraine's stockpile destruction efforts.

31. In April 2011, Ukraine provided updated information in accordance with Article 7, paragraphs 1(b) and 2 of the Convention reporting that 5,951,785 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained. On 20 June 2011, Ukraine informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine eliminated 6,480 PFM-1 mines in May and June 2011 using KSF-1 engineer cassettes ejected into a closed water reservoir. Ukraine stated that this improved technical method will enable the destruction of 1.1 million PFM-1 mines per year and is considered an environmentally friendly solution. Ukraine indicated as well that according to the government decree issued on 20 May 2011, the Ministry of Defence on 21 September 2011 would sign an Implementation Agreement with NAMSA which would ensure the incineration of 3 million PFM-1 landmines at the "State Enterprise Research-Industrial Complex Pavlograd Chemical Plant". Ukraine noted that if proper funding is provided and all necessary internal procedures are completed, the Pavlograd Chemical Plant together with the military engineers will be able to destroy remaining stocks of PFM-1 mines appropriately. Ukraine also noted the upgrades made to the Pavlograd Chemical Plant facilities using Norway's contribution of US\$ 1 million to facilitate Ukraine's destruction process. On 26 August 2011, the upgraded Pavlograd's incinerator was tested with the participation of Ukrainian and international experts.

32. Also on 20 June 2011, Norway informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that, in January 2011, a Norwegian observation team supported by a technical expert from the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) made a first visit to the Pavlograd Chemical Factory to inspect the facilities where the destruction of the mines will take place. Norway noted that the equipment that has been purchased under the Norwegian grant is in the process of being installed, and that the following week the Norwegian Ambassador and a technical expert from the GICHD would make a second visit to look at the equipment and procedures that should be in place to ensure its effective and efficient use. The GICHD added that the destruction method to be used by Ukraine is safe, affordable, easily upgradable to national emission standards, simple to maintain and operate, built using readily-available materials and capable of sustaining high rates of output.

33. At the 11MSP, Ukraine indicated that on 21 September 2011, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine signed the Implementing Agreement with the NATO Maintenance and Supply Organisation (NAMSO). The Implementation Agreement, which covers the destruction of half of the PFM-type mines, will enter into force after the completion of the internal procedures. Ukraine further reported that the Pavlograd Chemical Plant will be able to destroy up to 1.1 million PFM-1 type mines per year. In addition, Ukraine reported that the armed forces of Ukraine eliminated in 2011 more than 6,000 PFM-1 type mines.

34. States Parties again expressed concern that three States Parties have failed to comply with the four-year deadline to destroy or ensure the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned, possessed or under their jurisdiction or control, encouraged the early completion of stockpile destruction programmes and recalled that the Cartagena Action Plan provides guidelines for getting back into the status of compliance. It was recalled that in the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have missed their deadlines

for completion of obligations under Article 4 will provide an expected completion date<sup>9</sup>. It was noted that some States Parties in question have not yet done so. It was also noted that all States Parties have a role in being vigilant in ensuring that those with stockpile destruction programmes are on track to meet their obligations, including through the provision of international cooperation and assistance. In addition, it was again noted that Belarus, Greece and Ukraine each have expressed a deep commitment to the Convention and the fulfilment of their obligations.

35. The 10MSP's Geneva Progress Reported noted ambiguity with respect to the stockpile status of **Iraq** and that, should Iraq have stockpiled anti-personnel mines, Iraq would need to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled mines under its jurisdiction or control by 1 February 2012. (While in its May 2009 Article 7 submission, Iraq did not include any information on stockpiles or programmes related to their destruction, in its 15 June 2010 Article 7 submission, Iraq appeared to indicate that 690 stockpiled anti-personnel mines were held.) At the 20 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, Iraq indicated that all the mines in question had been destroyed with the exception of 45 mines that had been retained for permitted purposes under Article 3 of the Convention.

36. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, it was recalled that, at the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will, when previously unknown stockpiles are discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed, report such discoveries in accordance with their obligations under Article 7, and in addition take advantage of other informal means to share such information as soon as possible and destroy these anti-personnel mines as a matter of urgent priority.<sup>10</sup>

37. In its Article 7 report submitted in 2011, Burundi reported the destruction, on 18 June 2011, of 69 anti-personnel mines which were stockpiled at the Service National de Renseignement. At the 11MSP, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia indicated that, in an effort to determine what munitions held by its armed forces would need to be destroyed in accordance with the obligations of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's armed forces discovered 8 cassettes containing approximately 500 of PFM1-S type anti-personnel mines (464 kilos in total). The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia further indicated that in November 2011, the Ministry of Defence of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia contacted the GICHD with respect to making arrangements for a mission by a technical expert to destroy the mines in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's possession. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia reported that all these mines could likely be destroyed early in 2012 and in a relatively easy manner. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia indicated that it would share information at the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction in May 2012 on progress made in the destruction of the stockpiled antipersonnel mines. Also at the 11MSP, Guinea Bissau indicated that a small stockpile of antipersonnel mines had been found in Quebo and Gabu military bases during a joint assessment mission conducted by Guinea Bissau's Government and UNMAS to identify the quantity of Guinea Bissau storage ammunitions. 7 PMN mines and two original boxes of POMZ-2 were found. Guinea Bissau indicated its intention to destroy these mines as soon as possible but no later than 31 March 2012.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #9.

<sup>10</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #12.

### III. Clearing mined areas

38. The 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report recalled that there are 54 States Parties that originally had formally reported that they had to fulfil the obligation contained in Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Of these, by the close of the 10MSP, 16 had reported that they had fulfilled their obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. Therefore, at the close of the 10MSP, there were 38 that had to still fulfil this obligation.

39. Since the 10MSP, two States Parties - Burundi and Nigeria - informed the States Parties that they had completed implementation of Article 5. In making its announcement at the 11MSP, Burundi noted that between May 2005 and 25 October 2011, **Burundi** released 235 areas – covering 29 square kilometres -originally suspected to be mined. In the course of its efforts, Burundi found and destroyed 72 antipersonnel mines. In making its announcement at the 20 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, **Nigeria** noted that its efforts to comply with Article 5 of the Convention involved surveying over 150,000 square kilometres in 11 of Nigeria's States and, that in the course of complying with Article 5, a total of 820 anti-personnel mines, 325 anti-vehicle mines and 17,516 other explosive hazards were destroyed. Nigeria also noted that the fact that the main challenge faced by Nigeria concerned unexploded ordnance points to how valuable this Convention is in ensuring that not only landmines are dealt with by affected countries, but that all other explosive remnants of war are dealt with.

40. There are now 36 States Parties that formally indicated that they must still fulfil the obligation contained in Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zimbabwe. In addition, on 22 June 2011, Germany informed the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies that it suspected that there may be anti-personnel mines in areas under the jurisdiction or control of Germany and provided an update on this matter at the 11MSP. Also at the 11MSP, Hungary reported patches of land straddling the border of Hungary and Croatia suspected to contain mines.

41. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have been granted an extension to their initial Article 5 deadline will complete implementation of Article 5 as soon as possible but not later than their extended deadlines, ensure progress toward completion proceeds in accordance with the commitments made in their extension requests and the decisions taken on their requests, and report regularly on such progress.<sup>11</sup> Since the 10MSP, States Parties continued efforts to act in accordance with their Cartagena Summit commitments.

42. **Argentina** indicated in its request that, as it “does not exercise territorial control over the land to be demined,” the plan submitted as part of the request is a “schematic plan”. Argentina has pointed out that this plan will be developed in detail and will be implemented as soon as Argentina does exercise control over the areas in question or when both Argentina and the United Kingdom “reach agreement over making progress in such planning.” Since the 10MSP, there has been no change regarding the exercise of control over the areas in question.

<sup>11</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #13.

43. **Bosnia and Herzegovina**, in its request, committed to have released a total of 493.70 square kilometres of suspected area between 2009 and 2011. Bosnia and Herzegovina has reported that between 2009 and May 2011, a total of 343.67 square kilometres had been released. Additionally, in its extension request, Bosnia and Herzegovina committed to develop a survey method for releasing “priority risk category III areas”, to be reviewed during the first revision of the strategic plan in 2012; distribute a list of locations for humanitarian demining by administrative units in Bosnia and Herzegovina including the size of the suspected areas; distribute plans for technical survey and clearance which include the size and location of the areas to be addressed and the organizations that will carry out the activities in accordance with annual mine action plans, and; adopt a new mine action law to create conditions for stable and continuous funding of mine action from local government budgets and donor support, and, see that the Bosnia and Herzegovina Ministry of Finance and Treasury will ensure shortfall of funds.

44. **Cambodia** committed in its request to clear, in 2009 and 2010, a total of 78,027,793 square metres of area containing anti-personnel mines, and, in 2011, to clear an additional 40,188,176 square metres of area containing anti-personnel mines. Cambodia has reported the release (i.e., through clearance and other means) in 2009 and 2010 of 135,258,400 square metres of area containing anti-personnel mines and / or anti-vehicle mines and /or other explosive remnants of war. Also in its extension request, Cambodia indicated that an estimated 648.8 square kilometers of area containing anti-personnel mines covering 122 districts would require full clearance and that by the end of 2011 it would have completed Phases 1 and 2 of a Baseline Survey in 61 districts to define a new baseline. By November 2011, Cambodia has completed the Baseline Survey in 60 districts and more districts will be completed by the end of 2011. Cambodia further reported that the Baseline Survey to date had resulted in the identification of 9,435 suspected hazardous areas (i.e., areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and / or anti-vehicle mines and /or other explosive remnants of war) in 23 districts totaling 714,320,976 square metres. In addition, in its extension request, Cambodia committed to develop annual clearance plans based on the outcomes of the Baseline Survey. This task is pending completion of the Baseline Survey in late 2012.

45. **Chad** committed in its request to conduct reconnaissance and technical survey to assess the mine problem in the entire country (excluding Tibesti) and carry out clearance of high impact areas known to contain mines and unexploded ordnance particularly in areas where operators have started demining operations; create a new demining section or acquire mechanised means to resume demining operations in the minefield surrounding the Wadi Doum base in 4 areas with a combined area of 4 million square meters over a period of 5 years; over an estimated period of 2 years update its database; on completion of the reconnaissance, carry out demining of areas known to contain mines and unexploded ordnance, and; resume operations in the north-east of the country. In 2011, Chad reported that the technical investigation has covered four regions (N’Djamena, Sila, Salamat, Hadjer-Lamis) and the majority of two others (Borkou, Ennedi), and, that technical survey must now be implemented in three regions (Ouaddai, Tibesti Wadi Fira). Chad indicated that operations have located a total of 32,743,108 square meters of suspected area, located and destroyed 1,298 anti-personnel mines and 1,261 anti-vehicle mines, cleared 1,027,506 square meters and marked 49 million square meters, including 32,743,108 square meters of newly located suspected area and 6,256,892 square meters of previously confirmed mined area.

46. Chad further reported that since 2010 its database has been up to date, that quality control work in Wadi Doum began in March 2011, that survey operations and demining stopped in Wadi Doum in mid June 2011 that it expected that the operator would transmit the full report to the UNDP in July 2011. Chad also reported that it has created a local demining capacity in the Tibesti region and that four EOD teams have been deployed in the

east and north. In addition, Chad reported that it will submit a reliable and revised plan in 2012 based on the results of the technical survey which will form part of its third extension request to be submitted no later than 31 March 2013.

47. **Colombia** committed in its request to releasing, in 2011, 2,602,034 square metres of suspected hazardous area in 14 municipalities using a combination of national squads and civilian organisations. In addition, Colombia committed to carry out activities and establish methodologies to better understand the level of contamination in the country. In June 2011, Colombia reported that 288,495 square metres in 12 municipalities had been released by that date in 2011 with 196 improvised explosive devices with anti-personnel mine characteristics and 24 UXO having been located and destroyed. Colombia also reported that the Colombian Congress approved Law 1421 of 2010 which authorizes the adoption of national standards and methods to regulate humanitarian demining activities by non-governmental organizations. Colombia reported that the decree for regulating activities of NGOs and national standards was at an advanced stage of development.

48. **Croatia** committed in its request to release approximately 173 square kilometres of suspected hazardous area in 2009-2010 and approximately 119 square metres in 2011. Croatia has reported having released approximately 132.5 million square metres in 2009-2010 through mine clearance and mine search projects and general survey activities. In addition, Croatia committed to develop methodologies enabling better quality analysis of the mine contamination situation in forested areas; to have removed the danger from areas for reconstruction of houses and infrastructure by the end of 2010 and from areas allocated for agricultural production and cattle breeding by 2013, and; to demining around houses planned for reconstruction and return of displaced person by 2010.

49. **Denmark**, in its request, committed, in the first half of 2010, to carry out a tender process and set up operations, and, from July 2010 to December 2011, carry out surface probing, sifting of dikes and dunes, clearance of beaches, clearance of low marshlands and clearance of high marshland. From January to June 2012, Denmark would carry out quality control. In 2011, Denmark reported that the clearance of the last remaining mined areas will be conducted by the Danish Consortium Damasec J. Jensen Group and that the contractor aimed to complete clearance well before December 2011. Denmark also indicated that, by June 2011, 155 hectares have been cleared resulting in the destruction of 4,045 mines. Of these 155 hectares, 66 hectares had been released for public access. Another 89 hectares were cleared but public access was still restricted in order to complete quality control and to maintain the safety distance from the ongoing clearance. Thirty-one (31) hectares remained to be cleared. Denmark also confirmed that implementation would be complete by the 1 July 2012 deadline.

50. **Ecuador** committed in its request to release 21,365 square metres in the province of Morona Santiago during the period of October 2009 to September 2010 and to release an additional 10,150 square metres in the same province during the period October 2010 to September 2011. At the 10MSP, Ecuador reported that 15,795.35 of the 21,365 square metre planned had been cleared with the remaining area released without the use of manual demining. Ecuador further reported that a total of 22 objectives had been concluded of which 7 were planned for the period of October 2009 to September 2010 and 15 corresponded to new areas identified and other areas planned for the period between 2011 and 2013.

51. **Jordan** committed in its request to complete clearance of its Northern Border Mine Clearance Project, amounting to 10,355,967 square metres of mined area, by the end of 2011. In June 2011, Jordan reported that as of the end of May 2011, almost 74 percent of the North Border Project's clearance phase had been completed, as well as 28 percent of the verification phase. Jordan further reported that manual clearance is expected to be completed by the end of 2011. In 2010, Jordan also reported on its Jordan Valley Sampling



and Verification Project indicating that 190 suspected hazardous areas with a total of 12.5 million square meters of the original 267 have been identified in the Jordan Valley in need of Quality Assurance and Verification. In 2011, Jordan reported that 51 suspected hazardous areas with 2.6 million square metres have been verified and 405,000 square metres having been sampled.

52. **Mauritania** committed in its request during the period of 2010 to 2011 to release 7 areas measuring 9,315,000 square meters. In 2011, Mauritania reported that mine clearance operations in the region of Daklet Nouadhibou have destroyed 271 mines and that a total of 9 areas measuring 11,670,000 square meters would be demined during the period of 2010 to 2011 instead of the 7 planned for the same period.

53. **Mozambique** committed in its request to having addressed 383 areas totalling 4,807,920 square metres during the period 2008 to 2010 and to having addressed an additional 28 areas totalling 2,574,239 square metres in 2011. In June 2011, Mozambique reported that during the 2008 to 2010 period it had completed 499 tasks totalling 12,794,957 square metres. This included 321 tasks totalling 7,262,989 square metres from the 541 areas and equaling 12,164,401 square metres that were identified in the 2008 baseline survey and in the extension request, and 178 tasks totalling 5,531,968 square metres of new areas identified since the request was submitted. Mozambique also reported that as of December 2010, 323 tasks totalling 10,560,399 square metres remained including 220 tasks representing 4,901,412 square metres from the original baseline and 103 presenting 5,658,987 newly identified suspected hazardous areas.

54. Mozambique also committed in its extension request to survey and to clear an 11 kilometre stretch of mine belt near the Cahora Bassa Dam, to clear approximately 170 power pylons mined in Maputo Province, and to survey the Mozambican-Zimbabwean border in order to estimate clearance implications. In June 2011, Mozambique reported the completion of mine clearance in areas surrounding the Chicamba Dam. Survey and clearance of the Cahora Bassa Dam and the Maputo Power pylons are ongoing. Mozambique also reported the completion of the survey of the border with the results indicating the existence of 22 mine fields totalling 3.2 million square metres inside Zimbabwe and 2.9 million square metres inside Mozambique. This portion of the Mozambique border (2.9 million square metres) is included in the 103 new tasks equalling 5.6 million square meters of suspected hazardous areas.

55. **Peru** committed in its extension request (a) in 2008 to complete the clearance of 153, 600 square metres remaining in the ETECEN-Huancayo high tension towers, complete clearance of 7,800 square metres remaining around retransmission antennas and electric substations (Antena Cuto Cuto – Junin, Antena Yahuaspuquio – Junin, Antena Huamurca – Huarochiri and Estacion Zapallal – Lima) and complete clearance of 2,265.52 square metres in one objective on the border with Ecuador, (b) in 2009 to complete the clearance of two police bases (Anti Drug Base – Santa Lucia, and Anti Terrorist Base – Tulumayo) and the clearance of 8,700 square metres in two objectives on the border with Ecuador, (c) in 2010 to complete the clearance of 11,167 square metres in three maximum security prisons (Castro Castro – Lima, Yanamayo-Puno and Huacariz – Cajamarca) and clearance of 19,000 square metres in four objectives on the border with Ecuador, and, (d) in 2011 to complete clearance of four areas totalling 29,800 square metres in Sector Santiago and in Sector Cenepa on the border with Ecuador. In 2010 Peru reported that over the course of 2009 a total of 1,622 square metres were cleared on the border with Ecuador and that a total of 813.20 square metres were cleared around maximum security prisons Castro-Castro and Yanomayo. In 2011 Peru reported that clearance work was currently underway in the maximum security prisons with Castro Castro complete and with a 7,021.14 square metres cleared and 5,304 mines destroyed. Peru also reported that over the course of 2010 one area was addressed on the border with Ecuador measuring 17,349.28 square meters culminating

in the destruction of 78 anti-personnel mines and that in 2011 (up to June) a total of 18,636.73 square meters has been cleared culminating in the destruction of 314 anti-personnel mines.

56. **Senegal** indicated in its request that it was not realistic or credible at present to make projections about the areas which will have to be demined or those which will be “ruled out” through clearance techniques as the total suspected areas are not yet known and that the program will implement a range of land release techniques in order to concentrate on areas in which the presence of mines is actually confirmed. These techniques were to be used over the period of October 2008 – April 2009 in the 41 localities suspected of being lightly contaminated in order to confirm contamination or to delete them from the list of suspected areas. Senegal reported in 2009 that (a) a general survey of 11 localities resulted in 8 areas being proposed for cancellation and 3 for technical survey, (b) a general survey took place on the Djifanghor – Boulome trail where suspicion has been removed and (c) demining was completed in Bacounoume, Etafoune, Darsalame and Kaguitte with a total of 34,417 square metres cleared and a total of 97,668 square metres remaining to be addressed. In 2010 Senegal reported (a) that general survey took place in 3 suspected areas in the district of Dioulacolon/Koda with 2 of these being cancelled, (b) general survey also took place in 37 areas in the department of Goudomp, (c) general survey took place in 12 suspected areas in Gouraf, and (d) the sites of Kaguitte and Sindone have been completed and operations were continuing in the town of Gouraf with a total of 43,672.22 square metres having been cleared. In terms of quality control, Senegal reported in 2010 that a total of 5 areas had been verified and accepted totalling 58,672.7 square metres and that quality control operations would continue.

57. Senegal also reported in 2010 that new general surveys in the department of Ziguinchor, Bignona Oussouye, Bounkiling and Kolda would be initiated and that land release through non-technical means would be initiated with the recruitment of a second operator. Senegal reported in 2011 that non-technical survey in the Sedhiou regions visited 73 areas with 62 proposed for cancellation and 11 proposed for technical survey, and, that non-technical survey in the Kolda region visited 4 areas with 3 being verified and 1 being downgraded. Senegal also reported a total of 16 areas released in previously inaccessible areas measuring 2,762,172 square metres (8 having been released through non technical methods and 8 through technical methods). In 2011 Senegal summarised annual achievements as follows: 48,421.42 square metres cleared in 2008, 38,237.34 square metres cleared in 2009, 26,002.49 square metres being cleared in 2010 and 8,276.24 square metres cleared in 2011, and, the discovery of 17 areas in 2008, 94 areas in 2009, 20 areas in 2010 and 15 areas in 2011.

58. **Tajikistan** committed in its request to release, during the period 2009 to 2011, 123 areas in the Tajik-Afghan border region totalling 6.1 million square metres and 26 areas totalling 2.4 million square metres in the Central Region. In addition, Tajikistan committed to complete re-survey operations in the 6 remaining districts in the Tajik-Afghan border region and 5 districts in the Central Region by December 2009 and start wide-range technical survey operations in April 2009. In 2010, Tajikistan reported that over the course of 2009 resurvey operations in the Tajik-Afghan border region were completed and that a total of 5,735,000 square meters was released. In June 2011, Tajikistan indicated that in 2010 a total of 22 areas measuring 1.8 million square metres were cleared on the Tajik-Afghan border region and that, in 2011, two areas had been cleared measuring 360,000 square metres.

59. **Thailand** committed in its request to have released, during the period 2009 to 2011, 128,073,803 square metres of suspected hazardous area. In addition, Thailand committed to develop Standard Procedures for Area Reduction and to implement a new national annual demining plan. In 2009 Thailand reported having identified a safe area of around

2,000 square kilometres with quality control procedures having been carried out on around half of this safe area. Thailand also reported that the total area in 2009 of located mine fields is 60,098,393 square metres, cleared is 1,789,686 square metres and the reduced area is 235,887,421 square metres waiting to be handed over. Thailand reported that in 2010, since the Second Review Conference, Thailand has been able to reduce 4.3 square kilometres, employing both the Locating Minefield Procedure and the manual clearance method. In June 2011, Thailand reported that since the 10MSP it has demined an area of 2.2 square kilometres, reducing the total minefield clearance area to 546.8 square kilometres.

60. **Uganda** committed in its request in 2009 to release a total of 15,000 square metres in Ngomoromo and 12,500 square metres in Agoro Mountains, in 2010 to complete the clearance of 52,500 square metres in Ngomoromo and 85,000 square metres in Agoro Mountains and in 2011 to complete the clearance of 52,500 square metres in Ngomoromo and 32,500 square metres in Agoro Mountains. In addition, Uganda committed to increase the current demining capacity with 40 additional deminers and to acquire additional demining team equipment and vehicles. In 2010, Uganda reported completion, in March 2010, of the initial surveyed 4 kilometre minefield stretch at Ngomoromo with a total of 141,082 square metres cleared and 224 anti-personnel mines destroyed. In 2011, Uganda reported a total of 73,673 square metres cleared in the Agoro minefields and 117 anti-personnel mines destroyed. Uganda also reported on training and deployment of an additional 39 deminers, raising the capacity to 107.

61. The **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** committed in its request to initiate the clearance of three mined areas, develop a Statement of Requirement and tender; establish a Mine Action Coordinating Committee; develop appropriate national mine action standards, and; provide as soon as possible, but not later than 30 June 2010, a detailed explanation of how demining is proceeding and the implications for future demining in order to meet the UK's obligations in accordance with Articles 5.4. b. and c. of the Convention, including the preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programs and financial and technical means available. In 2011 the UK reported completion of a 4-site pilot project resulting in the removal of 568 anti-vehicle mines and 678 anti-personnel mines, as well as 2 sub-munitions and 9 other unexploded ordnance in a total area of 345,880 square meters. The UK indicated that a second phase for the pilot project would be carried out in the Stanley Common Fence areas, an area which was used extensively for recreational purposes before the 1982 conflict. The successful contract would use land release processes in accordance with IMAS to confirm the presence of the minefields and accurately define their extent, fence them on all sides and then confirm that the other land within the designated area is free from ERW and safe for release to public use. The identification of the exact location and extent of the minefields will be useful for subsequent clearance programmes. Procurement processes are now under way for a main contractor to undertake this land release and a Demining Programme Office to provide quality control and assurance, and community confidence building measures.

62. **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** committed in its request to clear 15 mined areas measuring 8 hectares in Puesto Naval de Guafitas, Puesto Naval de Puerto Paez and Puesto Naval de Atabapo during the period 2010-2011. In 2011 Venezuela indicated that the new Demining Committee of the National Bolivarian Armed Forces has reprogrammed the timeline for demining and that as per the new timeline the mined area measuring 2 hectares in Puesto Naval de Rio Arauca Internacional (programmed for 2012) was cleared in 2010. Venezuela also reported the clearance of Puerto Naval Guafitas (6 mined areas measuring 2 hectares) with work concluding in April 2011. Venezuela also reported that in 2011 an inspection of Puesto Naval de Puerto Paez took place but the area could not be cleared due to flooding. Venezuela reported that the Committee has adapted machinery that is currently available for use in this type of situation and that this action and experience

acquired allows Venezuela to declare that the goals and objectives of the extension request will be accomplished in a shorter time period (by the first semester of 2013).

63. **Yemen**, in its request, committed in 2009 to carry out technical survey in one affected community in Shabwah governorate with one suspected hazardous area measuring a total of 45,438,386 square metres with a total of approximately 1,540,361 square metres expected to be marked as requiring clearance and to carry out clearance in a total of 1,370,388 square metres in Lahij, Ibb, Hadhramoot, Al Dhalee, Shabwah and Amran from a total of 7,658,734 square metres marked for clearance from previous years. In 2010 Yemen committed to the clearance of a total of 2,055,582 square metres from the total area marked in Ibb, Hadhramoot, Al Dhalee, Saada, Al-Jawf, Mareb and Shabowah and in 2011 to clear a total of 2,055,582 square metres in Ibb, Hadhramoot, Al-Jawf, Mareb and Shabowah.

64. **Zimbabwe** committed in its request (a) within 12 to 24 months, to train and equip a limited survey capacity and to improve the efficiency of its demining capacity, (b) within 12 months, to undertake the non-technical survey of the 4 remaining “unknown” areas (Rushinga, Lusulu, Mukumbura & Kariba) amounting to 6.75 square kilometres as well as undertaking further survey of the cordon sanitaire between Crooks Corner and Sango border post; (c) within 12 months, to carry out mine risk education activities in high impact areas; (d) within 18 months, to relocate ZIMAC out of military cantonment area; and, (e) within 24 months, to undertake development on Zimbabwe national mine action standards in accordance with internationally accepted norms. Zimbabwe also indicated that, following the two year process of survey, retraining, consolidation of resources and fundraising, it intended to submit a further extension request containing a clear and effective plan for the final removal of all the remaining minefields (amounting for now to 201.32 square kilometres in total) as required under Article 5.

65. Since the 10MSP, Zimbabwe reported that: (a) there has not been much progress on the resurveying of the known minefields and actual mine clearance; (b) a total of 800 mines were cleared from the minefield located in the South Eastern part of the country bordering South Africa and Mozambique between April and June 2011; (c) a number of meetings have taken place among Zimbabwean authorities and between Zimbabwean authorities and international organizations to raise awareness on the negative impact of mines; and, (d) that the ICRC and the HALO Trust have visited a minefield to evaluate the impact of landmines. Zimbabwe recommitted to relocate from its mine action centre to an area where it will be easily accessible to all, to establish another demining squadron, to resurvey all known minefields and suspected hazardous areas, and, to continue with mine clearance and mine risk education.

66. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to identify, if they have not yet done so, the precise perimeters and locations, to the extent possible, of all areas under their jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced, and report this information.<sup>12</sup> It was also agreed that these States Parties will do their utmost to ensure that all available methods are applied where and as relevant, by developing and implementing applicable national standards, policies and procedures for releasing land through technical and nontechnical means that are accountable and acceptable to local communities, including through the involvement of women and men in the acceptance process, and, that such States Parties would provide information on the areas already released, disaggregated by release through clearance, technical survey and nontechnical survey.<sup>13</sup> As well, it was agreed that these States Parties will do their utmost to

<sup>12</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #13.

<sup>13</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #15 and #17.

take full national ownership of their Article 5 obligations by developing, implementing and regularly reviewing national mine action strategies and associated policies, plans, budget policies and legal frameworks, inform the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance on their implementation, and provide annually, in accordance with Article 7, precise information on the number, location and size of mined areas, anticipated particular technical or operational challenges, plans to clear or otherwise release these areas. Since the 10MSP, States Parties continued efforts to act in accordance with their Cartagena Summit commitments.

67. **Afghanistan** reported in 2011 that, to date, a total of 4,786 “hazards” suspected to contain anti-personnel mines remain to be dealt with totalling 344 square kilometres. In addition a significant number of hazards suspected to contain other explosive remnants of war remain.

68. **Algeria** reported that, to date, approximately 8 million mines have been destroyed and 66,928,200 square metres cleared and that approximately 7,368,000 square meters remain to be addressed in the west (852,000 square meters in Tlemcen and 6,516,000 square meters in Naama) and a total of 17,740,000 square meters remains to be addressed in the east (4,220,000 square meters in El-Taref, 2,320,000 square meters in Guelma, 5,000,000 square meters in Souk-Ahras and 6,200,000 square meters in Tebessa). In its extension request submitted in 2011, Algeria has indicated that completion of Article 5 implementation is expected by 1 April 2017.

69. **Angola**, at the 10MSP, reported 111 areas had been technically surveyed but were pending clearance measuring 54,659,261 square metres. Angola further reported: that 629 areas had been cleared measuring 267,771,233 square metres; that 12 areas were in the process of being cleared measuring 1,164,556 square metres; 44 areas which were not subject to technical survey had been or were being cleared measuring 18,431,652 square metres, and; 2,515 areas were pending technical survey in order to confirm or refute the presence of anti-personnel mines.

70. **Bhutan** reported in its initial transparency report the existence and location of two mined areas in Gobarkunda and Ngamglam sub districts, both in Samdrupjonkhar Dzongkhag along their southern border containing a total of 50 MNM 14 mines and 53 M16 mines. Bhutan has subsequently reported that it has every expectation that it will be in a position to make a formal declaration on full compliance of its obligations under Article 5 well before its 1 February 2016 deadline.

71. **Chile** reported that, to date, of a total of 199 areas measuring 23,207,281 square metres, a total of 30 areas have been demined and certified totalling 4,586,746 square meters. In addition, 24 areas have been cleared but are pending certification totalling 4,796,613 square metres. A total of 144 mined areas are pending clearance measuring 13,823,922 square metres. In its extension request submitted in 2011, Chile has indicated that completion of Article 5 implementation is expected by 1 March 2020.

72. **Congo**, in its initial transparency report, indicated that its border region with Angola, in the southwest of the country, was suspected to contain mines. In its extension request submitted in 2011, Congo has indicated that it still needs to obtain the information necessary to confirm or refute this suspicion.

73. **Cyprus** reported that, to date, 2,135 anti-personnel mines in 13 minefields have been effectively removed and destroyed with a total of 2,183 anti-personnel mines in 5 minefields in the vicinity of Dali and Potamia villages remaining to be destroyed by Cyprus’ 1 July 2013 deadline. Cyprus also reported that with the support of the United Nations a total 78 mined areas were cleared in the buffer zone, with the destruction of more than 27,000 mines, releasing almost 10 kilometres of land and that as of April 2011 one minefield laid in the buffer zone remains to be cleared.

74. **The Democratic Republic of the Congo** reported that, since the start of the demining programme in 2002, a total of 7.5 square kilometres have been subject to clearance and verification activities resulting in the locations and destruction of 3,331 mines (anti-personnel and anti-tank mines) and that 82 areas are currently classified as suspected or confirmed mined areas (70 suspected, 12 confirmed) measuring a total of 14.13 square kilometres. It also reported that General Mine Action Surveys (GMAS) and General Mine Action Assessments (GMAA) will further offer clarity concerning the remaining challenge and that 100 territories will be subjected to GMAS or GMAA with activities having commenced in approximately 25 of these territories. In 2011, the Democratic Republic of the Congo requested a 26 month extension (until 1 January 2015) to provide it with the time necessary to survey all suspected hazardous areas with a view to determining with greater precision the extent of the remaining challenge and to elaborate a plan of action.

75. **Eritrea** reported that it is carrying out mine clearance and UXO destruction in different parts of Eritrea according to the priority demands of communities culminating in the clearance, during the period of 2001-2011, of 79 areas measuring 54,735 square metres and the destruction of 10,296 anti-personnel mines, 998 anti-tank mines and 69,401 UXO. Eritrea indicated that of the 411 communities identified as impacted, 146 have been addressed and 265 are pending re-survey in order to identify the level of contamination. In its extension request submitted in 2011, Eritrea has indicated that this resurvey will take place during the 3 year extension period.

76. **Ethiopia** reported that of the 1,916 suspected hazardous areas that were subject to a landmine impact survey (LIS), only 182 with a total area of 37 square kilometres have been confirmed as mined areas. Of this total, 166 have been cleared with a total area of 26 square kilometres and 16 minefields measuring 11 square kilometres remain to be cleared in the coming years. In addition, 363 suspected hazardous areas remain to be technically surveyed with a total of 6 square kilometres expected to require clearance.

77. **Gambia** reported that it has no known mined areas and hence does not have an obligation under Article 5. Nevertheless, Gambia indicated that the nature of the border region, particularly on the southern border with the Senegalese Region of Cassamance where armed conflict has taken place in the last two decades, is such that people move freely from one side to another thus exposing them to landmines as was the case in an area bordering the Gambian village of Gillanfari in Foni Bintang District. Gambia also reported that it continues to collaborate to deliver mine risk education in communities in the affected areas and has a well trained and fully equipped humanitarian demining team which is always ready to respond to any emergencies.

78. **Iraq**, in information provided to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in May 2009, indicated that the total area of contamination was still unknown and reported 3,673 areas in which anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced or which were suspected to be hazardous. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan, Iraq reported that it does not have accurate information on the exact locations in which anti-personnel mines were emplaced because no inclusive locating procedure has been yet undertaken. Iraq further indicated that the only source of information it currently has available is the survey that was carried out in 13 of the 18 districts during the period 2004-2006.

79. **Serbia** reported that, to date, 3,997 anti-personnel, 842 anti-tank and 300 UXO have been destroyed in areas totalling 6,197,791 square meters. Serbia indicated that toward the end of 2009 knowledge was obtained that mines were emplaced along the administrative line with Kosovo and Metohija. Serbia indicated that a survey resulted in suspected hazardous areas totalling 3,800,000 square meters in the municipalities of Bujanovac and Presevo.

80. **Sudan**, in information provided at the 11MSP, reported that over the past 6 years, the Sudan Mine Action Programme had succeeded in reducing the number of known hazards by approximately 85 percent and that around 300 known registered hazards remain to be cleared over the next 3 years. Sudan indicated that its anti-personnel mine problem is measurable and can be addressed in a short time-frame but if international assistance is not provided soon, Sudan would need to apply for an extension of its deadline. Sudan indicated that it will need at least 20 mine clearance teams of various types (mechanical and manual) for the next 2 or 3 years.

81. **Turkey**, in its initial Article 7 transparency submission, reported 15 areas in which anti-personnel mines were known to be emplaced and 7 areas in which antipersonnel were suspected to be emplaced. The report contained a table listing each area linked to a province, the types and quantity of mines it contained as well as the date of emplacement when known. The total number of emplaced mines in the known areas was reported to be 921,080. In 2010, Turkey indicated that its western borders with Greece, Bulgaria and Georgia were mine-free and that mine clearance along its southern border constituted a priority with around two thirds of the mines emplaced along this border. At the 11MSP, Turkey reported that 25,092 anti-personnel mines have been cleared so far and that 977,407 mines, including 163,825 anti-tank mines, remain to be cleared.

82. At the 11MSP, Turkey indicated that with respect to mine clearance along the Syrian border, in February 2011, a “Sales Agreement for Quality Management, Consultancy Support and Certification” was concluded between the MOD and the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA), that in April 2011, the tendering process was announced and that in June 2011, candidate firms submitted their files to the MOD. In August 2011, a preliminary assessment of the candidate firms was concluded and a short-list was established, in consultation with NAMSA and at present, firms on the “short-list” are being scrutinized within the phase of the “second assessment”, under the consultancy and supervision of NAMSA. Turkey indicated that in early 2012, qualified short-listed firms will receive a “call for tender”, that in July 2012, the selection process for the contractor will be initiated, that in October 2012, the contractor would commence work and that the completion of the clearance of mines along the Syrian border was expected for the end of October 2016.

83. At the 11MSP, **Germany** reported that the results of a survey on potential future use of the Wittstock former military training area concluded that the training area probably still contains, amongst other unexploded ordnance, cluster munitions and antipersonnel mines dating from the period of its use by the Soviet Armed Forces. Germany reported that in October 2011, ownership of the area was transferred to the General Authority in charge of the real estate property and that a directive was issued by the local authorities to prevent access of the civilian population. In addition, a mine risk education programme in the adjacent areas started to be implemented. Germany further indicated that a strategic action concept was developed in order to create the necessary infrastructure for further targeted survey.

84. Also at the 11MSP, **Hungary** reported that during the recent and ongoing demining work in Croatia, patches of land straddling the border of Hungary and Croatia were found suspect of containing mines. Hungary further reported that since there are no exact data or maps giving clear evidence that the near border areas on both sides are clear from mines or explosive remnants of war, the Hungarian and Croatian authorities have taken steps to ensure that these areas are clear of mines and safe and accessible to all. 3.5 million euros have been allocated to carry out the necessary work and the project is to be implemented in a 24 month timeframe, beginning in September 2011. In the first year, the aim is to survey and mark the mine suspected areas and establish a mine information database. In the second

year, the aim is to clear all the areas identified to contain mines and carry out an environmental rehabilitation of the target area.

85. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recalled the decisions taken at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP) to establish a process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions of Article 5 deadlines, noted the suggested outline provided by the ISU to assist requesting States Parties in organising the content of their requests and expressed the view that the Article 5 extensions process has led to the establishment of an orderly and predictable calendar for submitting, analysing and considering extension requests. With respect to such requests, at the Cartagena Summit it was agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control but due to exceptional circumstances need to request an extension to their 10-year deadline will inform the States Parties of these exceptional circumstances in due time, develop the extension request in line with the recommendations made by the 7MSP and utilise the opportunity for informal dialogue with the group mandated to analyse the extension request.<sup>14</sup>

86. At the 10MSP, the States Parties recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests to the overall effective functioning of the Article 5 extension process and, in this context recommended that all States Parties that wish to submit requests do so no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered (i.e., the year prior to the State Party's deadline). Since the 10MSP, requests were received by the President from Algeria (on 31 March 2011), Chile (on 14 April 2011), Republic of the Congo (on 24 November 2011), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (on 31 March 2011), and Eritrea (on 31 March 2011). In keeping with the decisions of the 7MSP, the President informed the States Parties of the receipt of these requests and instructed the ISU to make these requests available to all interested actors on the Convention's web site.

87. Further to the commitments made at the Cartagena Summit, representatives of each requesting State Party and the group mandated to analyse the extension requests engaged in informal dialogue with a view to the analysing group seeking a better understanding of the requests and to offer advice and suggestions to requesting States Parties. This cooperative process resulted in requesting States Parties clarifying many questions about their requests and with some (Algeria, on 17 August 2011, the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 11 September 2011 and Eritrea, on 11 August 2011), submitting revised, improved requests.

88. The 10MSP, in noting that the Republic of Congo has an Article 5 deadline on 1 November 2011 and that it had not indicated whether it would be able to comply by its deadline, noted the importance of the Republic of the Congo providing clarity on this matter as soon as possible. Although on 24 November 2011, the Republic of the Congo submitted a request for an extension of its deadline indicating that the purpose of the request is to provide clarity, by not having submitted its request by the 10MSP, the Republic of Congo has been in violation of its Article 5 obligations as of 1 November 2011.

89. It was noted that the following States Parties with Article 5 deadlines that occur in 2012 did not submit requests for extensions: Denmark, Guinea Bissau, Jordan and Uganda. It was also noted that the following States Parties with deadlines in 2013 will submit extension requests in 2012: Angola, Afghanistan and Zimbabwe. It was further noted that two additional States Parties, Cyprus and Gambia, have deadlines that occur in 2013.

90. At the 10MSP, the President of the Second Review Conference reported that the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those

---

<sup>14</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #21



States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests.<sup>15</sup> In her report to the 10MSP, she recommended that, to further assist the States Parties in continuing to effectively lead this process, the President, with the support of the ISU, should consider ways and means (e.g., seminars, workshops, etc.) to increase the knowledge and expertise of the analysing group with respect to the technical subject matter contained within Article 5 requests. In follow up to this recommendation, the 10MSP President, with the assistance of the ISU and with financial support provided by Norway, convened a workshop on 7 March 2011, the purpose of which was to increase the knowledge and build the capacity of representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests.

91. While there was widespread appreciation for the 7 March 2011 workshop for representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests, it was noted that the engagement in and contributions to the analysis process from most States Parties mandated to carry out the task remained less than anticipated and hoped for. It was suggested that the States Parties reflect on how they can enable the necessary in-depth analysis and discussion of the requests in order to ensure that high quality requests continue to be the norm.

92. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies were proactive in promoting advances in Article 5 implementation. In order to contribute to this progress and with a view to providing a constructive and enabling environment in which States Parties that are in the process of implementing Article 5 may benefit from the experiences of their peers, the Co-Chairs convened a one-day workshop for national demining directors / national focal points for Article 5 implementation. This workshop took place on 18 March 2011 in Geneva – immediately following the United Nations’ annual meeting of national demining directors and their advisors. All States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5, as well as a variety of other experts, were invited. The workshop was carried out in close cooperation between the Co-Chairs, the ISU, the ICBL, and 25 participating States Parties who supported the discussions with their knowledge and experience. The workshop featured a constructive exchange of experiences and views on two main topics: clarity regarding the size, location, and nature of each State Party’s remaining Article 5 implementation challenge; and, strengthening national ownership.

93. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies also sought to advance Article 5 implementation by experimenting with new ways of using the June 2011 Intersessional Work Programme. Pursuant to the 10MSP decision to see that time during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees would be allocated to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan, the Co-Chairs used a small-group format to provide an interactive forum for in-depth cooperation discussions on the progress made and the road ahead for two States Parties (Cambodia and Mozambique) that are fulfilling commitments made in their Article 5 extension requests.

94. Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, the Co-Chairs recalled that at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties noted that they “have come to see that the lessons derived from fulfilling Article 5 obligations are applicable in addressing related challenges associated with other explosive remnants of war” and that “in many instances, the organisational structures, the capacities that have been built and the standards that have been established largely as a result of the need to implement Article 5 are also being applied to address weapons contamination more broadly.”<sup>16</sup> In this context, the Co-Chairs initiated a

---

<sup>15</sup> APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.16.

<sup>16</sup> Review of the Operation and Status of the Convention, 2005-2009, paragraph 97.

discussion on questions such as: Following completion, how have States Parties made best use of the materiel and human resources which have been at their disposal for Article 5 implementation? How have they adapted coordination and management structures developed for Article 5 implementation and applied the knowledge gained from Article 5 implementation to address other challenges? How should States Parties prepare for completion?

95. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to ensure that all available methods for the full and expedient implementation of Article 5 (1) are applied where and as relevant, by developing and implementing applicable national standards, policies and procedures for releasing land through technical and non-technical means that are accountable and acceptable to local communities, including through the involvement of women and men in the acceptance process.<sup>17</sup> In this context, in early 2011 the GICHD launched the *Guide to Land Release – Technical Methods* and an outreach programme to assist States Parties in the process of further developing and improving the release of land through technical survey. Since the 10MSP, the GICHD has assisted Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique and Tajikistan in the development of a national policy and national mine action standards that included chapters on releasing land through non-technical and technical means.

#### IV. Assisting the victims

96. At the Cartagena Summit, while noting the progress that has been made in achieving the victim assistance aim of the Convention, the States Parties recognised that the most identifiable gains had been process-related and that the real promise of the Convention is to make a difference on the ground, in the lives of survivors, the families of those killed or injured, and their communities.<sup>18</sup> The States Parties expressed the view that a persistent challenge remains in translating increased understanding on victim assistance into tangible improvements in the quality of daily life of mine victims. To this end, the States Parties expressed their resolve to provide adequate age- and gender-sensitive assistance to mine victims, through a holistic and integrated approach that includes emergency and continuing medical care, physical rehabilitation, psychological support, and social and economic inclusion in accordance with applicable international humanitarian and human rights law, with the aim of ensuring their full and effective participation and inclusion in the social, cultural, economic and political life of their communities.<sup>19</sup> Also to this end, the States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, agreed to reinforce their efforts and do their utmost to facilitate measurable progress by applying 11 specific actions in the Cartagena Action Plan related to victim assistance.<sup>20</sup> Since the 10MSP, States Parties continued efforts to act in accordance with their Cartagena Summit commitments.

97. **Afghanistan** reported that the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) was passed by both houses of parliament and it is currently awaiting ratification. Afghanistan reported that new national disability legislation has been adopted with this containing a small support mechanism for those disabled due to war, including those disabled due to mines, other explosive remnants of war and terrorist attacks. Afghanistan recalled that its overarching National Disability Action Plan of 2008-2011 is due to expire and that efforts are being made to develop tools to ensure a more streamlined mechanism for monitoring and reporting. These tools would be applicable not only on the national plan

<sup>17</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #15.

<sup>18</sup> Review of the operation and status of the Convention: 2005-2009, paragraph 112.

<sup>19</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, paragraph 12.

<sup>20</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #23 to #33.

but also to ensure the fulfilment of reporting obligations under the CRPD and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. In addition, Afghanistan reported that it is integrating inclusive and mainstreamed activities within many of its policies and strategies. New strategies are being developed for disability and rehabilitation as well as mental health within the Ministry of Public Health. The Ministry of Education has developed a road map towards inclusion for education methodologies that ensures inclusive and child friendly education for all children with a focus on girls and boys with disabilities. New units have been established for inclusive education and special education. Afghanistan also reported that the Ministry of Public Works has adopted a three year strategy for rural access to ensure persons with disabilities gain greater access to services. As well, Afghanistan stressed the importance of gender equality, as well as equal access to education for all children, embodied in its legal system.

98. **Albania** reported that at the end of 2010, a national victim assistance workshop was staged at which government representatives, local health authorities, donors and other partners and organisations assessed progress in the application of Albania's National Victim Assistance Plan and discussed future needs. Albania also reported that, in accordance with the Cartagena Action Plan, data and detailed statistics on casualties from mines and unexploded ordnance have been made available in collaboration with the ICRC. Albania further reported that, in terms of physical rehabilitation services to landmine survivors and others who may need such services, the prosthetic workshop at the Kukes Regional Hospital has provided, since the 10MSP, major repairs and new prostheses for at least 60 amputees. In addition, the Physical and Medical Rehabilitation (PMR) project in Albania continues to provide technical assistance to medical staff and the Faculty of Nursing in Albania aimed at improving and upgrading the rehabilitation capacities at the local and national level. Finally, Albania reported that the social inclusion of boys and girls who are survivors has been a focus of victim assistance activities and that 20 survivors or family members successfully completed vocational training courses and have been provided with modest financial assistance to start up small businesses.

99. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** reported that, since the 10MSP, a Council of Persons with Disabilities has been established and a law on professional rehabilitation, training and employment of persons with disabilities has been adopted. This law creates new opportunities for economic and social integration for all persons with disabilities. Bosnia and Herzegovina also reported that a fund for professional rehabilitation and employment of disabled persons in Republic of Srpska supported 201 persons with disabilities in 2010 and that the plan in 2011 is to employ about 220 persons with disabilities.

100. **Burundi** reported that a national victim assistance workshop was held at the start of 2011 to provide input for the development of a national plan of action. The workshop was followed by a working meeting of national technical experts to develop the first version of the national plan of action. The plan, which focuses on persons with disabilities including landmine victims, was finalised and adopted by April 2011. Burundi reported that the national plan adopts an inclusive and comprehensive approach to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Burundi further reported that, in accordance with the Cartagena Action Plan, the national plan incorporates objectives in the areas of data collection, capacity building, accessibility and awareness-raising. Data collection objectives include undertaking of a qualitative survey of people with disabilities and their needs, setting up a database with the service providers and their locations, and incorporating a category for persons with disabilities in existing survey mechanisms before 2012. Objectives on capacity building and training include the training of village rescuers in each mine-affected area before 2012, facilitating emergency evacuation plans for victims in specialised centres, strengthening emergency care capacities, and reducing the cost of long term care for survivors. Objectives to improve the availability of and accessibility to appropriate services include increasing quality and improving accessibility in at least five provinces that do not

already have these services and improving geographical accessibility to services for landmine victims and other persons with disabilities. The national plan also includes the provision of adequate psychosocial support to mine survivors and persons with disabilities in local care and rehabilitation centres.

101. **Cambodia** reported that, in August 2011, a national workshop on disseminating the Cartagena Action Plan took place in order to raise awareness and encourage progress in implementation amongst relevant operators, affected communities, and persons with disabilities including victims and survivors. In addition, Cambodia reported that since the 10MSP, five sub-decrees have been adopted in order to implement the Law on Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and various policies related to disability, including a sub-decrees on the organisation and function of the Disability Action Council (DAC), the organisation and functioning of the Foundation for Persons with Disabilities, the employment quota system for persons with disabilities, the establishment of a national coordination committee for disability, the policy for supporting poor persons with disabilities in communities, and on the establishment of a disability rights administration. At the international level, Cambodia reported that it is in the process of ratifying the CRPD. In addition, Cambodia reported that it is in the process of reviewing on the progress of the implementation of its National Plan of Action for persons with disabilities including landmine/ERW survivors which is due to expire at the end of 2011.

102. **Chad** reported that a national plan of action for victim assistance has been developed spanning a five-year period and that it is awaiting validation by the government, which has established a Committee of Experts to examine financial implications and develop proposals in view of its adoption. Chad further reported that progress had been made in establishing inter-ministerial/inter-sectoral coordinating mechanisms within the country.

103. **Colombia** reported the adoption of the Law of the Victim and Land Restitution, which is designed to promote the protection of boys, girls and teenagers against all forms of violence and to guarantee reparation. Through this law, the Programme of Psychosocial Attention and Integral Health to Victims was also created. To achieve the implementation of this law, Colombia's mine action programme (PAICMA) has worked on the following matters: reparation; employment and administrative compensation; information systems; prevention; protection and guarantees of non-repetition; and, assistance, attention and rehabilitation. As a result, the national government has: (a) a draft Regulation Decree and (b) a document of public policy guidelines, which will be the basis of the National Plan for Victims Reparation and Comprehensive Assistance. In June 2011, Colombia's Congress approved the Integral Rehabilitation Law for the members of the Public Forces. This law enhances the capacities of the Ministry of National Defense in rehabilitation. Colombia further reported progress in the area of data collection through the establishment of a National Disability Advisory in June 2011 and by incorporating information regarding assistance to victims of mines and other explosive remnants of war into the National Disability System. According to recent data collection, 370 Colombians were victims of mines and other explosive remnants of war between January and August 2011, including 120 civilians and 250 members of the Public Forces. Colombia reported that 100 people received training on topics such as the rights of survivors and their families. Colombia also reported that its nation-wide "remágate" campaign had great success in raising awareness of the rights and needs of persons with disabilities. In addition, Colombia reported that it signed an agreement with Ecuador to exchange good practices in the disability field.

104. **Croatia** reported that it has strengthened national ownership by establishing the national Coordinating Body for Helping Mine and UXO Victims made up of representatives from governmental and non-governmental sectors. This body consists of 19 members, 5 of whom represent non-governmental organisations. The main tasks of this

body are to create a national action plan for helping mine/UXO victims, to establish a unified national database of mine/UXO victims, and to ensure that adequate measures for the timely provision of assistance to mine/UXO victims are being taken. Since the 10MSP, the National Action Plan for Helping Mine and UXO Victims 2010 – 2014 was drafted, the main goal of which is to improve the quality of life of people injured by mines and UXO, and families of the victims. Areas of focus in this plan include emergency and continuing care, physical rehabilitation, psychosocial support and economic integration. The Plan also foresees changes to parts of Croatian legislation in order to enhance compliance with conventions. A process of unification is underway for a national database of mine/UXO victims and Croatia expects that the unified base should provide easier monitoring of the process of rehabilitation and integration of mine/UXO victims into society.

105. The **Democratic Republic of the Congo** (DRC) reported that, since the 10MSP, the IMSMA data collection form has been updated to enhance the information to be collected about each victim and that this form has been used in the Kinshasa, Eastern Kasai, North Kivu, South Kivu and Katanga provinces in the first trimester of 2011. The DRC further reported that, in June 2010, a strategic national plan for victim assistance was adopted under supervision by the Ministry of Social Affairs, Humanitarian Actions and National Solidarity and that the process of developing this plan was inclusive and involved all relevant actors working at the national level. The DRC reported that it is working to establish an inter-ministerial coordination committee under the leadership of the General Secretary for Humanitarian Affairs. The General Secretary of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Humanitarian Action and National Solidarity will preside over the committee and will lead discussions on the strategy to ratify the CPRD.

106. **El Salvador** reported having raised awareness of the Cartagena Action Plan at the national level through its governing body for disability policy (CONAIPD). El Salvador further reported that progress with its system for health information (SIS) has been enhanced to record access to employment, educational opportunities, sexual and reproductive health, recreation, tourism, among many others.

107. **Ethiopia** reported that, in early 2011, a campaign involving public media messages was implemented to promote understanding regarding the self reliance of survivors with a view to creating attitudinal change amongst the general public. Ethiopia reported that the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA) has established a body to coordinate disability issues within the country. The body, which is comprised of 11 regional and local offices mandated to assist with disability services, is supported by international and local non-governmental organisations. Ethiopia also reported its National Physical Rehabilitation Strategy, the Proclamation for the Right to Employment for Persons with Disabilities, and the National Plan of Action for Persons with Disabilities all received status within the governing body of Ethiopian ministers. In addition, in April 2011, new legislation on pensions was passed by the House of Peoples Representatives with this legislation foreseeing that special provisions would be extended to the survivor of a pensioner if that person has a disability. Ethiopia also reported that the MOLSA and the ICRC are collaborating on a training programme for orthopaedic technicians which would train 24 young students from various regions. In addition, Ethiopia reported on the establishment of many community-based rehabilitation programmes as well as a National Rehabilitation Centre established by the emergency Demobilization and Reintegration Project. Ethiopia further reported that from April to June 2011, UNICEF helped supply over 350 orphans and vulnerable children with disabilities. Finally, Ethiopia noted that Building Proclamation Code No. 624/2009 (concerning physical accessibility) still awaits signatures from various ministries.

108. **Guinea-Bissau** reported having enacted anti-discrimination legislation and having reached an agreement within the Ministry of National Solidarity, Family and Poverty to fix

budget lines for disability. Guinea-Bissau also reported that it provides medical/medicinal assistance, psychosocial support, and professional training to young victims. In addition, Guinea Bissau reported that it is attempting to further strengthen legislation in favour of people with disabilities. Guinea-Bissau reported having renovated a Physical Rehabilitation Centre, with financial support from the Economic Community of West African States and ICRC.

109. **Iraq** reported that the Ministry of Health has begun the implementation of a national project to register persons with disabilities. The aim of this project is to gather information on the quantity, types, and causes of disabilities in Iraq and to use this information as the basis for the planning and development of services. In addition, Iraq reported that in September 2011, the second national workshop on victim assistance/disability was held bringing together representatives from relevant ministries at various levels to conduct a situational analysis and to develop SMART objectives in six areas of victim assistance – emergency and continuing medical care, physical rehabilitation, psychological reintegration, socio-economic reintegration, data collection and legislation and policies – for inclusion into the first national plan on victim assistance and disability.

110. **Peru** reported on efforts to raise awareness on the Cartagena Action Plan through campaigns implemented by the National Advisory for the Integration of People with Disabilities (CONADIS). Using television and radio broadcasts nationwide in addition to including information with utility bills sent to 1.3 million homes in Lima, Peruvians have been informed of existing rules, regulations and rights for persons with disabilities. Additionally, a campaign called “Respect my space” was launched to promote further awareness. Peru recalled that an Equal Opportunity Plan for Persons with Disabilities has been launched for the period 2009 to 2018 and that a new committee had been created to monitor the compliance rate of the target of 3 percent of workers with disabilities on the payrolls of public entities. Peru also reported that new regulations have established offences and penalties for breach of the General Law for Disabled Persons. Regulations related to the Law on Promoting Access have also been approved with respect to access for persons with disabilities to the Internet and public telephones. Peru also reported that its national mine action programme (CONTRAMINAS) had convened a side event during the 10MSP displaying Peru’s progress in assisting the victims of anti-personnel mines. In addition, CONTRAMINAS, with international cooperation, has been undertaking work to update existing information on victims to include more information and a needs assessment. CONTRAMINAS’ mine victim database has now registered 334 victims, of which 141 are civilians, 118 soldiers and 75 police officers. CONTRAMINAS also has been involved in medical evaluations in two provinces of Peru - Junín and Lima – where over 50 people were provided with medical care, including the delivery of prostheses. In addition, CONTRAMINAS continued its efforts to implement social and economic reintegration programmes to assist landmine survivors and the families of the deceased.

111. **Serbia** reported that the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy has been designated as the decision making authority for providing financial support and protection to citizens of the Republic of Serbia who suffered damage caused by armed conflicts as well as from residual war material on the territory of the Republic of Serbia. With respect to the availability of and accessibility to appropriate services for landmine victims, Serbia reported that all survivors in the Republic of Serbia are integrated within the country’s health care system at all levels including in emergency medical care, treatment, physical therapy and rehabilitation, and supplying prosthetic and orthotic aids.

112. **Tajikistan** reported that, since the 10MSP, it has translated the Cartagena Action Plan and used it at various events including: inter-agency victim assistance coordination group meetings, summer camps, meetings with survivors, round-tables, and the United Nations’ International Day of Mine Awareness and Assistance to Mine Action. Tajikistan

reported that the “Law on the Social Protection of Persons with Disabilities” entered into force at the start of 2011. This legislation is designed to assist with the establishment of a coordination council on disability issues and includes provisions regarding accessibility. Tajikistan also reported that, on 14-15 December 2010, it attended the first interstate conference on psychosocial rehabilitation in Kabul, Afghanistan and participated in “peer-to-peer support” training with the Afghanistan Landmine Survivors Organization (ALSO). These bilateral exchanges were useful for both parties. A second inter-country conference of psychosocial rehabilitation took place on 19-20 October 2011. In addition, Tajikistan reported that it continued with efforts to provide capacity building to survivor organisations in the areas of English language and computer training. Tajikistan announced a call for micro-capital grants for the socio-economic reintegration of 25 landmine/ERW survivors and that the organisation of persons with disabilities “Imkonyat” had been selected to implement the project. Tajikistan also reported that, in July 2011, it organised a summer rehabilitation camp for 25 survivors. In addition, Tajikistan reported that it is preparing to conduct a needs assessment of landmine and other ERW victims in mine affected districts with the main goal being to establish a functional victim information system (VIS), which would comply with the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) standards and become a systematic and reliable mechanism at the district and oblast level.

113. **Thailand** reported that 19 people fell victim to mines or other ERW during the period October 2010 to September 2011, compared with 23 in the previous year. Thailand reported that it has established several community-based rehabilitation projects to play a key role in the effective physical, mental and economic rehabilitation of victims. Awareness raising activities have been undertaken mostly through community-based rehabilitation projects. However, Thailand still faces a challenge in ensuring that persons with disabilities register to receive benefits. Since the 10MSP, a multi-agency response plan was formulated as a result of the enactment of new laws on persons with disabilities. Accordingly, landmine victim assistance has been integrated into the government’s plan of action. This effectively reduces benefit-approval processes and allows landmine victims to quickly access rehabilitation and reintegration assistance. Thailand further reported that it has extended its cooperation relationships to China after successful projects with the Lao PDR and Burundi. Thailand recalled its Plan on Victim Assistance 2012-2016, which was presented at the 10MSP, and noted that this plan supplements the global efforts towards full implementation of the Cartagena Action Plan.

114. **Uganda** reported on efforts to raise awareness on the Cartagena Action Plan within the country by disseminating it alongside its 2008 Comprehensive Plan on Victim Assistance in order to create awareness on the linkages between the two plans and demonstrate the improvements contained in the later plan. These efforts led to an amendment of the national plan to align it with the Cartagena Action Plan as well as with the CRPD. The revised plan covers the period 2010-2014. Uganda intends to commence an assessment of achievements and challenges in implementing the national plan at the start of 2014 and will be in a position to report on its progress at the Third Review Conference. Uganda also reported that it is developing ways to periodically monitor and evaluate the plan to ensure that activities are having a tangible impact on the quality of life of landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Poverty has been highlighted as a key challenge among landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities in Uganda. In response to this, Uganda launched two key programmes. The first is a country-wide special grant programme intended to assist persons with disabilities in acquiring employable skills and in supporting them to start income-generating activities. The second is the expansion of the social protection programme, a component of which provides disability grants to chronically poor persons with disabilities amongst other vulnerable groups in the community. Uganda also mentioned gender responsiveness, inclusion, and non-discrimination in dealing with disabled children’s education.

115. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration also sought to advance victim assistance efforts by experimenting with new ways of using the June 2011 Intersessional Work Programme. This experimentation was conducted pursuant to the 10MSP decision to see that time during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees would be allocated to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Co-Chairs used a small-group format to provide an interactive forum for in-depth cooperation discussions on the challenges of two States Parties (Afghanistan and Uganda) that have: (a) reported responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors; (b) are in the process of implementing a national plan of action on victim assistance/disability; and, (c) volunteered to be the focus of this experimentation session. At this small group session, representatives from Afghanistan and Uganda shared their experiences in implementing their national plans and highlighted persistent challenges faced. The Co-Chairs expressed their appreciation to Afghanistan and Uganda for being the first to volunteer to be the subjects of the more intensive focus and noted that the small group session provided the opportunity for a good exchange of ideas and experiences. It was also noted that focused discussions such as these, with relevant experts present, have the potential to greatly advance efforts and collaboration at the national level. It was noted that any future experimentation sessions would benefit from focusing on a small number of areas to promote more detailed exchange and to ensure a meaningful outcome from the discussions.

116. In June 2011, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration launched the publication *Assisting Landmine and other ERW Survivors in the Context of Disarmament, Disability and Development*. This publication, which Australia commissioned the Implementation Support Unit to produce, brings together over a decade of experience in efforts to assist the victims of landmines and other explosive remnants of war. The Co-Chairs highlighted that the publication has the potential to promote coherence, closer cooperation and efficiency in collective efforts to implement relevant instruments of international humanitarian and human rights law.

117. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed their resolve to provide adequate age- and gender-sensitive assistance to mine victims.<sup>21</sup> In this context, it was noted that at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration that some States Parties reported on this matter. In addition, in opening the meeting of the Standing Committee, the Co-Chairs addressed the matter of gender by reminding other States Parties of their obligations to gender sensitivity in the Cartagena Action Plan.

118. States Parties continued to take steps to strengthen linkages between the work of the Convention and the work of those involved in disability more generally, including those involved in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). At the 23 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, Dr. Tom Shakespeare of the World Health Organization (WHO) was invited to present the landmark *World Report on Disability* to the Standing Committee. Dr. Shakespeare highlighted that the *World Report on Disability* provides evidence for innovative policies and programmes that can improve the lives of persons with disabilities and facilitate the implementation of the CRPD.

119. Linkages between the work of the Convention and the work of those involved in disability more generally were evident at the 30 May to 1 June *Tirana Symposium* on cooperation and assistance as concerns victim assistance. The 10MSP President sought to

---

<sup>21</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, paragraph 12.



ensure that organisations such as the United Nations Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Disability Alliance and the International Disability and Development Alliance would be key participants at this event. As well as concerns linkages, at the 4 March 2011 16<sup>th</sup> Session of the Human Rights Council, the ISU addressed the Council to highlight that the States Parties to the Convention and the Member States of the CRPD share an agenda and could work closely together.

120. On the margins of the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees, the Co-Chairs, with the support of the ISU and the financial assistance of Australia, again convened a parallel programme for victim assistance experts that examined, in-depth, the matter of accessibility. At the parallel programme, experts reviewed the depth and breadth of what constitutes accessibility, benefited from the States' and survivors' experiences as concerns accessibility and exchanged experiences on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan as concerns accessibility.

121. It was noted that 126 States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention are also parties to the CRPD, including 17 of the States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, and Uganda.

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

### *(a) Cooperation and assistance*

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

123. The 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report recorded that the President of the Second Review Conference placed a high priority on cooperation and assistance, including by convening a special session on cooperation and assistance in June 2010. The Geneva Progress Report recorded various understandings about cooperation and assistance that emerged from this special session. As well, several delegations expressed support at this special session for Zambia's proposal to establish a new Standing Committee to address the challenges related to international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention.

124. The 10MSP, in expressing appreciation for Zambia proposing the creation of a new Standing Committee, agreed to establish a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, to be supported, like other mechanisms established by the States Parties, by the Implementation Support Unit, and, to be presided over in 2011 by the President of the 10MSP, with the leadership of this Standing Committee being regularised as of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. In assuming the role of Chair, the 10MSP President indicated that his aim was to advance the cooperation and assistance agenda that was spelled out in 2010 at the special sessions on cooperation and assistance which were held both in June 2010 and at the 10MSP.

125. With a view to advancing the Convention's cooperation and assistance agenda as concerns victim assistance, the Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources,

Cooperation and Assistance convened an international symposium in Albania from 30 May to 1 June 2011. The purpose of the *Tirana Symposium* was to follow up on the recognition made in the Geneva Progress Report of the need for two distinct discussions – one that concerns Article 5 implementation and one that concerns victim assistance. It was noted that while both matters belong to the larger family of mine action, mine clearance and victim assistance have different timelines, involve distinct national and international actors and relate to different national institutional and regulatory frameworks and budget lines.

126. All States Parties and relevant organisations were invited to the *Tirana Symposium* with approximately 100 delegates from every corner of the world taking part in the event. The *Tirana Symposium* dealt with opportunities presented by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) to enhance victim assistance-related efforts. It was noted that the States Parties are fortunate to have experts who work largely outside of the Convention community sharing how Article 32 of the CRPD spells out measures concerning international cooperation and assistance. These experts represent organisations such as the United Nations Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Disability Alliance and the International Disability and Development Alliance. It was noted that they, along with the ICBL, have helped the States Parties increase their understanding of how the CRPD can assist in our cooperation and assistance efforts as concerns victim assistance.

127. The *Tirana Symposium* also dealt with the role of development cooperation as concerns victim assistance. It was recalled that development agencies likely are responsible for the bulk of what truly amounts to resources for victim assistance-related efforts, even if this is not captured in surveys of mine action assistance. Through research prepared by the ISU, it was illustrated that the wealth of data already provided by OECD DAC Member States may be a good starting point in understanding the broader magnitude of efforts as concerns health care and human rights. It was also noted that the States Parties' acceptance of the concept of inclusive development meant that ultimately development assistance in its entirety should take disability into account. This point was well demonstrated at the *Tirana Symposium* through presentations delivered by representatives of the Austrian and Australian development agencies.

128. The *Tirana Symposium* also dealt with national capacity and national ownership. Albanian experts, as well as those from Handicap International and the ICRC, highlighted that support for national capacity building is essential for sustainability and accessibility and that capacity building is a long term activity, that it is multifaceted and that multi-year financial commitments are essential. It was also recognised that national ownership is essential to the long-term sustainability of victim assistance-related activities.

129. The final topic dealt with at the *Tirana Symposium* was the importance of peer support and psycho-social rehabilitation. It was recalled that at the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recorded that “psychological support, including peer support, is necessary in the immediate aftermath of (an) accident and may be needed at different times throughout the lifetime of the survivor.”<sup>22</sup> Experts from three continents participating in the symposium helped increase understanding of the main elements of and challenges to delivering psycho-social assistance, shared the benefits of peer-to-peer programmes, and highlighted an example of bilateral cooperation between two affected States on psycho-social support.

130. The Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance provided an opportunity during the Standing Committee's 24 June 2011 meeting for delegations to explore, in greater detail, two topics identified in 2010: partnerships and

---

<sup>22</sup> Review of the operation and status of the Convention: 2005-2009, paragraph 142.

coordination, and, ensuring a high level of efficiency in cooperation and assistance. With respect to partnerships and coordination, it was recalled that in 2010 the recognition was made that coordination of assistance and cooperation is a central aspect of national ownership and that, the emphasis should be on partner responsibilities rather than donor priorities. At the Standing Committee meeting, the Chair called upon two States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 – Cambodia and Mozambique – along with key partners to illustrate key lessons concerning partnership and coordination.

131. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, it was illustrated how a mine-affected, developing country and its development partners together recognised the need for adequate coordination and national ownership and what steps have been taken in Cambodia to enhance both of these aspects. The Cambodian case highlighted the importance of measures taken such as the establishment of a national authority to lead, coordinate and regulate the mine action sector and the adoption of national mine action standards (NMAS) as a single strategic framework for policy and assistance coordination. The Cambodian case also provided an example of the introduction of “Partnership Principles”, which in a manner consistent with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, reaffirms development partners’ respect for national ownership and leadership, commits development partners to support capacity development, and, requires development partners to align their support with Cambodian NMAS and consult the government on project / programme formulation.

132. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, the case of cooperation between Mozambique and Norway also illustrated how the principles of the Paris Declaration are being applied through a partnership arrangement that concerns itself with Article 5 implementation. Mozambique and Norway provided an example of how cooperating States Parties can establish a framework that, in focusing in an unwavering manner on Article 5 implementation, reinforces national ownership, respects national priorities, and, provides the assurance of multi-year support.

133. With respect to ensuring a high level of efficiency in cooperation and assistance, at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) gave an update on the numerous steps it has taken to improve the expedient and efficient flow of funding through the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Mine Action, provided an example of how this has worked well, and highlighted possible variables within and external to the United Nations system that may affect the timely flow of support. In addition, the ICBL drew attention to inefficiencies in the expenditure of funds related to Article 5 implementation, recommended to donors that their efforts are consistent with national priorities and ensure a timely flow of funds, and, called for accountability on the part of implementing partners. The ICBL also highlighted that the size, structure and placement of coordinating mechanisms should reflect actual needs. In addition, the ICBL noted that many efficiency issues they have raised touch upon the role of the United Nations and, in this regard, expressed appreciation for a constructive dialogue that has started in recent months between non-governmental organisations and the UN.

134. Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, a number of delegations raised topics related to cooperation and assistance that may be pursued by the Standing Committee in the future. These included: identifying and prioritising mine action resource requirements; identifying and promoting mine action resources including from non-traditional sources (such as the private sector); identifying and promoting mechanisms, approaches and best practice models for coordinated global and national level mine action assistance; promoting and supporting national ownership and coordination of mine action programs; identifying, promoting and sharing knowledge and experience on effective cooperation and assistance; exploring

possible limitations to mainstreaming mine action into development budgets; exploring the possibility of establishing new funding mechanisms; examining ways to better exchange information on the availability of equipment, technical expertise and best practices; and, examining in more detail South-South cooperation.

135. Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, Thailand recalled the proposals it had suggested at the Cartagena Summit to develop a concept paper on explore the idea of the establishment of a trust fund for implementation and to establish a database mechanism regarding available assistance. It further recalled that possibility of requesting the ISU to take on these tasks. A number of delegations expressed support for Thailand's proposals.

136. Since the 10MSP, the central role of the United Nations in cooperation and assistance was again highlighted. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance the United Nations Mine Action Team (UNMAT) expressed that its resource mobilisation efforts are consistent with the Cartagena Action Plan and supporting States to fulfil their obligations to the Convention. The UNMAT also noted that it continues to facilitate the development of its "Portfolio of Mine Action Projects", which, in 2011, contained 240 mine action initiatives by 71 appealing agencies in 29 countries.

137. Since the 10MSP, it was recalled that at the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will ensure that international cooperation and assistance, including development cooperation, is age-appropriate and gender-sensitive and inclusive of, and accessible to, persons with disabilities, including mine survivors.<sup>23</sup> At the Cartagena Summit, it was also agreed that all States Parties will ensure that assistance in mine action is based on appropriate surveys, needs analysis, age-appropriate and gender-sensitive strategies and cost-effective approaches.<sup>24</sup> It was also recalled that United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted over a decade ago, emphasised "... the need for all parties to ensure that mine clearance and mine awareness programmes take into account the special needs of women and girls." In this context, it was suggested that both States Parties and the broader implementation community need to make sure that this actually happens, including moving beyond the general discussions of how to ensure that girls, boys, women and men have equal access to the resources generated through implementation of the Convention, and, by asking why progress has been so slow.

138. Since the 10MSP, Australia, Norway and Switzerland supported the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP), which has since the 10MSP become an independent association. The GMAP has continued to support training, capacity building and advocacy activities with States Parties in order to make mine action more inclusive, non-discriminatory, accurate and effective by mainstreaming gender into all interventions. The GMAP has provided training and technical assistance on gender and mine action to mine action programmes and national authorities, operators and non-governmental organisations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Sweden and Uganda.

139. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties in a position to do so will continue to support, as appropriate, mine action to assist populations in areas where armed non-State actors operate including by facilitating access for humanitarian organisations.<sup>25</sup> Since the 10MSP, the Geneva Call has reported that assistance resulted in the destruction of 1,504 stockpiled anti-personnel mines in one instance and 382 in another and, that in a third instance, 2,000 anti-personnel mines and other explosive remnants of

<sup>23</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #42.

<sup>24</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #52.

<sup>25</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #43.

war have been gathered and await destruction. The Geneva Call also reported support provided in the context of Cartagena Action Plan Action #43 has ensured that mine risk education is being implemented according to national standards in one instance and that, in another instance, a physical rehabilitation project has been launched.

140. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to contribute to further development of the UN's International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) to be used as a frame of reference to establish national standards and operational procedures for addressing all aspects of mine and other explosive ordnance contamination. Since the 10MSP, efforts have continued to finalise IMAS on information management and national standards for information management have been implemented in several countries. This will lead to clearer and more consistent statistics on contamination, impact and progress. In addition, the GICHD has assisted five States Parties – Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Jordan, Sudan and Thailand – in the development of national standards on land release and in reviewing existing standards.

141. In recognition of the pivotal role of mine action in meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties agreed to continue to promote the inclusion of mine action activities into ongoing development programmes, bearing in mind the international aid effectiveness agenda, and to promote the identification of mine action as a priority in local, national and international development actions, in cooperation with regional and international organisations and international financial institutions.<sup>26</sup> Since the 10MSP, the GICHD continued carrying out landmines and livelihoods surveys of mine-affected communities in Afghanistan to gain a better understanding of the development outcomes stemming from demining, and to enhance the contribution that the Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA) makes towards Afghanistan's development. These surveys provided insight into the costs of explosives contamination and the benefits of mine action, and documented the type of development investments that are valued by this sample of rural communities. Partnership agreements with the Afghan Institute for Rural Development and the Central Statistics Office mean that expertise exists in the country to design implement and report on similar surveys in the future.

142. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties committed to ensure cooperation among all relevant actors to improve national and international policies and development strategies, enhance effectiveness in mine action and reduce the need to rely on international personnel.<sup>27</sup> In this context, since the 10MSP, the GICHD highlighted that the avoidance of land rights issues can inhibit the return of displaced populations and reduce the developmental effectiveness of mine action. Based on the findings of case studies and discussions that took place during a 2010 workshop in Cambodia, the GICHD published a policy brief which provides mine action practitioners with a range of actions and approaches to ensure they “do no harm” and address the land issues that they commonly encounter.

*(b) Transparency and the exchange of information*

143. At the close of the 10MSP, one (1) State Party – Equatorial Guinea – had not yet complied with the obligation to report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party, on the matters for which transparency information is required in accordance with Article 7.1. In addition, 92

---

<sup>26</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #50.

<sup>27</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #51.

States Parties had and 63 States Parties had not in 2010 provided updated information, as required, covering the previous calendar year.

144. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not submitted their initial Article 7 report will immediately fulfil their obligation to initially submit and annually update Article 7 transparency reports. Since the 10MSP, Equatorial Guinea has remained non-compliant with its obligation to report in accordance with Article 7.1. In addition in 2011, the following 71 States Parties did not provide updated information covering calendar year 2010 in accordance with Article 7.2 as required: Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Dominica, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Liberia, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Niger, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

145. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will maximise and take full advantage of the flexibility of the Article 7 reporting process as a tool to assist in implementation, including through the reporting format "Form J" to provide information on matters which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilization, such as information on international cooperation and assistance, victim assistance efforts and needs and information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in all aspects of mine action.<sup>28</sup> Since the 10MSP, the following States Parties made use of "Form J" to provide information on matters related to resources, cooperation and assistance Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Since the 10MSP, the following States Parties made use of "Form J" to provide information on victim assistance efforts and needs [Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Mauritania, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela and Zimbabwe]. Since the 10MSP, no States Parties made use of "Form J" to provide information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in all aspects of mine action.

146. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will regularly review the number of anti-personnel mines retained for purposes permitted under Article 3 to ensure that it constitutes the minimum number absolutely necessary for these purposes and destroy all those exceeding that number.<sup>29</sup> It was agreed that all States Parties will annually report, on a voluntary basis, on the plans for and actual use of anti-personnel mines retained, explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained anti-personnel mines.<sup>30</sup> Since the 10MSP, **Argentina** reported 96 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010 and as of 31 December 2010, 404 anti-personnel mines were used to train engineers with techniques and procedures for effective destruction of anti-personnel mines. Retained anti-personnel mines were also used for the development of basic and advanced courses in humanitarian demining including the Engineering School of Argentina (EDA). **Australia** reported 20 fewer M16 type mines than it had reported in 2009 and that stock levels are

<sup>28</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #55.

<sup>29</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #56.

<sup>30</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #57.

regularly reviewed and assessed with stocks now centralised and small numbers of anti-personnel mines in ammunition depots throughout Australia to support regional training conducted by the School of Military Engineering in Sydney. **Belgium** reported that a total of 104 anti-personnel mines were used for education and training of EOD specialists and deminers with live ammunition during courses organized by the Belgian Armed forces.

147. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** reported 270 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010. **Brazil** reported 1075 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2010 and that it retains mines to allow the Brazilian Army to participate adequately in international demining activities. **Canada** reported that anti-personnel mines are retained to study the effect of blast on equipment, to train soldiers on procedures to defuse live anti-personnel mines and to demonstrate the effect of landmines and that during the period 21 April 2010 to 20 April 2011, Canada destroyed 16 anti-personnel mines for research and development permitted purposes. **Croatia** reported 106 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010 and indicated that mines stored at the Croatian Armed Forces storage site (“Jamadol”) are going to be used by Croatian Mine Action and the Centre for Testing Development and Training (CROMAC-CTDT) on testing machines, dogs and detectors. The **Czech Republic** reported 24 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010. **Denmark** reported 57 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for research, development and training in mine detection by the Danish Defence Research Establishment, and the Defence Acquisition and Logistics organization. **Ecuador** reported 90 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010 (1,000).

148. **Germany** reported that it continued to retain a limited number of anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes in a so-called “APM Pool”, namely for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance and mine destruction techniques. Germany further reported that the necessary amounts, types and estimated future requirements were reviewed on an annual basis, that, since 1999, the number of retained anti-personnel mines had been reduced substantially (by 805 mines), and that 68 mines on average are used for training, testing and research purposes annually. **Indonesia**, while reporting no change in the number of anti-personnel mines retained (2,454) since 2010, recalled that anti-personnel mines are retained to be used as instruction and teaching materials to further enhance identifying, detecting and destroying landmines. **Iraq** reported 1,441 anti-personnel mines retained, an increase of 741 in the number of anti-personnel mines reported retained since 2010. **Ireland** retained 2 fewer anti-personnel mines and reported that the Irish Defence Forces use live anti-personnel mines as part of testing and validation of mechanical mine clearance equipments. **Italy** reported 5 fewer anti-personnel mines retained and that 4 anti-personnel mines were used for bomb disposal and pioneers training courses. **Japan** reported 303 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than in 2010. It also reported that it plans to use anti-personnel mines for education and training in mine detection and mine clearance. **Jordan** reported 50 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010.

149. **Lithuania**, which had previously reported retaining no anti-personnel mines, reported the retention of 1563 anti-personnel mines in 2011. **Luxembourg** reported 201 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Mozambique** reported 8 fewer mines than it had reported in 2010 and that it retains mines to train deminers in mine detection and mine clearance techniques. The **Netherlands** reported 193 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Nicaragua** reported 515 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010, that these were destroyed by the national humanitarian demining programme and that 26 anti-personnel mines were deactivated and destined for the calibration of mine detectors. **Peru** reported 20 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Portugal** reported 3 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010 and reported that it used them for

training the Portuguese Armed Forces in mine detection, clearance and destruction. **Serbia**, while reporting no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,159) that since 2010 it had reported retained, reported that it plans to use the anti-personnel mines it has retained for personnel training towards possible engagement in United Nations peace operations, protection equipment testing, and mine detectors. **Slovakia** reported 50 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2010 and that it retained anti-personnel mines for development of UXO clearance techniques and training in mine detection. In the 2011, Slovakia plans to destroy up to 50 anti-personnel mines. **Slovenia** reported 13 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than in 2010.

150. **South Africa** reported 1 less anti-personnel mine retained than it had reported in 2010 and indicated that anti-personnel mines continue to be held by “Defencetek” on behalf of the Department of Defence, as formally mandated by ministerial authorisation on 7 March 2006. **Spain** reported 6 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Sweden** reported 214 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Thailand** reported 160 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010, that it located 40 additional anti-personnel mines which were not previously reported, and, that 200 anti-personnel mines were provided to the Royal Thai Army for training purposes. **Tunisia** reported 70 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010 and that these were used for training purposes. **Turkey**, while reporting no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (15,100) that since 2006 it has reported retained, indicated that it is carrying out research including a modification project for mine proof boots. The **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** reported 160 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** reported 86 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010. **Yemen** reported 240 more anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2010.

151. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have maintained, under the provisions of Article 3, the same number of anti-personnel mines over periods of years, and have not reported on the use of such mines for permitted purposes or on concrete plans for their use, would be encouraged to report on such use and such plans and to review whether these anti-personnel mines are needed and constitute the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes and to destroy those that are in excess of this number.<sup>31</sup> Since the 10MSP, **Afghanistan** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (2,618) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Algeria** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (5,970) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Angola** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (2,512), that since 2007, it has reported retained. **Bangladesh** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (12,500), that since 2010, it has reported retained. **Belarus** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (6,030), that since 2005, it has reported retained. **Benin** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (16) that since 2007, it has reported retained.

152. **Bhutan** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (4,491) that since 2007, it has reported retained. **Burundi** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (4) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Bulgaria** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,672), that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Cameroon** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,855) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Cambodia** reported that during the last 6 years (2005-2010), it had

<sup>31</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #58.



retained a total of 4,309 anti-personnel mines for the purposes permitted under Article 3, and that the anti-personnel mines were removed from the ground and utilized for general training, MDD training, trial fields, research and development purposes by the accredited operators including (2,190 by CMAC, 1,038 by NPMEC, 920 by HALO Trust and 161 by MAG). Cambodia further reported that a total of 2,666 anti-personnel mines will be retained by the four operators, including 1,488 retained by CMAC for the future general training of new deminers and burring for MDD training, 306 by NPMEC, 711 by HALO and 161 by MAG. Of the total anti-personnel mines received, 1,643 anti-personnel mines were destroyed during training. **Cape Verde** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (120) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Colombia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (586) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Chile** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,346) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Congo** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (322) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Cyprus** recalled that 50 percent of its anti-personnel mines retained were destroyed on 8 October 2010 and that the remaining number of retained anti-personnel mines amounts to 500. **Eritrea** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (172) that since 2010 it has reported retained.

153. **Ethiopia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (303) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **France** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (4017) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Gambia** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (100) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Greece** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (6,158) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Guinea-Bissau** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (9) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Honduras** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (826) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Indonesia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,454) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Kenya** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,000) that, since 2001, it has reported retained. **Mauritania** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (728) that, since 2005, it has reported retained. **Namibia** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,634) that, since 2010, it has reported retained.

154. **Niger** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (146) that, since 2005, it has reported retained. **Nigeria** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,364) that, since 2010, it has reported retained. **Romania** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,500) that, since 2005, it has reported retained. **Rwanda** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (65) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Senegal** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (28) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Serbia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,159) that, since 2010 it has reported retained. **Sudan** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,938) that, since 2009 it has reported retained. **Turkey** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (15,100) that, since 2010 it has reported retained. **Tanzania** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,780) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Uganda** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,764) that, since 2010 it has reported retained. **Ukraine** reported destroying all 187 PMN mines that it has previously reported having retained for permitted purposes. **Uruguay** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (260) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Zambia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,120) that,

since 2009, it has reported retained. **Zimbabwe** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (550) that, since 2009, it has reported retained.

155. The 10MSP considered a paper presented by Belgium which highlighted the importance of further discussions on a number of matters concerning the Convention's transparency provisions and the reporting process. Since the 10MSP, Belgium continued these discussions through consultations with delegations and through its ongoing efforts in coordinating the informal Article 7 Contact Group. These discussions focused on possible ways and means to increase both the reporting rate and the quality of information reported.

(c) *Measures to ensure compliance*

156. At the close of the 10MSP, there were 61 States Parties that had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations and that there were 34 States Parties that had reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention.<sup>32</sup> The remaining 61 States Parties had not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they considered that existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention.<sup>33</sup>

157. Since the 10MSP, the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** enacted legislation in accordance with Article 9. There are now 62 States Parties that have reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations, 35 States Parties that have reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention and 59 States Parties have not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they consider that existing laws are sufficient to give effect to the Convention. (See annex VI.)

158. During the June 2011 intersessional work programme, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, with the support of the ICRC, sought to assist States Parties in fulfilling their Article 9 obligations. Pursuant to the 10MSP decision to see that time during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees would be allocated to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan, the Co-Chairs used a small-group format to provide an interactive forum for delegations to work together to overcome challenges associated with Article 9 implementation. At this small group session, representatives of Bulgaria, Ireland and Zambia shared their national experiences in establishing legislation or on determining that existing legislation was sufficient. The Co-Chairs noted that States Parties that still must fulfill Article 9 obligations could draw upon experiences such as these. It was also noted that the small group session provided the opportunity for a good exchange of ideas and experiences and that at least one State Party that has not yet implemented Article 9 may be in a position to do as a consequence of the session.

159. States Parties expressed concern that there have been several allegations of use over the past couple of years, by armed non-State actors in States that are party to the Convention, by States not parties, and even by States Parties, and emphasised the importance of a strong reaction to allegations of non-compliance by all States Parties. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the case of alleged use of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors

<sup>32</sup> The figure 61 is a correction with respect to the figure 59 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report. The figure 34 is a correction with respect to the figure 33 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

<sup>33</sup> The figure 61 is a correction with respect to the figure 64 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

in **Sudan** was specifically mentioned. With respect to this case, an August 2011 report issued by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights stated that “both the SAF (Sudanese Armed Forces) and the SPLA-N (Sudan People’s Liberation Army – North) are reported to have laid anti-personnel mines in strategic areas of Kadugli town”, that “the SAF is reported to have mined the Kalimo neighbourhood” and that “the SPLA-N is reported to have laid land mines in areas around the deputy governor’s residence.”<sup>34</sup>

160. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Co-Chairs recalled that the 10MSP Geneva Progress Report recorded that, in 2010, the States Parties were informed about an allegation that may relate to compliance with the Convention’s prohibitions within the territory of **Turkey**. Turkey reported that a legal process concerning these allegations is continuing and that it would subsequently inform the States Parties of the outcome of this process.

161. Since the 10MSP, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) continued fulfilling the United Nations Secretary General’s responsibility to prepare and update a list of names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts designated for fact finding missions authorised in accordance with Article 8.8. Since the 10MSP, two States Parties – Germany and Switzerland – provided new or updated information for the list of experts.

162. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that all States Parties will recognize that when armed non-State actors operate under State Parties’ jurisdiction or control, such non-State actors will be held responsible for acts prohibited to States Parties under the Convention, in accordance with national measures taken under Article 9. Since the 10MSP, Colombia again advised the States Parties that armed non-State actors are carrying out acts in contravention of the Convention’s prohibitions on Colombian territory.

*(d) Implementation support*

163. At the 10MSP, the States Parties adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU”, ensuring that the ISU is directly responsible to the States Parties while it continues to be hosted by the GICHD, and, mandated the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. At the 20 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the President reported that on 16 February 2011, he sent to the Director of the GICHD an initial draft amended agreement. The consultations between the President and the Director of the GICHD lasted until 27 April 2011. On the basis of these consultations, the President prepared a revised draft and sent it to the States Parties on 10 May 2011 and subsequently distributed a discussion paper.

164. On 19 May 2011, the President convened an informal meeting to discuss the draft amended agreement. Representatives of 40 States Parties participated in this meeting. In general, the States Parties expressed support for the proposed draft amended agreement, with many considering the proposed draft consistent with both the 10MSP decisions and the President’s mandate. Two States Parties asked for finalising the new financing scheme of the ISU, before negotiating the amended agreement with the GICHD. One State Party expressed concerns regarding the proposed draft amended agreement and asked for fundamental changes with most participants expressing their opposition to such fundamental changes.

---

<sup>34</sup> Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Thirteenth periodic report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Sudan. August 2011.

165. Following the 19 May 2011 informal meeting, the President invited written input and consulted bilaterally with delegations on 14 June and throughout the week of 20 June. On 24 June, the President presented a revised agreement to the meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention which he indicated was agreeable, in his view, both to States Parties and to the GICHD. The agreement was produced in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish and signed by the 10MSP President and GICHD Director on 6 September 2012.

166. Also at the 10MSP, the States Parties, while recording their increasing appreciation for the work of the ISU and the evolution of the support provided by the ISU, recalled that the Cartagena Summit highlighted that a challenge for the States Parties remains to ensure the sustainability of funding of the operations of the ISU, through either the existing method or another manner. As well, the Geneva Progress Report recalled that at the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties also highlighted that, without a sustainable means of financing, the ISU will have to drastically reduce its service offerings, which no doubt would adversely affect the implementation process.

167. The 10MSP tasked the President to establish an informal open-ended working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU and present recommendations and draft decisions on the most feasible comprehensive financing model for adoption by the 11MSP, so it may be effective from the financial year 2012. On 8 March 2011, the 10MSP President convened the first meeting of the open-ended working group, recalling that the starting point for its efforts was the Final Report to the Task Force on the Evaluation of the ISU, and the Final Report and Recommendations of the ISU Task Force, endorsed by the 10MSP. The President also recalled that the States Parties have expressed satisfaction with the performance, efficiency, professional competence, responsiveness and dedication of the ISU and that there was general agreement among the Task Force members on the need to review the financing model of the ISU, in order to make it sustainable and predictable, and to achieve more equitable burden sharing.

168. At the first meeting of the open-ended working group, most States Parties emphasised that the current funding model of the ISU is not adequate and expressed their readiness to explore other options, aiming at identifying the financing model that may best ensure the continuity of activities, sustainability and predictability of funding for the ISU's activities, as well as provide better burden sharing among the States Parties. Some States Parties asked either for more time, or for more information, in order to be better prepared to continue this discussion. Two States Parties expressed satisfaction with the existing voluntary funding scheme. Arguments were made in the favour of covering the ISU budget on a mixed model of a properly adjusted assessed scheme, with voluntary, and with in-kind contributions. A summary of the discussions of the meeting was distributed to all States Parties and made available on the Convention's website.

169. On 28-29 March 2011, the 10MSP President held a number of bilateral and small group consultations with States Parties regarding the ISU funding model. His main conclusion was that, while there is a degree of diversity as well as divergence of States Parties' positions, there is a large degree of flexibility on the part of a number of State Parties with regard to a future financing scheme for the ISU. On 11 May 2011, the 10MSP President distributed to all States Parties a paper that served as the basis for discussions at the second meeting of the open-ended working group on 19 May 2011. Representatives of 40 States Parties participated in this meeting. At this meeting, the ISU Director provided additional information on the cost structure of the ISU and of other conventions' support mechanisms (BWC, CCW), a description of the financing of the different ISU activities, under the present funding scheme, and, an overview of ISU's tasks related to meetings of the states parties, review conferences and the intersessional work programme.

170. On 20 June 2011, the 10MSP President reported on his efforts regarding the ISU funding model to the meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention. He concluded that while there was a diversity of views regarding a financing model for the ISU, there was broad agreement regarding the value of a well functioning ISU and on the need to ensure it continued to deliver its high quality services to the States Parties. The 10MSP President expressed that the financing of the ISU's activities through a predictable, sustainable and equitable burden sharing funding model is of paramount importance and that he intended to continue consultations in order to reach agreement on the basic principles and elements for the most appropriate funding model. On 3 November 2011, the last meeting of the open-ended working group took place. The 10MSP President gave an oral update on this meeting at the 11MSP.

171. In adopting the "Directive from the States Parties to the ISU", the 10MSP agreed that the ISU shall "report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference, and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate." At the 24 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Director of the ISU provided a written and oral report. The ISU Director recalled that the 10MSP decisions updated the ISU's mandate, noted the lengthy set of activities consistent with this mandate which are contained in the ISU's 2010 work plan and provided highlights of work undertaken by the ISU during the first half of 2011.

172. With respect to its substantive efforts, in 2011 the ISU carried out its activities in accordance with its 2011 work plan and budget, which was adopted by the Coordinating Committee in November 2010. The ISU provided advice to State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance (including in-country support to States Parties regarding Article 5 implementation and applying the understandings adopted by the States Parties on victim assistance), assisting States Parties in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes, providing strategic direction to Co-Chairs and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, supporting the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests, supporting States Parties in preparing transparency reports, leading seminars and providing training on understanding the Convention and its operations, supporting the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts, providing advice on applying the lessons learned from implementing the Convention, supporting the 11MSP President-Designate and host, continuing to serve as the authoritative source of information on the Convention and maintaining the Convention's Documentation Centre.

173. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would provide necessary financial resources for the effective operation of the Implementation Support Unit. On 7 January 2011, the 10MSP President wrote to all States Parties noting that, while the 10MSP decisions included tasking the President in establishing a working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU, it remained the collective responsibility of the States Parties in 2011 to fund the ISU's core work plan through the existing funding model. Through both his 7 January 2011 letter and a follow-up letter on 8 July 2011, the President appealed to all States Parties to consider providing a voluntary contribution to the ISU in order that the burden of financing the ISU is shared as widely as possible. Contributions in support of the ISU's 2011 core work plan were received from the following States Parties: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cambodia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Malaysia, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey. In addition, commitments have been made by Belgium, Canada, Croatia, and Italy which should see contributions from these States Parties received by the end of 2011.

174. The Geneva Progress Report recorded the ISU Director's hope that the ISU could return to a staffing and service level that States Parties have come to expect as the norm in recent years, particularly through restaffing the position of "victim assistance specialist". In 2011, the ISU, largely through consultancies, was able to provide intensive in-country victim assistance support to four affected States Parties (down from the normal level of approximately 9-12) in applying the victim assistance understandings adopted by the States Parties. However, sufficient funding was not acquired to restaff the "victim assistance specialist" position in 2011.

175. In addition to carrying out its core work plan, the ISU executed other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, when additional funds were made available to fully fund these efforts.

(a) Through enhanced funding provided by Norway, the ISU was able to provide enhanced support to the 10MSP President, which included supporting the President and his Special Envoy on universalization efforts and supporting the President in convening a symposium on international cooperation and assistance.

(b) Through enhanced funding provided by Australia, the ISU was able to organize programmes for victim assistance experts that ran parallel to the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP. Also through enhanced funding provided by Australia, the ISU was able to produce the publication "Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development" and provide enhanced victim assistance advisory services to one State Party in Africa.

(c) Through enhanced funding provided by Switzerland, the ISU was able to support the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in convening a workshop on Article 5 implementation on the margins of the annual United Nations Mine Action Programme Directors' Meeting.

(d) In addition, funds were received from Australia to provide enhanced support to universalisation and implementation in the Pacific.

176. The 10MSP, in warmly welcoming the Review of the Intersessional Work Programme, presented by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, agreed *inter alia* to examine the possibility of rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees. In this regard, the 10MSP requested that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Co-Chairs/Co-Rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the 11MSP.

177. At the 24 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the 10MSP President presented a proposal on rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees. This proposal pointed to a reduction in the number of States Parties leading each Standing Committee to be reduced from four to two, with this reduction taking place over the course of two years. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention concluded that there was general support for this proposal and it was put forward to the 11MSP for a decision.

178. In keeping with established tradition, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention undertook the task of consulting with States Parties to identify a list of nominees to serve as Co-Rapporteurs following the 11MSP. On 9 June 2011, the Co-Chairs wrote to all States Parties to indicate that they were seeking one new State Party for each of the five Standing Committees, noting that it was

their expectation that over two years States Parties may arrive at an end state of two Co-Chairs for each Standing Committee, serving overlapping two-year terms. At the 20 June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Co-Chairs again reminded delegations of their 9 June 2011 written appeal. On the basis of interest expressed to the Co-Chairs and consultations with interested delegations, the Co-Chairs proposed a set of five new States Parties which were elected at the 11MSP.

179. Also in warmly welcoming the Review of the intersessional work programme, presented by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, the 10MSP requested the Coordinating Committee to organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in 2011 in such a way that time is allocated for Co-Chairs, individual States Parties and others to experiment with new ways of using the intersessional work programme to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The 10MSP further agreed that, on the basis of experimentation carried out during various intersessional work programmes, the States Parties should keep an open mind regarding the structure of the week of meetings of the Standing Committees to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the intersessional work programme.

180. Further to the 10MSP decisions concerning the 2011 intersessional work programme, the Coordinating Committee agreed that two 1.5 hour sessions on 23 June 2011 would be scheduled for interested Co-Chairs to organise activities to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Coordinating Committee also agreed that these experimental sessions should be based on certain key principles, including: that participation would be on a voluntary basis, particularly as concerns States Parties that would be the subject of a national focus; that the overarching purpose of each session would be to seek cooperative means to support implementation; and, that there would be no report produced attributing views to any participant or revealing participants' affiliations.

181. Pursuant to the decisions of the Coordinating Committee regarding the 2011 intersessional work programme experimentation: the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance convened two sessions to discuss in more detail the challenges faced by two States Parties in implementing the plans and fulfilling the commitments made in their Article 5 extension requests; the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance convened two sessions to discuss in more detail the experiences of two States Parties in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan; and, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention convened one session to assist States Parties in fulfilling their obligations to take appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention.

182. In assessing the experimentation that occurred during the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees, the Coordinating Committee expressed general satisfaction, noting that the vast majority of delegates that attended the experimental sessions indicated that these sessions indeed resulted in cooperative discussions on how a variety of actors could assist one another in overcoming implementation challenges. There was general agreement that there would be benefit in continuing with experimental sessions with these sessions organised consistent with principles noted in paragraph 97. In addition, the Coordinating Committee noted that experimental sessions could be improved in the future, including by aiming for increased interactivity and greater avenues for participation by mine-affected States Parties.

183. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to support the efforts of the President and Coordinating Committee to ensure effective preparations and conduct of

meetings of the Convention.<sup>35</sup> Since the 10MSP, the Coordinating Committee met six times to fulfil its mandate to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the 10MSP.

184. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would contribute to the Sponsorship Programme thereby permitting widespread representation at meetings of the Convention, particularly by mine-affected developing States Parties. In 2011, the following States Parties contributed to the Sponsorship Programme: Australia, Denmark and Norway. In addition, commitments have been made by Canada and Italy which should see contributions from these States Parties received by the end of 2011. At the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees, 44 representatives of 28 States Parties were sponsored as were 4 representatives of 3 States not parties. At the 11MSP, 46 representatives of 29 States Parties were sponsored as were 7 representatives of 5 States not parties. In 2011, the Sponsorship Programme again helped enable States Parties live up to the commitment they made at the Cartagena Summit to ensure the ensure the continued involvement and effective contribution in all relevant Convention related activities by health, rehabilitation, social services, education, employment, gender and disability rights experts.

185. Since the 10MSP, the States Parties, in keeping with their Cartagena Summit commitment, continued to recognise and further encourage the full participation in and contribution to the implementation of the Convention by the ICBL, ICRC, national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and their International Federation, the UN, the GICHD, international and regional organisations, mine survivors and their organisations, and other civil society organisations.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #63.

<sup>36</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #62.



## Appendix I

### Stockpiled anti-personnel mines

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported at the close of the 10MSP</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed since the close of the 10MSP</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines remaining</i>
Belarus	3,368,156 <sup>37</sup>	11,520	3,356,636
Greece	953,285 <sup>38</sup>	0	953,285
Turkey	22,716 <sup>39</sup>	22,716	0
Ukraine	5,951,785	6,480	5,945,305
Totals	10,295,942 <sup>40</sup>	18,000	10,277,942

  

<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties as of the close of the 10MSP</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties since the close of the 10MSP</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties as of 3 December 2011</i>
44,494,405	18,000	44,512,405

<sup>37</sup> The figure 3,368,156 is a correction with respect to the figure 3,370,172 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

<sup>38</sup> The figure 953,285 is a correction with respect to the figure 951,146 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

<sup>39</sup> The figure 22,716 is a correction with respect to the figure 22,788 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

<sup>40</sup> The figure 10,295,942 is a correction with respect to the figure 10,295,891 which appeared in the 10MSP's Geneva Progress Report.

## Appendix II

### Mines reported retained for purposes permitted under Article 3 of the Convention

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Afghanistan <sup>41</sup>	1076	1887	2692	2680	2618	2618	
Albania	0		0	0	0	0	
Algeria	15030	15030	15030	15030	6000	5970	
Andorra	0	0	0		0		
Angola	1390	1460	2512			2512	
Antigua and Barbuda							
Argentina <sup>42</sup>	1680	1596	1471	1380	1268	1142	1046
Australia	7395	7266	7133	6998	6785	6947	6927
Austria	0		0	0	0	0	0
Bahamas	0				0		
Bangladesh	15000	14999	12500	12500	12500	12500	
Barbados							
Belarus	6030	6030	6030	6030	6030	6030	6030
Belgium	4176	3820	3569	3287	3245	3204	3100
Belize							
Benin		30	16	16			
Bhutan			4491				
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0						
Bosnia and Herzegovina <sup>43</sup>	2755	17471	1708	1920	2390	2255	1985
Botswana <sup>44</sup>							

<sup>41</sup> In its Article 7 report submitted in 2005, Afghanistan indicated that the Government had yet to develop a formal policy on the number of mines retained for development and training purposes. The Government on a case-by-case basis approves the number and type of APMs retained by UNMACA on behalf of the MAPA.

<sup>42</sup> In its report submitted in 2002, Argentina indicated that 1160 mines were retained to be used as fuses for antitank mines FMK-5 and that 1000 will be consumed during training activities until 1 April 2010. Additionally, in Form F, Argentina indicated that 12025 mines would be emptied of their explosive content in order to have inert mines for training.

<sup>43</sup> In its Article 7 report submitted in 2010, BiH indicated that 2,255 mines were without fuses.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Brazil <sup>45</sup>	16125	15038	13550	12381	10986	10051	8976
Brunei Darussalam <sup>46</sup>			0			0	
Bulgaria	3676	3676	3670	3682	3682	3672	3672
Burkina Faso <sup>47</sup>							
Burundi				4	4	4	4
Cambodia	596	125	125	594	519	701	845
Cameroon <sup>48</sup>	3154				1885		
Canada <sup>49</sup>	1907	1992	1963	1963	1939	1937	1921
Cape Verde					120		
Central African Republic							
Chad	0	0	0		0	0	
Chile	5895	4574	4484	4153	4083	3346	
Colombia	886	886	586	586	586	586	586
Comoros							
Congo	372	372	372		322		
Cook Islands			0				
Costa Rica	0					0	
Côte d'Ivoire	0	0	0		0	0	
Croatia	6400	6236	6179	6103	6038	5954	5848
Cyprus	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	500	500
Czech Republic	4829	4829	4699	4699	2543	2497	2473
Democratic Republic of the Congo <sup>50</sup>							

<sup>44</sup> In its report submitted in 2001, Botswana indicated that a “small quantity” of mines would be retained.

<sup>45</sup> In its reports submitted in 2006 and 2009, Brazil indicated that it intends to keep its Article 3 mines up to 2019.

<sup>46</sup> In its report submitted in 2007, Brunei Darussalam indicated that there were no live anti-personnel mines prohibited by the Convention retained for the development and training in Brunei Darussalam. For these purposes, the Royal Brunei Armed Forces is using anti-personnel mines that are not prohibited by the Convention.

<sup>47</sup> In its reports submitted in 2005, 2007 and 2008, Burkina Faso indicated that “nothing yet” was retained.

<sup>48</sup> In its report submitted in 2009, Cameroon indicated in Form B that 1,885 mines were held and in Form D that some thousands of mines were held for training purposes.

<sup>49</sup> 84 of the 1941 mines reported in 2007 are without fuses.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Denmark	1989	60	2008	2008	1990	1950	1893
Djibouti	2996						
Dominica	0						
Dominican Republic					0		
Ecuador	2001	2001	2001	1000	1000	1000	910
El Salvador	96	72			0		
Equatorial Guinea							
Eritrea <sup>51</sup>	9		109	109	109	172	172
Estonia	0		0	0	0	0	
Ethiopia				1114	303	303	
Fiji							
France	4455	4216	4170	4152	4144	4017	4017
Gabon							
Gambia					0	100	
Germany	2496	2525	2526	2388	2437	2261	2201
Ghana							
Greece	7224	7224	7224	7224	7224	6158	6158
Grenada							
Guatemala	0				0	0	0
Guinea							
Guinea-Bissau <sup>52</sup>		109		109	9	9	9
Guyana		0				0	
Haiti					0		
Holy See	0	0	0		0	0	0
Honduras		815	826				

<sup>50</sup> In its reports submitted in 2008, 2009 and 2010, the Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the decision concerning mines retained was pending.

<sup>51</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Eritrea indicated that the mines retained were inert. In its report submitted in 2007, Eritrea indicated that 9 of the 109 mines retained were inert. In its report submitted in 2008, Eritrea indicated that 8 of the 109 retained mines were inert. In its report submitted in 2010, Eritrea indicated that 71 of the 172 mines retained for training were inert.

<sup>52</sup> In its reports submitted in 2006 and 2008, Guinea Bissau indicated that amongst the 109 retained mines, 50 POMZ2 and 50 PMD6 did not contain detonators or explosive. In its report submitted in 2009, Guinea Bissau indicated that the 50 POMZ2 were transferred for metal use and the 50 PMD6 were eliminated and used as wood.

<i>State Party</i>	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Hungary	1500		0		0	0	
Iceland	0	0	0	0			
Indonesia				4978	4978	2454	2454
Iraq				9	TBC	698	1441
Ireland	85	77	75	70	67	66	64
Italy	806	806	750	721	689	674	669
Jamaica	0		0				
Japan	6946	5350	4277	3712	3320	2976	2673
Jordan	1000	1000	1000	950	950	900	850
Kenya		3000		3000			
Kiribati							
Kuwait				0	0	0	
Latvia		1301	902	899	899	118	0
Lesotho							
Liberia							
Liechtenstein	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	0	0	0	0	0	0	1563
Luxembourg	956	956	900	855		800	599
Madagascar							
Malawi	21				0	0	
Malaysia	0				0	0	0
Maldives		0					
Mali	600						
Malta	0	0		0	0		
Mauritania	728	728	728	728	728	728	728
Mauritius	0	0	0	0			
Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monaco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montenegro			0	0	0	0	0

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Mozambique <sup>53</sup>	1470	1319	1265		1963	1943	1935
Namibia	6151	3899			1734	1634	
Nauru							
Netherlands	3176	2878	2735	2516	2413	2214	2021
New Zealand <sup>54</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nicaragua	1040	1021	1004	1004	1004	963	
Niger	146	146			146		
Nigeria	0	0			3364	3364	
Niue							
Norway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palau				0	0		0
Panama					0		
Papua New Guinea <sup>55</sup>							
Paraguay		0	0			0	
Peru	4024	4012	4012	4000	4047	2060	2040
Philippines	0	0	0			0	
Portugal	1115	1115	1115		760	697	694
Qatar							
Romania	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500
Republic of Moldova	249	249	0	0	0	0	0
Rwanda	101	101		65			
Saint Kitts and Nevis							
Saint Lucia							
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines							

<sup>53</sup> In its report submitted in 2009, Mozambique indicated that 520 of the retained mines were inherited from an NPA mine detection training camp. This camp is not used as training falls outside of the IND scope of work so the mines will be destroyed in June 2009.

<sup>54</sup> In its report submitted in 2007, New Zealand indicated that it retains operational stocks of M18A1 Claymores which are operated in the command-detonated mode only. Other than the M18A1 Claymores, the New Zealand Defence Force holds a very limited quantity of inert practice mines, used solely in the training of personnel in mine clearance operations, in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention.

<sup>55</sup> In its report submitted in 2004, Papua New Guinea indicated that it had a small stock of command-detonated Claymore mines for training purposes only by the Papua New Guinea Defence Force.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Samoa			0				
San Marino	0		0	0	0	0	0
Sao Tome and Principe				0			
Senegal <sup>56</sup>	0		24	24	28	28	28
Serbia <sup>57</sup>	5000	5507		5565	3589	3159	3159
Seychelles	0						
Sierra Leone							
Slovakia	1427	1427	1427	1422	1422	1422	
Slovenia	2994	2993	2993	2992	2991		2978
Solomon Islands							
South Africa	4388	4433	4406	4380	4356	4356	4355
Spain	2712	2712	2034	1994	1797	1735	1729
Sudan	5000	10000	10000	4997	1938	1938	1938
Suriname	150	150	150	0			
Swaziland		0					
Sweden <sup>58</sup>	14798	14402	10578	7531	7364	7364	7150
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tajikistan	255	225	105	0	0	0	0
Thailand <sup>59</sup>	4970	4761	4713	3650	3638	3626	3466
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4000	0	0	0	0		0
Timor-Leste							
Togo							
Trinidad and Tobago		0			0	0	0
Tunisia	5000	5000	5000	4995	4980	4980	4910

<sup>56</sup> In its reports submitted in 2007 and 2008, Senegal indicated that the 24 mines it retains under Article 3 were found during demining operations or in rebels stocks held before they were destroyed in August-September 2006. These mines have been defused and are used to train deminers. In its report submitted in 2010, Senegal indicated that 4 of the mines retained for training had been defused.

<sup>57</sup> In its report submitted in 2009, Serbia indicated that all fuses for 510 PMA-1 type and 560 PMA-3 type had been removed and destroyed.

<sup>58</sup> In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005, Sweden indicated that 2840 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies. In its report submitted in 2009, Sweden indicated that 2780 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies.

<sup>59</sup> In its Article 7 report submitted in 2010, Thailand reported the transfer of all its mines for training and destruction.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>
Turkey	16000	15150	15150	15150	15125	15100	15100
Turkmenistan	0	0				0	
Ukraine		1950	1950	223	211	187	0
Uganda	1764			1764	1764	1764	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1937	1795	650	609	903	833	673
United Republic of Tanzania	1146	1146	1102	950	1780		
Uruguay				260			
Vanuatu		0		0			
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4960	4960	4960	4960	4960	4960	4874
Yemen	4000	4000				3760	4000
Zambia	3346	3346	3346	2232	2120	2120	2120
Zimbabwe <sup>60</sup>	700	700	700	600	550		550

<sup>60</sup> In its report submitted in 2008, Zimbabwe reported 700 mines retained for training in Form D and indicated that 100 had been destroyed during training in 2007 in Form B.



### Appendix III

#### Legal measures taken in accordance with Article 9

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

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

## Annex I

### Agenda of the Eleventh Meeting of the States parties

1. Official opening of the meeting
2. Election of the President
3. Brief messages delivered by or on behalf of Nobel Peace Prize laureate Jody Williams, the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the President of the Council of the Foundation of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining and the Secretary-General of the United Nations
4. Adoption of the agenda
5. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the meeting and of other officers
6. Confirmation of the Secretary-General of the meeting
7. Organization of work
8. General exchange of views<sup>61</sup>
9. Informal presentation of requests submitted under Article 5 and of the analysis of these requests
10. Consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention
  - (a) Assisting the victims
  - (b) Clearing mined areas
  - (c) Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines
  - (d) Universalizing the Convention
  - (e) Cooperation and Assistance
  - (f) Implementation Support
    - (i) Amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU
    - (ii) Recommendations on a financing model for the ISU
    - (iii) Report on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU and presentation of a work plan and a budget for the 2012 activities of the ISU
    - (iv) Matters pertaining to the functioning of the intersessional work programme
    - (v) Others matters concerning implementation support
  - (g) Transparency and the exchange of information
  - (h) Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities and facilitating compliance

---

<sup>61</sup> Given the volume of work that must be dealt with at the Eleventh Meeting, States Parties and observers are encouraged to refrain from making general statements but rather provide updates on implementation on thematic matters indicated in agenda item 11. In addition, if they wish, delegations can distribute written statements rather than deliver oral statements.

11. Informal session: Reflecting on two decades of efforts to end the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines
12. Consideration of requests submitted under Article 5
13. Consideration of matters arising from/in the context of reports submitted under Article 7
14. Consideration of requests submitted under Article 8
15. Date, duration and location of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties, and matters pertaining to the preparations for the Twelfth Meeting.
16. Any other business
17. Consideration and adoption of the final document
18. Closure of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties

## Annex II

### **Report on the consideration of requests for extensions to Article 5, deadlines 2010-2011**

1. At the 2006 Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP), the States Parties established “a process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extension to Article 5 deadlines.” This process includes the President and the Co-Chairs and Co-rapporteurs of the Standing Committees jointly preparing an analysis of each request. In doing so, this group of 17 States Parties (hereafter referred to as the “analysing group”) is tasked, along with requesting States Parties, with cooperating fully to clarify issues and identify needs. In addition, in preparing each analysis, the analysing group in close consultation with the requesting State, should, where appropriate, draw on expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice, using the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to provide support. Ultimately, the President, acting on behalf of the Co-Chairs and Co-rapporteurs, is charged with submitting the analyses to the States Parties well before the Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference preceding the requesting State’s deadline.
2. At the 7MSP, the States Parties agreed “to encourage States Parties seeking Article 5 extensions to submit their request to the President no fewer than nine months before the Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference at which the decision on the request would need to be taken.” At the 10MSP, the States Parties recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests for the overall effective functioning of the Article 5 extension process and, in this context, recommended that requesting States Parties submit requests no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered (i.e., the year prior to the State Party’s deadline).
3. Following up on a recommendation of the President of the Second Review Conference, the President, assisted by the ISU and with financial support provided by Norway, convened a workshop on 7 March 2011 for the representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests to increase their knowledge and expertise with respect to the technical subject matter contained within Article 5. The workshop was also intended to ensure that the representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests were fully aware of the analysing group’s working methods.
4. In accordance with the decisions of the 8MSP, requests to be considered at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP) should normally have been submitted no later than the end of March 2011. On 31 March 2011, the President received requests submitted by Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Eritrea. On 14 April 2011, the President received a request submitted by Chile.
5. As a result of a cooperative dialogue with the analysing group, three States Parties revised their requests and submitted these revisions as follows: Algeria on 17 August 2011, the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 11 September 2011 and Eritrea on 11 August 2011.
6. In accordance with the decisions of the 8MSP, each request and each revised request received by the President was made available on the Convention’s website.
7. In accordance with working methods of the analysing group, agreed to by the analysing group in 2008, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, with the support of their Co-rapporteurs, made an initial determination of the completeness of each request and generated questions to obtain additional information from each

requesting State Party. The President forwarded these questions to the concerned State Parties with each providing a detailed response.

8. On 20 May 2011, the analysing group met to share initial views on the four requests that had been received by that date. In addition, in keeping with past practice, the ICBL and the ICRC were invited to share their views on the requests. The analysing group also noted that four States Parties with 2012 deadlines did not submit requests: Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan and Uganda. In addition, the analysing group noted that one State Party with a 2011 deadline, Congo, had neither provided clarity on whether it would be in a position to fulfil its Article 5 obligations by its 1 November 2011 deadline nor submitted a request for extension for consideration by the 10MSP.

9. The analysing group met on 21 June 2011, 22 June 2011 and 24 June 2011, primarily to engage in informal discussions with representatives of requesting States Parties. Algeria, Chile and the Democratic Republic of the Congo each accepted the analysing group's invitation to take part in such discussions.

10. The analysing group met for a final time on 5 September 2011 to consider draft analyses. In addition, throughout September and October additional deliberations were held electronically. Analyses on the requests submitted by Algeria and Chile were forwarded to the 11MSP Executive Secretary on 27 September 2011. The analysis on the request submitted by Eritrea as forwarded on 8 October 2011 and the analysis on the request submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo was submitted on 21 October 2011.

#### **Observations and recommendations**

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

12. The analysis in 2011 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by States Parties in the past, of States Parties that lack clarity regarding their Article 5 challenge "requesting only the period necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts".

13. The analysis in 2011 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by the States Parties in the past, of the States Parties agreeing that those that have been granted extensions be asked to report regularly on time-bound commitments made in requests and on the decisions taken on requests.

14. At the 10MSP the States Parties "recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests to the overall effective functioning of the Article 5 process" and "recommended that all States Parties that wish to submit requests do so no later than 31 March of the year when requests would be considered." In this context, there was improved performance on the part of requesting States Parties in 2011 in terms of the timely submission of requests.

15. Notwithstanding the timely submission of requests by Algeria, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Eritrea, in 2011, for the first time, the deadline for a State Party passed without the State Party indicating with clarity the location of all mined

areas that contain or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under its jurisdiction or control and without the State Party submitting an extension request on its deadline. As of 1 November 2011, the State Party in question, Congo, had still not provided this clarity. It is recommended that the 11MSP express its concern regarding the lack of clarity regarding the status of implementation of Article 5 by Congo. It is further recommended that in order to prevent similar situations from occurring in the future, the 11MSP should encourage States Parties to communicate with the Presidency in a timely manner if there is an issue that arises that may place a State Party in a situation of non-compliance with Article 5.

16. At the 10MSP, the President of the Second Review Conference noted that the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests. The President of the Second Review Conference recommended that the President, with the support of the ISU, should consider ways and means to increase the knowledge and expertise of the analyzing group with respect to the technical subject matter contained within Article 5 requests. The 10MSP President acted on this recommendation, with assistance from the ISU and financial support from Norway, and convened a workshop on 7 March 2011 to increase the knowledge and build the capacity of representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests.

17. While there was widespread appreciation for the 7 March 2011 workshop for representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests, it was observed in 2011 that the analysis process requires a renewed commitment from Co-chairs and Co-rapporteurs. It is recommended that States Parties considering taking on the task as serving as a Co-chair/rapporteur recall that a central aspect of their responsibilities involves actively contributing to the analysis process.



## Annex III

### **Rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees**

#### **Background**

1. At the 2009 Second Review Conference, the Coordinating Committee was mandated “to review the operation of the intersessional work programme, with the Chair of the Coordinating Committee consulting widely on this matter and presenting a report and, if necessary, recommendations to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties” (10MSP).
2. In its report to the 10MSP, the Coordinating Committee “noted that it has become increasingly challenging for States Parties to fulfil responsibilities related to being a Co-chair/Co-rapporteur (given the increased volume and complexity of work) and increasingly difficult to identify a geographically representative group to take on all roles (given an increase in demands for States to take on tasks related to conventional weapons)”.
3. The report further noted that “moving to a leadership team of two States Parties for each Standing Committee, rather than four, would be an effective means to rationalise the numbers of States in leadership positions” and that “a structure could be devised that maintained the coherence and continuity of the leadership team”.
4. In response to the report of the Coordinating Committee, the 10MSP “agreed to examine the possibility of rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, requested that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Co-chairs/Co-rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties” (11MSP).

#### **Considerations:**

5. At its meetings in the first trimester of 2011, the Coordinating Committee considered ways and means of “rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees”, particularly with a view to arriving at a situation wherein there would be “a leadership team of two States Parties for each Standing Committee, rather than four”. The Coordinating Committee also considered that “to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties” meant that, in part, it was essential that any new configuration would continue to ensure continuity and geographic representation.
6. At present, there are four Standing Committees that have a leadership team of four States Parties per Standing Committee and one Standing Committee that is led by one State Party (i.e., the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, which the 10MSP agreed would be presided over by the President in 2011).
7. While the ultimate goal may be a leadership team of two States Parties per Standing Committee, it may be practical to consider that achieving this goal could be reached in two stages, at least for those four Standing Committees which currently have a leadership team of four States Parties. That is, these leadership teams each include two States Parties which, by the time of the 11MSP, will have served for only one year (as Co-rapporteurs) and which represent continuity on their Standing Committees. These Co-rapporteurs elected at the 10MSP, in keeping with past practice, could be elected as Co-chairs at the 11MSP.

However, to move one step toward a leadership time of two, at the 11MSP only one additional State Party would be elected to join the leadership team of each of these four Standing Committees as Co-rapporteurs.

8. As concerns the one Standing Committee that is led by one State Party (i.e., the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance), to ensure continuity the State Party that currently chairs this Standing Committee alone could be elected at the 11MSP to a second one year term (which would be consistent with the existing practice of Standing Committee leaders serving for two years). In addition at the 11MSP, an additional Co-Chair of this Standing Committee could be elected for a two year term.

9. At the 12MSP, all five Standing Committees could see be regularised as being led by two States Parties. “Co-rapporteurs” would no longer be elected. Rather, both States Parties in leadership positions would be equals – as “Co-chairs”. To ensure continuity, each would serve overlapping terms.

	<i>Current situation</i>	<i>Proposed 11MSP Decision</i>	<i>Proposed 12MSP Decision</i>
General Status	Co-chairs: Canada and Thailand Co-rapporteurs: Norway and Peru	Co-chairs: Norway and Peru Co-rapporteur: State A	Co-chair: State A Co-chair: State F
Stockpile Destruction	Co-chairs: Lithuania and the Philippines Co-rapporteurs: Germany and Romania	Co-chairs: Germany and Romania Co-rapporteur: State B	Co-chair: State B Co-chair: State G
Mine Clearance	Co-chairs: Colombia and Switzerland Co-rapporteurs: Indonesia and Zambia	Co-chairs: Indonesia and Zambia Co-rapporteur: State C	Co-chair: State C Co-chair: State H
Victim Assistance	Co-chairs: Australia and Uganda Co-rapporteurs: Algeria and Croatia	Co-chairs: Algeria and Croatia Co-rapporteurs: State D	Co-chair: State D Co-chair: State I
Resources, Cooperation and Assistance	Chair: Presidency (Albania)	Co-chair: Albania Co-chair: State E	Co-chair: State E Co-chair: State J

## Annex IV

### **Report on the activities, functioning and finances of the Implementation Support Unit and preliminary 2011 financial report**

#### **Background**

1. At the 10MSP, the States Parties agreed to and adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU” in which it is stated that the ISU shall “report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference, and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate.” The “Directive” further states that “an audited annual financial report” for the previous year and “preliminary annual financial report” for the present year shall be submitted by the ISU to the Coordinating Committee and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval.
2. The 2011 work plan and budget for the ISU were prepared by the ISU and endorsed by the Coordinating Committee prior to the decisions taken by the 2010 that see that subsequent annual work plans and budgets are to be endorsed by the Coordinating Committee and adopted by Meetings of the States Parties / Review Conferences. Nevertheless, the objectives and activities, contained within the 2011 work plan are entirely consistent with the mandate agreed to later at the 10MSP.

#### **Report**

3. Regarding the mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including (...) the Coordinating Committee”, the ISU organized a day-long retreat for the Coordinating Committee in February and supported five subsequent meetings of the Coordinating Committee in 2011.<sup>62</sup>
4. Regarding the mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from (...) the Article 5 Extension Request Analysing Group”, the ISU in 2011 provided support to the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests. This involved organising a one-day training for the analysing group to increase the capacity of the individuals involved to carry out their tasks.<sup>63</sup> In addition, the ISU supported the pre-analysis efforts of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, assisted in organizing meetings of the analysing group as a whole, obtained working translations of requests, acquired expertise as requested, served as a liaison between requesting States and the analysing group, transmitted communications between requesting States Parties and the President and analysing group, and made requests available on the Convention’s website.
5. With respect to the mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from (...) Meetings of the States Parties”, a significant effort was undertaken throughout 2011 in support of Cambodia as it prepared to host and preside over the 11MSP. The ISU hosted Cambodian delegations in March, May, September and November in Geneva for detailed discussions on preparations. In April, the ISU carried out a mission to Siem Reap to continue these discussions and to support a national preparatory event. In August the ISU

---

<sup>62</sup> Costs associated with a retreat for the Coordinating Committee were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

<sup>63</sup> Costs associated with the training session for the Article 5 analysis group were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

carried out a joint planning mission to Phnom Penh with the United Nations Officer for Disarmament Affairs. (It should be noted that none of the ISU's support consistent with its mandate to "prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties (...)" duplicates any responsibilities which, by tradition, are executed by the UNODA.)

6. In September the ISU participated in a regional seminar in Phnom Penh that was intended to build interest in the Convention in advance of the 11MSP and co-organized a press seminar in Phnom Penh. In addition, the ISU provided ongoing advice on communications aspects related to the 11MSP, maintained the website [www.11msp.org](http://www.11msp.org) and, on 18 November, briefed the Geneva-based press gallery on the 11MSP.

7. With respect to the mandate to "provide substantive and other support to the President, President-Designate Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings", the ISU assisted the Co-Chairs in dozens of small group meetings to help them in elaborating strategies for the year and in preparing the Intersessional Work Programme, in supporting their preparations for the 20-24 June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and in providing substantive and other support at these meetings.

8. The ISU's support to the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance included organising a one day seminar in March for representatives of national authorities of States Parties implementing Article 5.<sup>64</sup>

9. The ISU, on behalf of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, again organised parallel programmes for victim assistance experts for the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP.<sup>65</sup>

10. The ISU provided support in particular to the President, who also serves as the Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources Cooperation and Assistance, in assisting in organising an international symposium on cooperation and assistance as concerns victim assistance, which took place in Tirana from 30 May to 1 June.<sup>66</sup>

11. In support of the Presidency, the ISU Director accompanied the 10MSP President to Vienna for a presentation by the President to the 650th plenary meeting of the OSCE's Forum for Security and Cooperation. In addition, the ISU Director supported the President at meetings with OSCE Permanent Representatives and called upon the head of disarmament of the Austrian Foreign Ministry.

12. While it certainly is within the mandate that the ISU shall "prepare, support and carry-out follow-up activities" from formal meetings of the Convention, it was not foreseen that the ISU would be called upon as extensively as it has been to provide information in support of the processes related to a new ISU agreement and ISU funding models, to make arrangements for meetings, to cover the costs of these meetings, to provide a venue for and assist in organizing President's consultations, to distribute documents to the States Parties and to acquire translations of the ISU agreement. This was a drain on the ISU's resources in 2011 and at times created challenges as concerns being able to remain focused on supporting the core work of the Convention.

13. With respect to the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention" as well as the Seventh Meeting of

<sup>64</sup> Costs for the Article 5 seminar were covered through enhanced funding provided by Switzerland.

<sup>65</sup> Costs for interpretation and both parallel programmes and organisational costs associated with the 11MSP parallel programme were covered through enhanced funding provided by Australia.

<sup>66</sup> Costs for the cooperation and assistance symposium, including the ISU's participation, were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

the States Parties' agreement "that requesting States Parties are encouraged, as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their (Article 5) requests," the ISU made its services widely known to the States Parties with pending Article 5 deadlines, with a view to supporting high quality requests being submitted by 31 March 2012. As noted in the final documents agreed to by the States Parties, the ISU has pioneered a methodology for assisting States Parties in preparing Article 5 extension requests. This involves taking steps to ensure that approximately one year before the date when a submission is expected work begins on it. Subject to the needs and desires of individual State Parties, this may involve advising authorities in capital.

14. The ISU's 2011 work plan states that the ISU will carry out approximately 10 advisory visits in response to requests by States Parties wishing to achieve greater clarity in understanding their Article 5 obligations, to advance preparations of a request for an extension, or, to achieve and declare completion. In 2011, the ISU carried out missions to Chile, Angola (twice, with one of these mission to the USA to support a workshop to assist Angola's expert) and Afghanistan to advise national authorities on the preparation of Article 5 extension requests. In addition, the ISU carried out a mission to Nigeria to advise Nigeria on understanding and declaring completion of Article 5 obligations.<sup>67</sup>

15. Consistent with the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention" and a core activity of the ISU going back to 2005, as noted in the final documents of the Second Review Conference, the ISU continued to provide advice and technical support to States Parties on applying the victim assistance understandings agreed to by the States Parties at the First and Second Review Conferences. In doing so, the ISU continued to respond to individual States Parties needs and acted, as is noted in the agreed mandate, to "carry out follow-up activities" from formal meetings under the Convention.

16. With the position of victim assistance specialist remaining unstaffed, the ISU had to scale back victim assistance advisory activities but continued to provide support in this area to the extent possible. The amount of time allocated to victim assistance support by the Implementation Support Officer was increased in 2011. In addition, the ISU made use of consultancies.

17. The ISU carried out a mission to Burundi in response to a request made by Burundi to support an inter-ministerial effort to develop a national action plan on disability that incorporates an appropriate response to needs of landmine survivors.<sup>68</sup> The ISU carried out a mission to Iraq to support a national workshop on victim assistance in the context of disarmament, disability and development.<sup>69</sup> The ISU carried out two missions to Cambodia to assist Cambodian authorities in assessing the implementation of Cambodia's 2009-2011 National Plan of Action on disability, and, in supporting Cambodian authorities in acquiring input on a subsequent national plan. In addition, the ISU carried out a mission to Afghanistan to support Afghan authorities in developing tools for reporting on disability activities in Afghanistan.

18. Also consistent with the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention", the ISU provided advice to one State Party regarding next steps it could take regarding its discovery of a small number of PFM-1 type stockpiled anti-personnel mines. In addition, the ISU supported many States Parties in preparing transparency reports, assisted States Parties and others in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes and responded to hundreds of

---

<sup>67</sup> Nigeria assisted in off-setting costs related to the ISU mission to Nigeria.

<sup>68</sup> Costs for the ISU's mission to Burundi were covered by enhanced funding provided by Australia.

<sup>69</sup> The UNDP assisted in off-setting costs related to the ISU mission to Iraq.

miscellaneous requests for advice, information and support regarding a wide range of matters concerning the Convention.

19. Regarding the mandate to “provide advice and technical support to States Parties (...) on universalization”, the ISU supported the activities of the President, President-Designate, the President’s Special Envoy on the Universalization of the Convention and individual States Parties with their universalization efforts. The ISU has also provided information to States not parties, both to inform their accession processes and to assist in their participation in the work of the Convention.

20. The ISU supported the 10MSP President in organizing, in Tirana, a strategy session for universalization partners. The ISU Director accompanied the Special Envoy on universalization missions to the Republic of Korea, Tuvalu and Tonga. The mission to Tuvalu also featured engagements of heads of missions of States not parties and universalization partners in Suva, Fiji. The ISU accompanied the 11MSP President-Designate on high-level universalization missions to Vietnam and Singapore in October. The ISU carried out preparations for planned universalization missions by the Special Envoy to Nepal and by the 10MSP President-Designate to Morocco. Both missions were cancelled when confirmations regarding meeting programmes and other details were not provided in a timely manner.

21. With respect to the mandate to “provide advice and technical support to States Parties (...), including on the Sponsorship Programme,” the ISU twice provided a proposed strategic plan to the Sponsorship Programme Donors’ Group – in advance of the Intersessional Work Programme and the 11MSP – and implemented, in concert with the GICHD’s conference manager, the strategic direction on sponsorship adopted by the Donors’ Group. The ISU also prepared project documents for and fulfilled the reporting requirements of Donors’ Group members.

22. The ISU is mandated to “facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public.” Furthermore, the ISU is mandated to “keep records of formal and informal meetings under the Convention, and communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from such meetings to States Parties and other stakeholders.” The ISU’s 2011 work plan notes that in any particular year, personnel from the ISU may be called upon 10 to 25 times to lead seminars and provide training on understanding the Convention and its operations.

23. The ISU participated in seminars for Geneva-based diplomats which were organized by the Geneva Forum (once) and the GICHD (twice). In addition, the ISU delivered presentations at training sessions organised on by the GICHD on mine action contracting (twice). The ISU served as an expert resource at a NATO Partnership for Peace training courses in April and November. In May, the ISU served in an expert capacity at a regional workshop organised by Handicap International in Tajikistan.<sup>70</sup> Also in May, the ISU was invited to a regional workshop hosted by Regional Arms Control Verification and Implementation Assistance Centre (RACVIAC) in Croatia to share lessons learned from the Convention on victim assistance for possible applicability for the Convention on Cluster Munitions.<sup>71</sup> In August, the ISU was called upon to again lead a seminar at the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme. In September, the ISU was called upon to again lead seminars (on victim assistance and Article 5 implementation) at the senior management training course organized by Jordan’s National Committee for Demining and

---

<sup>70</sup> Costs for the ISU’s participation in the Tajikistan workshop were covered by Handicap International.

<sup>71</sup> Costs for the ISU’s participation in the RACVIAC workshop were covered by RACVIAC.

Rehabilitation.<sup>72</sup> In October, the ISU participated in a meeting in Denmark to provide input on a draft evaluation report on the UN's International Mine Action Standards.

24. Also as concerns the mandate to “facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public,” the ISU issued press releases on behalf of the 10MSP President and 11MSP President-Designate, continued to maintain and enhance the Convention's website, and made itself available to student groups and others that wish to learn about the Convention and its implementation processes. The ISU hosted visits by five groups of university students in 2011.

25. The ISU's ability to disseminate information and knowledge on victim assistance was enhanced through the development of the publication entitled *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development*.<sup>73</sup> In addition, the ISU's advisory work on Article 5 implementation continued to benefit from the publication entitled *Understanding mine clearance in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention*.<sup>74</sup> As well, the ISU produced background publications for the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP.

26. The ISU's 2011 work plan indicates that the ISU will continue to maintain the Convention's Documentation Centre, receiving and making available up to 1,000 new documents in 2011 related to the implementation process. Thanks to the support of highly skilled interns, the Documentation Centre has been well maintained and brought up to date with statements delivered in June 2011 and with hard copies of transparency reports submitted in 2011.

27. The ISU continued to communicate through social media, including by continuing to maintain the Convention's presence on Facebook, Flickr and Twitter.

28. Also as concerns communications, the ISU sought to respond to the Task Force recommendation which states that “in order to reinforce the identity and visibility of the Convention, the ISU will be identified through a distinct profile that emphasizes its role as supporting entity for the Convention”. The ISU did so initially by acquiring a distinct email address and business card for ISU staff. The ISU hopes to proceed with a comprehensive approach to ISU design, taking into account the approximately 20 communications products that may be produced by the ISU. In this regard, discussions with the GICHD Director and the Coordinating Committee on next steps are ongoing.

29. As concerns the mandate to “liaise and coordinate, as appropriate, with relevant international organizations that participate in the work of the Convention”, the ISU both sought to maintain good collaboration with the ICBL, ICRC and elements of the United Nations system that normally participate in the work of the Convention as well as to deepen relations with other organizations. In 2011, for instance, the ISU sought to ensure that NGOs with a disability focus – such as the International Disability Alliance and International Disability and Development Consortium – and international organizations such the United Nations Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace

---

<sup>72</sup> Costs for the ISU's participation in the management training course in Jordan were covered by Jordan's National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation.

<sup>73</sup> The publication *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development* was made possible in 2011 through enhanced funding provided by Australia.

<sup>74</sup> The publication *Understanding mine clearance in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention* had previously been produced through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

know that their mandates and missions, and, the understandings on victim assistance adopted by the States Parties, coincide. This ISU was pleased that efforts to liaise with such organisations in 2011 paid off in terms of these organizations' contributions to the Convention.

### Finances

30. The ISU's 2011 work plan, not including the costs associated with returning to full staffing, was projected to cost CHF 1,050,000. If the ISU were to return to previous staffing levels (i.e., by restaffing the position of victim assistance specialist), an additional CHF 150,000 would be required, bringing this total up to CHF 1.2 million. The ISU started 2011 with a carry-over from 2010 totalling CHF 141,944.

31. On 7 January 2011, the 10MSP President wrote to all States Parties to recall that "it remains (the States Parties') collective responsibility in 2011 to fund the ISU's core work plan through the existing funding model" and appealed to all States Parties to contribute to the ISU. On 8 July 2011, the 10MSP again wrote to all State Parties to "appeal to each State Party to consider providing a voluntary contribution to the ISU in order that the burden of financing this important implementation mechanism is shared as widely as possible." In addition to the efforts of the 10MSP President to remind States Parties of their responsibility to fund the ISU, in 2011, given the deliberations of the open-ended working group on ISU finances, there was an unprecedented level of awareness of the ISU's financial situation and existing funding model.

32. The ISU began the year with a carry-over from 2010 totalling CHF 141,944. As of 25 November, the following States Parties contributed to the ISU core work plan: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, Malaysia, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey. Together these States Parties have contributed CHF 527,663. In addition, agreements are in place with or firm commitments have been made by Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Ireland and Italy which should result in a total of approximately CHF 258,250 flowing to the ISU. Some other States Parties have indicated that they still may be in a position to contribute to the ISU in 2011 but not firm commitments have been made. As well, as of 21 November, miscellaneous income totalled CHF 24,920 (largely due to insurance reimbursement).

33. On 6 September 2011, the Director of the ISU reminded the Coordinating Committee that the ISU's work plan projected expenditures in 2011 totalling CHF 1.05 million and that restaffing the position of victim assistance specialist would bring this total to CHF 1.20 million. The Director noted that fully funding the work plan and restaffing would mean that approximately CHF 490,000 would still be required between 6 September 2011 and the end of the year. The Director noted that, for the following reasons, it would be prudent to take some initial steps to see that total 2011 costs expenditures would be below not only CHF 1.20 million, but also below CHF 1.05 million:

(a) Some of the States Parties with the greatest means had not as of 6 September 2011 provided support to the ISU despite the increased awareness in 2011 of all matters concerning ISU financing and the expressed preference of these States Parties to maintain a voluntary funding model.

(b) Some States Parties, which in the recent past have contributed to the ISU, had not done so. The contributions from some of these States Parties would normally be crucial to the ISU in funding its annual work plans.

(c) Most of the ISU's costs are in Swiss francs. However, some of the contributions received in 2011, once converted into Swiss francs, were much less in 2011



than they had been in recent years even though the amounts contributed were relatively constant in the contributing States' own currencies.

34. The ISU Director indicated to the Coordinating Committee on 6 September that he anticipated making savings in the following areas:

(a) The Director noted that it is clear that restaffing the position of "victim assistance specialist", which carries an annual cost of approximately CHF 150,000, would not be possible in 2011.

(b) The Director reported that the Implementation Support Specialist, who was on maternity leave for four months in 2011, was not replaced for the entirety of her leave. The Director noted that a key implication of this was significant delays in producing draft Article 5 analyses and the draft Phnom Penh Progress Report and that another implication is that the ISU has been at times without a native French-speaking professional officer.

(c) The Director reported that with the return of the Implementation Support Specialist in October 2011, this position would be converted from 80 percent of full-time to 60 percent of full-time. The Director noted that the implication of this would be that other ways will have to be found for picking up some duties normally carried out by the Implementation Support Specialist.

(d) The Director reported that staff travel expenses for the purpose of providing individual States Parties with support and advice on Article 5 implementation would total only about 40 percent of projected costs.

35. As of 21 November 2011, accounted expenses totalled CHF 852,673. It is forecast that total expenses for 2011 will be approximately CHF 950,000 to CHF 975,000.

36. On 6 September 2011, the ISU presented to the Coordinating Committee the auditor's statement on the ISU's 2010 finances.

37. The ISU's 2011 work plan notes that, in keeping with past practice, the ISU is able to execute other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, if additional funds are made available to fully fund these efforts (including funding any additional human resource costs). As noted in this report, enhanced funding was provided in 2011 by the following States Parties for the following purposes:

(a) With enhanced funding provided by Switzerland, the ISU organised a workshop in March for representatives of national authorities of States Parties implementing Article 5.

(b) With enhanced funding provided by Norway, the ISU supported the enhanced efforts of the 10MSP President, which included the February Coordinating Committee retreat, the March training session for the Article 5 analysing group, the 30 May–1 June 2011 cooperation and assistance symposium in Tirana, and the universalization efforts of the 10MSP President and his Special Envoy.

(c) With enhanced funding provided by Australia, the ISU carried out a victim assistance advisory mission to Burundi, produced and launched the publication *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development*, organised parallel programmes at the June meetings of the Standing Committees and at the 11MSP, and organised an inclusive-development-focused side event at the 11MSP. In addition, Australia continued to provide enhanced funding to support universalization and implementation in the Pacific.

38. The ISU carried out missions twice to Brussels to engage the European Union on the implementation of a proposed EU Council Decision in support of the Convention. It was noted that an EU Council Decision was a great opportunity for the ISU to do more of what

it is mandated to do. On 3 November, the ISU Director presented to the Coordinating Committee a draft implementation plan for such a Council Decision, which would foresee that enhanced support would be provided for the pursuit of various aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Coordinating Committee expressed general appreciation for the commitment of the EU to proceed with a Council Decision and to provide the funding necessary to the ISU to implement this decision. In addition, it was noted that the ISU was sensitive to the fact that while this is an opportunity for the ISU to take on additional activity, it must not be a drain on existing ISU priorities and that any additional human resource need would need to be funded by the EU.

39. The 10MSP mandated the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. On 6 September 2011, the President and the Director of the GICHD signed a new agreement. According to this agreement, the GICHD will continue to provide infrastructure, administrative and other support for the operations of the ISU. In addition, the GICHD will continue to support the organisation of the Intersessional Work Programme and the administration of the Sponsorship Programme. GICHD support to the ISU, to the Intersessional Work Programme and to the Sponsorship Programme includes human resources management, financial management, internal information management, office space and general logistics, information and communication services, travel services, conference management, sponsorship administration, publications support and website management. These support services are funded by Switzerland's core contribution to the GICHD.

**Financing of the ISU's 2011 work plan  
(As of 25 November 2011)**

<b>Contributions received 2011</b>	
Albania	CHF1,736
Algeria	CHF3,876
Argentina	CHF5,013
Australia	CHF145,730
Austria	CHF18,245
Cyprus	CHF3,200
Denmark	CHF50,374
Estonia	CHF1,263
Germany	CHF16,946
Indonesia	CHF1,700
Iraq	CHF3,904
Malaysia	CHF833
Mozambique	CHF4,920
Netherlands	CHF12,901
Norway	CHF166,583
Qatar	CHF3,213
Slovenia	CHF11,716
Switzerland	CHF70,000
Thailand	CHF2,000
Turkey	CHF3,510
Subtotal contributions received 2011 as of 25 November	<b>CHF527,663</b>
<b>Contributions expected in 2011 (based on estimated exchange rates)</b>	
Belgium	CHF64,700
Cambodia	CHF2,750
Canada	CHF95,000
Croatia	CHF11,600
Ireland	CHF24,700
Italy	CHF59,500
Subtotal contributions expected 2011 as of 25 November	<b>CHF258,250</b>
<b>Miscellaneous income</b>	
Subtotal miscellaneous income as of 21 November	<b>CHF24,920</b>
<b>Carry-over</b>	
Subtotal carry-over from 2010	<b>CHF141,944</b>
<b>Total revenue as of 25 November</b>	<b>CHF927,857</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
Salaries and social costs	CHF 682,183
Staff travel	CHF 83,438
Consultancy fees and travel	CHF 48,998
Translations	CHF 16,020
Publications	CHF 10,508
Meetings rooms and catering	CHF 7,868
Miscellaneous	CHF 3,658
<b>Total expenses accounted for as of 21 November</b>	<b>CHF 852,673</b>

## Annex V

### Implementation Support Unit 2012 work plan and budget

#### Background

1. At the 2010 Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10MSP), the States Parties agreed that the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) will “propose and present a work plan and a budget for the activities of the ISU for the following year to the Coordinating Committee for endorsement and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval.”

2. Also at the 10MSP, the States Parties adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU”, within which is contained the “mandate” of the ISU. This mandate states that the “the ISU shall, in support of the States Parties:

(a) Prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties, Review Conferences, Amendment Conferences, intersessional meetings, Standing Committees, the Coordinating Committee and the Article 5 Extension Request Analysing Group.

(b) Provide substantive and other support to the President, President-Designate, Co-chairs and Co-rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings.

(c) Provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation and universalization, including on the Sponsorship Programme, of the Convention.

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

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

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

#### Financial context

3. In accordance with the decisions of the 10MSP, the ISU has prepared, for endorsement by the Coordinating Committee and approval by the 11MSP, a work plan that covers each point in the agreed mandate. In establishing a budget for this work plan, the ISU has given due regard for the need to reduce costs and the desire of States Parties that the ISU place a relatively higher priority on certain aspects of its mandate.

4. The “ISU Task Force Final Report and Recommendations”, which were adopted by the 10MSP, indicated “the need to establish (an ISU funding) model that is sustainable and predictable.” Discussions in 2011 on developing such a model have not evolved to the point where the ISU could plan for 2012 on the basis of anything other than the continuation of the existing voluntary funding method. Hence, planning for 2012 is based in large part on the recent experience in the application of this model.

5. The recent application of the voluntary funding model is characterised by some key factors that point to the need to reduce costs in 2012: First, while the number of small contributors has increased dramatically in 2011, there has been no increase in the number of

States Parties with relatively greater means that have contributed to the ISU. Second, some States Parties that have been regular contributors to the ISU have not, as of the end of October 2011, provided contributions to the ISU. Third, the relative strength of the Swiss franc has meant that contributions from major regular contributors, while constant in their home currencies, have resulted in reduced funding in real terms having been made available to the ISU in 2011 relative to previous years.

6. On the basis of the need to reduce costs, the ISU has prepared a budget for 2012 which is approximately 12 percent below the level of the budgeted expenditures in 2011 (i.e., CHF 1.05 million in 2011 versus CHF 925,000 in 2012). Savings will be achieved in the following areas. In some instances, there are implications associated with these savings.

(a) The regular staff complement will be reduced from 4.3 full time equivalent staff members in 2011 to 4.1 full time equivalent staff members in 2012. This will be realised through the position of “Implementation Support Specialist” dropping from 80 percent of full time to 60 percent of full time (due to mutual agreement). The implications of this are as follows:

(i) The maintenance and enhancement of the Convention’s documentation centre has been eliminated from the job package of the “Implementation Support Specialist”. The ISU will attempt to fill in to a degree by assigning various tasks to interns, although there no doubt will be a reduction in quality and speed.

(ii) The 2010 ISU evaluation report noted that “(while) modern communications mean that the need for (the ISU Director) to delegate (his or her) responsibilities during (his or her) absences on business or leave is negligible, (...) the absence of a groomed understudy to deputise for (him or her) is seen by some as a risk to the continued smooth operation of the Convention.” In response to this, the Implementation Support Specialist had been increasingly called upon to serve in the Director’s place. The scope for doing so will now be diminished.

(iii) The ISU has prided itself on having in place professional officers who could serve the States Parties in English, French and Spanish. The Implementation Support Specialist is the ISU’s chief interlocutor with French-speaking States Parties, which has been a particularly important role in recent years given the large number of French-speaking States Parties implementing Article 5. There will now be a reduction in the capacity to serve States Parties in French.

(b) A Meeting of the States Parties (MSP) that takes place outside of Geneva typically will cost the ISU more than a MSP in Geneva. As the 12MSP will take place in Geneva in 2012, savings will be made relative to MSP support costs in 2011. (It should be noted that none of the ISU’s support consistent with its mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties (...)” duplicates any responsibilities which, by tradition, are executed by the UNODA.)

(c) The ISU has resorted to drawing upon the services of interns and temporary staff, particularly during peak periods of activity. While there is a relatively small cost associated with this relative to the value added, the ISU in 2012 will reduce the amount of funds invested in temporary staff and interns.

(d) For the past several years, the ISU has sought to communicate about the Convention in a professional manner, including through high quality publications. In 2012, unless additional funding is made available, the ISU will refrain from producing professional background publications in support of the intersessional work programme and the 12MSP.

(e) The ISU will reduce, by approximately 20 percent, costs attributed to acquiring external expertise to assist in responding to requests for advice and technical support on the implementation of the victim assistance provisions of the Convention. The implication would be a further reduction in the capacity of the ISU to respond to such requests.

#### Priority setting

7. The ISU understands that some States Parties consider that, in a time of financial stress, the ISU should place a relatively greater priority on functions that concern support for the Convention's implementation machinery and office holders. Accordingly, over 75 percent of the value of the ISU's staff time in 2012 will be allocated to aspects of its mandate other than providing advice and technical support to individual States Parties on the implementation of the Convention.

8. While over 75 percent of the value of the ISU's staff time in 2012 will be allocated to aspects of its mandate other than providing advice and technical support to individual States Parties on the implementation of the Convention, the ISU expects to continue to receive numerous requests from States Parties for such support, particularly as concerns the mine clearance and victim assistance provisions of the Convention. In addition, the ISU has regularly received significant financial support that is earmarked for providing victim assistance advisory services, perhaps in recognition of the niche expertise developed by the ISU in advising States Parties on applying, in their national contexts, the victim assistance understandings they have agreed to. As well, the ISU is conscious that the 2006 Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP) agreed that Article 5 requesting States Parties "are encouraged, as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their requests."

9. Notwithstanding the ISU continuing to support the Presidency and the Universalization Contact Group Coordinator on matters that concern universalization, the ISU will prioritise support to implementation over support for universalization, particularly when it comes to the use of funds allocated for staff travel.

#### Activities

10. **The ISU in 2012 will "prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties, Review Conferences, Amendment Conferences, intersessional meetings, Standing Committees, the Coordinating Committee and the Article 5 Extension Request Analysing Group"**, allocating approximately 36 percent of the value of its staff resources and 32 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) The ISU will prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities associated with approximately six meetings of the Coordinating Committee. While there is typically widespread appreciation for the day-long Coordinating Committee retreats organised by the ISU in the first quarter of each year, these normally are made possible through enhanced funding provided to the ISU. Unless such enhanced funding is provided, a retreat cannot take place. In addition as concerns the Coordinating Committee, the ISU will advise on scheduling meetings in such a way that costs could be minimised.

(b) The ISU will prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities associated with approximately six to ten meetings of the group of States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests. In 2012, the ISU is budgeting on the assumption that there will be little to no requirement for the acquisition of working translations of requests. In addition, no amount has been budgeted for any costs associated with possible requests to

acquire for and at the request of the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs “expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice.”

(c) The ISU will provide the support traditionally expected of it in preparing, supporting and carrying out follow-up activities associated with the May 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees and the December 2012 Twelfth Meeting of the State Parties (12MSP).<sup>75</sup>

(d) The ISU, as it has done since 2006, will make itself available to the Co-chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance to organise “victim assistance parallel programmes”. Doing so, however, will only be possible if enhanced funding is made available for any direct costs, mainly for interpretation.

**11. The ISU in 2012 will “provide substantive and other support to the President, President-designate, Co-chairs and Co-rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings”,** allocating approximately 19 percent of the value of its staff resources and 17 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) In keeping with past practice, substantive and other support to the President, President-designate and Co-chairs will be the aspect of the ISU’s work that continues to consume the greatest amount of staff resources. The ISU will support the Co-chairs in developing strategic plans for their 2012 terms, including by assisting in the preparation of the May 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees.

(b) The ISU will support the 11MSP President in his efforts to carry out any responsibilities that flow from the 11MSP and in pursuing his priorities. In addition, the ISU will support the 12MSP President-designate in the substantive preparations for the 12MSP in providing “other support” as requested. The ISU will make itself available to prospective 13MSP presidencies/hosts in order that the States Parties concerned are well aware of their prospective responsibilities and opportunities.

(c) In 2011, an unforeseen significant drain on ISU staff time (as well as a direct cost at times) was related to the ISU’s support to the President’s efforts on the ISU agreement and ISU funding model. Should the ISU funding model discussions continue in 2012, there would be costs associated with this.

**12. The ISU in 2012 will “provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation and universalization, including on the Sponsorship Programme, of the Convention”,** allocating approximately 23 percent of the value of staff resources and 29 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) In keeping with the 7MSP decisions, the ISU will continue to provide assistance to States Parties in the preparation of their Article 5 mine clearance extension requests. In the first quarter of 2012, three States Parties will need to submit requests and a fourth may need to submit a request. In addition, in 2012 four States Parties may need to commence work on extension requests in order that they are ready to be submitted in early 2013. As well, five States Parties in 2012 may wish to benefit from the ISU’s advice on reporting completion of Article 5.

(b) While the demand for ISU support for advice and technical support on the implementation of Article 5 may be great, the need to reduce costs and the desire of some States Parties to prioritise other matters means that fewer resources have been allocated to carry out Article 5 advisory missions.

---

<sup>75</sup> Dates subject to confirmation by the 12MSP.

(c) In keeping with the clear and unequivocal message of the States Parties at the Cartagena Summit of their reaffirmation of the “fundamental goal” of “promoting and protecting the human rights of mine survivors, and addressing the needs of mine victims, including survivors, their affected families and communities”, in 2012, the ISU will continue to take seriously the emphasis that the State Parties have placed on victim assistance, although planning to do so with fewer resources while standing ready to return to normal levels of support should additional resources be made available. The ISU will aim to follow up on past investments with a view to assisting States Parties in producing tangible outcomes.

(d) The ISU expects, as has been the case in the past, to receive hundreds of inquiries from States Parties on a vast range of matters concerning the implementation of the Convention. The ISU will do its utmost to respond in a prompt manner and to be able to provide responses in English, French or Spanish. Diminished staff resources, however, may have some effect on the timeliness of responses.

(e) The ISU will continue to provide advice and support to the Presidency, the Universalisation Contact Group Coordinator and individual States Parties on universalisation. However, as noted, implementation will receive relatively greater priority than universalisation. In addition, any universalisation missions in support of the States Parties to be carried out by the ISU would require additional, enhanced funding.

(f) A proposed strategic plan for the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme will be developed twice – once in the lead up to the meetings of the Standing Committees and once in the lead up to the 12MSP. In addition, ongoing support will be provided to the Coordinator and the Donors’ Group as a whole.

**13. The ISU in 2012 will “facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public”,** allocating approximately 9 percent of the value of its staff resources and 8 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) Given the need to reduce costs, the ISU, in carrying out its mandate to “facilitate communication...regarding the Convention” will emphasise the use of means that imply little or no direct cost and a minimal amount of staff time. These include maximising the use of the Convention’s website (the support for which is provided on an in-kind basis by the GICHD) and social media.

(b) The ISU will continue to provide professional communications support to the 12MSP President-designate and to the 12MSP as a whole, albeit with no background publication envisaged and with reduced amounts budgeted for temporary staff.

(c) The ISU will continue, upon request, to lead seminars and provide training on understanding the Convention and its operations. As was the case in 2011, the ISU will seek, where possible, to recover costs from organisations that make requests for its services.

**14. The ISU in 2012 will “keep records of formal and informal meetings under the Convention, and communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from such meetings to States Parties and other stakeholders”,** allocating approximately 6 percent of the value of its staff resources and 5 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) The ISU will continue to maintain and enhance the Convention’s Documentation Centre, albeit by relying more on interns to provide the support necessary.

(b) The ISU will continue to communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from the Convention’s meetings, making use wherever possible of low cost but effective means of doing so.



(c) The ISU has not budgeted to further act on the recommendation adopted by the 10MSP that “in order to reinforce the identity and visibility of the Convention the ISU will be identified by a distinct profile that emphasizes its role as supporting entity for the Convention.” Should additional funding be made available, the ISU will seek guidance from the Coordinating Committee on ways to proceed.

15. **The ISU in 2012 will “liaise, and coordinate as appropriate, with relevant international organisations that participate in the work of the Convention, including the ICBL, the ICRC, the United Nations and the GICHD”**, allocating approximately 8 percent of the value of its staff resources and 8 percent of its budget to activities in this area.

(a) The ISU will continue its close collaboration with those organisations that historically have played a leading role in supporting the States Parties, namely relevant United Nations departments, agencies and services, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and its member organisations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the GICHD.

(b) The ISU will continue to seek to deepen collaboration with actors that are central to disability issues (and hence should be central to the States Parties’ work on victim assistance), including the World Health Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and non-governmental organisations that have competence in the area of disability rights.

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

16. In keeping with past practice, the ISU is able to execute other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, if additional funds are made available to fully fund these efforts (including funding any additional human resource costs).

17. The ISU is in the process of finalising an agreement with the European Union regarding the ISU implementing a “Council Decision” in support of the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The EU has indicated that the ISU would be designated as the “technical implementer” of such an initiative as was the case with respect to the 2008-2010 EU Joint Action in support of the Convention. The ISU intends to seek guidance from and work in close collaboration with the Coordinating Committee on this matter.

#### **GICHD support to the ISU**

18. Costs for basic infrastructure and services in support of the ISU (office space, information technology, telecommunications, postage, publications coordination, travel support, human resources management, accounting, audit and other administrative support, etc.) are not included in this budget. These costs are covered by the GICHD general budget, on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland, and were valued at approximately CHF 380,000 in 2011.

19. While costs associated with providing substantive support to the Presidency and Co-chairs in preparing the intersessional work programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs totalling CHF 150,000 related to facility, interpretation and organisational matters concerning the intersessional work programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland.

20. While costs associated with providing strategic direction to the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs related to the administration of the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland. The value of these costs was projected to be CHF 40,000 in 2011.

21. The GICHD can serve to advance funds to the ISU's operations in periods of cash flow problems. It would also be the last resort in the case of a deficit.

22. As noted in the 2010 evaluation report, a portion of ISU staff time is consumed in providing value-added to the GICHD (which is not discounted from the GICHD's extrapolation of costs associated with hosting the ISU).

### **Contingencies**

23. The budget assumes that States Parties will fulfil their commitment to provide the necessary resources to ensure the operations of the ISU. It is expected that the Coordinating Committee will monitor the ISU financial situation at least quarterly in 2012, receiving proposals from the ISU Director on taking contingency actions should insufficient funds be provided in 2012. It is understood that, given the gravity of potential decisions the Coordinating Committee may need to make, proposals for contingency actions would be received well before meeting when they would be discussed.

24. Should it be clear by 30 June 2012 that contributions or commitments made by that time will be insufficient to cover the majority of the costs of the ISU's 2012 core work plan, the Director of the ISU will propose options to the Coordinating Committee, all of which would result in a significant reduction in the services provided by the ISU. It should be noted that such an action, while perhaps necessary, would be inconsistent with key conclusions contained in 1 September 2010 ISU evaluation report, which noted that "no one actually proposed any reduction of the Unit" and that "a strong wish was evident amongst mine-affected Parties that the ISU should be expanded."

25. Should sufficient funds be provided in addition to those required to cover the costs of the ISU's 2012 core work plan, the ISU would first increase in-country Article 5 and victim assistance advisory services. The second priority for the ISU should additional funds be provided would be to revert to communicating about the Convention in a professional manner through the publications it has traditionally produced. Finally, if significant additional funds were made available, the ISU would seek to re-staff the position of victim assistance specialist to return to at least the level of State Party-specific advisory services that States Parties have grown used to in recent years.

### **Other matters**

26. The 2012 work plan and budget does not profile time and associated costs of mobilising resources and servicing the administrative requirements of some contributors. In order to assist in work planning for 2013, the ISU will endeavour in 2012 to track the amount of time associated with these tasks.

27. It should be noted that providing a constant level of service in 2013 relative to that projected for 2012 will mean that 2013 costs will be greater than 2012 projections largely due to the likelihood of the Thirteenth Meeting of the States Parties taking place outside of Geneva.

## ISU Core Work Plan and Budget

	Salaries + Social Costs	Staff Travel	Consultants' costs and travel	Publications printing + layout	Translations	Other costs	Totals
Prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties, Review Conferences, Amendment Conferences, intersessional meetings, Standing Committees, the Coordinating	CHF291,476	CHF2,500			CHF2,000	CHF1,000	CHF296,976
Provide substantive and other support to the President, President-Designate, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings.	CHF156,652	CHF2,500				CHF2,000	CHF161,152
Provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation and universalization, including on the Sponsorship Programme, of the Convention	CHF184,288	CHF30,000	CHF57,250			CHF2,000	CHF273,538
Facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public.	CHF69,878	CHF2,500		CHF5,000			CHF77,378
Keep records of formal and informal meetings under the Convention, and communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from such meetings to States Parties and other stakeholders.	CHF46,295					CHF1,000	CHF47,295
Liaise, and coordinate as appropriate, with relevant international organisations that participate in the work of the Convention, including the ICBL, the ICRC, the UN and the GICHD.	CHF65,998	CHF2,500				CHF1,000	CHF69,498
	CHF814,587	CHF40,000	CHF57,250	CHF5,000	CHF2,000	CHF7,000	CHF925,837

## Annex VI

### List of documents of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
APLC/MSP.11/2011/1	Provisional Agenda. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.11/2011/2	Provisional programme of work. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.11/2011/3	Rationalizing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees. Presented by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the Coordinating Committee
APLC/MSP.11/2011/4	Implementation Support Unit 2012 work plan and budget. Presented by the Director of the Implementation Support Unit and endorsed by the Coordinating Committee, 3 November 2011
APLC/MSP.11/2011/5	Report. Consideration of requests for extensions to Article 5 deadlines 2010-2011. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.11/2011/6	Estimated costs for the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines and on their destruction. Note by the Secretariat
APLC/MSP.11/2011/7	Report. Activities, functioning and finances of the Implementation Support Unit and preliminary 2011 financial report. Submitted by the Director of the Implementation Support Unit
APLC/MSP.11/2011/8	Final Report
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.1	Analysis of the request submitted by Algeria for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.2	Request for extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Chile.

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.3	Analysis of the request submitted by Chile for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.4	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.5	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Eritrea
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.6	Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #1 - introduction, universalization, stockpile destruction
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.7	Analysis of the request submitted by Eritrea for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.8	The Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #5 - other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims - (c) measures to ensure compliance; (d) implementation support
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.9	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Algeria
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.10	Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #3 - victim assistance

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.11	Analysis of the request submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.12	Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Phnom Penh Progress Report 2010-2011. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #4 - Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims - (a) cooperation and assistance, (b) transparency and the exchange of information
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.13 and Add.1	Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Phnom Penh Progress Report. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #6. Annexes
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.14	Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Phnom Penh Progress Report. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. Section #2 - mine clearance
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.15	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Congo
APLC/MSP.11/2011/WP.16 and Corr.1 [English only]	Observations of the request submitted by Congo under article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.11/2011/MISC.1 [English/French/Spanish only]	Provisional list of participants
APLC/MSP.11/2011/MISC.2 [English only]	Declaration of completion of the implementation of Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines and on their destruction. Submitted by Nigeria
APLC/MSP.11/2011/INF.1 [English/French/Spanish only]	List of participants

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Title</i>
APLC/MSP.11/2011/INF.2 [English only]	Final report and recommendations. Open ended working group on implementation support unit funding models. Presented by the President of the Tenth Meeting of States Parties to the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties in Phnom Penh, Cambodia
APLC/MSP.11/2011/L.1	Draft Final Report

---

---

# 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

5 April 2012

Original: English

---

Eleventh Meeting  
Phnom Penh, 28 November – 2 December 2011

## Final report

### Corrigendum

#### 1. Part I, chapter C, paragraph 12

For the existing text *substitute*

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

#### 2. Appendix I, first table

For column 3, the total *should read* 40,716

For column 4, the total *should read* 10,255,226

#### 3. Appendix I, second table

For column 3, the heading *should read* Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties as of 2 December 2011

For column 2, the figure *should read* 40,716

For column 3, the figure *should read* 44,535,121

#### 4. Annex IV, paragraphs 32 and 39

For the existing text *substitute*

32. The ISU began the year with a carry-over from 2010 totalling CHF 141,944. As of 29 November, the following States Parties contributed to the ISU core work plan: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cambodia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Malaysia, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey. Together these States Parties have contributed CHF 554,855. In addition, agreements are in place with or firm commitments have been made by



Belgium, Canada, Croatia and Italy which should result in a total of approximately CHF 230,800 flowing to the ISU. Some other States Parties have indicated that they still may be in a position to contribute to the ISU in 2011 but not firm commitments have been made. As well, as of 21 November, miscellaneous income totalled CHF 24,920 (largely due to insurance reimbursement).

39. The 10MSP mandated the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. On 6 September 2011, the President and the Director of the GICHD signed a new agreement. This agreement is intended to increase transparency in implementation support and to ensure direct accountability on the part of ISU to the States Parties. According to this agreement, the GICHD will continue to provide infrastructure, administrative and other support for the operations of the ISU. In addition, the GICHD will continue to support the organisation of the Intersessional Work Programme and the administration of the Sponsorship Programme. GICHD support to the ISU, to the Intersessional Work Programme and to the Sponsorship Programme includes human resources management, financial management, internal information management, office space and general logistics, information and communication services, travel services, conference management, sponsorship administration, publications support and website management. These support services are funded by Switzerland's core contribution to the GICHD.

**5. Annex IV, table**

Under the title, the date *should read* (as of 29 November 2011)

Replace the table with the table below

<b>Contributions received 2011</b>	
Albania	CHF1,736
Algeria	CHF3,876
Argentina	CHF5,013
Australia	CHF145,730
Austria	CHF18,245
Cambodia	CHF2,722
Cyprus	CHF3,200
Denmark	CHF50,374
Estonia	CHF1,263
Germany	CHF16,946
Indonesia	CHF1,700
Iraq	CHF3,904
Ireland	CHF24,470
Malaysia	CHF833
Mozambique	CHF4,920
Netherlands	CHF12,901
Norway	CHF166,583
Qatar	CHF3,213
Slovenia	CHF11,716
Switzerland	CHF70,000
Thailand	CHF2,000
Turkey	CHF3,510
Subtotal contributions received 2011 as of 29 November	<b>CHF554,855</b>
<b>Contributions expected in 2011 (based on estimated exchange rates)</b>	
Belgium	CHF64,700
Canada	CHF95,000
Croatia	CHF11,600
Italy	CHF59,500
Subtotal contributions expected 2011 as of 29 November	<b>CHF230,800</b>
<b>Miscellaneous income</b>	
Subtotal miscellaneous income as of 21 November	<b>CHF24,920</b>
<b>Carry-over</b>	
Subtotal carry-over from 2010	<b>CHF141,944</b>
<b>Total revenue as of 29 November</b>	<b>CHF927,599</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
Salaries and social costs	CHF 682,183
Staff travel	CHF 83,438
Consultancy fees and travel	CHF 48,998
Translations	CHF 16,020
Publications	CHF 10,508
Meetings rooms and catering	CHF 7,868
Miscellaneous	CHF 3,658
<b>Total expenses accounted for as of 21 November</b>	<b>CHF 852,673</b>

**6. Annex V, paragraphs 17, 18, 19 and 20**

For the existing text *substitute*

17. Subject to availability of additional funding, the 2012 ISU core work plan and budget may be enhanced and expanded in the following areas: (a) assistance to the States Parties to apply the victim assistance provisions of the Cartagena Action Plan, appraisal thereof and lesson-learning from experience; (b) support to national appraisals of States Parties' efforts in mine clearance as per the Cartagena Action Plan and lesson-learning there from; (c) support to universalisation activities, including a High Level Task Force on Universalization of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention; and, (d) Support to the use of electronic, visual and other modern media tools to disseminate the commitments made by the States Parties and the Cartagena Conference and to accessibility thereto for persons with disabilities. The ISU will ascertain that any such additional funding will fully cover additional human resources required. The ISU will report to, and update, the Coordinating Committee as well as the May 2012 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, on the adjustments that such additional funding may be called for to the core work plan set out in paragraphs 10 to 15 above.

**GICHD support to the ISU**

18. Costs for basic infrastructure and services in support of the ISU (office space, information technology, telecommunications, postage, publications coordination, travel support, human resources management, accounting, audit and other administrative support, etc.) are not included in this budget. These costs are covered by the GICHD general budget, on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland, and are valued at approximately CHF 225,000 in 2012. The general level of support provided in 2012 is intended to be consistent with the level previously provided. Differences in the estimated value of this support relative to recent years is a result of more precise monitoring by the GICHD of actual levels of support provided and a reduction of ISU demand in 2012 for GICHD for publications management.

19. While costs associated with providing substantive support to the Presidency and Co-Chairs in preparing the Intersessional Work Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs totalling CHF 165,000 related to facility, interpretation and organisational matters concerning the Intersessional Work Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland.

20. While costs associated with providing strategic direction to the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs related to the administration of the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland. The value of these costs is projected to be CHF 40,000 in 2012.