

**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**

27 September 2012

Original: English

---

**Twelfth Meeting**

**Geneva, 3-7 December 2012**

Item 10 of the provisional agenda

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

**Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan:  
The Geneva Progress Report 2011-2012**

**Submitted by the President-Designate of the Twelfth Meeting of the  
States Parties**

**Section #3**

**Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims**

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

**(a) Cooperation and assistance**

1. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, Albania and Thailand, recalled that the States Parties, for over two years, have discussed cooperation and assistance in general terms and that it would now be useful to move to exploring specific ideas in more detail in order to advance the cooperation and assistance agenda. Given this, the Co-Chairs structured an agenda for the May 2012 meeting of the Standing Committee which sought to address the following three concrete ideas: the possibility of developing an information exchange tool, or platform for partnerships; options of trust funds to ensure the continuity of resources; and, the availability of assistance and procedures to obtain it.

2. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance used a small-group format to provide an interactive forum for in-depth discussion on the possibility of developing an information exchange tool. With respect to this, it was recalled that at the 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, Thailand stated that, while financial assistance is very much needed and appreciated, other types of non-financial assistance – such as material, equipment, expertise, et cetera – are also essential, and that a tool to exchange information on these other types of assistance may be beneficial. To frame the discussion, the Co-Chairs asked participants to consider three questions: If an information exchange tool was to be established, what information should it contain? How should it be organized? What

experiences have actors had in accessing information about available funding, technical support, or other forms of cooperation and assistance for implementation? What are the gaps in information about available assistance?

3. In terms of perceived gaps in available information and suggestions for information to be contained in an information exchange tool, it was noted that all States Parties are potential contributors and therefore any information exchange tool should house information on the assistance that any State Party may be in a position to provide. Additional information on available financial assistance may be desirable, but a key aim of the information exchange tool should be to serve as a place where those with needs can search for the full range of possible assistance, including technical support and equipment. “Match-making” could be facilitated by the information tool containing national contact points. Information contained should facilitate “south-south” cooperation, including the availability of financial resources necessary to fuel such cooperation. While the pre-occupation with information on available resources appears to relate mainly to Article 5 implementation, victim assistance should be included in any information exchange tool.

4. In terms of ways and means of developing an information exchange tool, the means suggested most frequently by discussion participants was an internet tool, with many suggesting that it need not be a complicated endeavour. It was noted that the more complex this effort was, the more expensive it may be. Some suggested that the ISU could house such an information tool as part of the Convention’s existing website. Some suggested that the information tool could simply link to other sites while others suggested, that to make it more user-friendly, the information tool itself should house information.

5. On the basis of the discussion, the Co-Chairs sought to investigate with the ISU the development an information exchange tool on a trial basis with an evaluation made after a certain period of time, including by drawing up data related to the number of visits and types of information accessed. The Co-Chairs acknowledged that in proceeding, care would have to be taken to fill an actual information gap and not duplicate the wealth of existing on-line and other information sources, including Landmine Monitor and Article 7 reports. Also with respect to preventing duplication, it was noted, as concerns victim assistance, efforts should be made to liaise with those supporting the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities given the central place of cooperation and assistance in that instrument.

6. Following the 11MSP, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance requested that the ISU prepare a discussion paper entitled “Exploring the options of trust funds to ensure the continuity of resources”, which the ISU Director presented to the Standing Committee on 25 May 2012.<sup>1</sup> In response, many States Parties, while expressing the view that there was no need to establish a new trust fund, agreed with the paper’s conclusion that a great deal of potential exists with respect to mechanisms that are already in place or that could easily come into being at the national level. It was highlighted that the States Parties are, with few exceptions, all Member States of the United Nations and have the opportunity to voice their preferences with regarding to existing UN mechanisms. It was further highlighted that States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention make up a majority of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and therefore could help ensure that a sound link is made between these instruments once the UN Partnership to promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Multi-Donor Trust Fund becomes operational. In addition, it was highlighted that the international community as a whole has largely embraced the

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.apminebanconvention.org/fileadmin/pdf/mbc/IWP/SC-may12/Discussion-papers/SC-May2012-e-Trust-Funds-Draft.pdf>

international aid effectiveness agenda and could do what it can to relate demining and victim assistance with national development strategies and cooperation programmes, and the funds established to implement them.

7. In terms of the availability of assistance and procedures to obtain it, the Standing Committee benefited from presentations from a donor, a non-governmental organisation and a national mine action authority, thus highlighting that a wide range of actors and not solely traditional donors are in position to provide assistance. These actors and others shared information on what each has to offer, for whom it is available and how it may be obtained.

8. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties committed to make their needs known to other States Parties and relevant organisations if they require financial, technical or other forms of international cooperation and assistance to meet obligations.<sup>2</sup> In addition, States Parties with obligations to fulfil committed to map the national resources available to meet their obligations and their needs for international cooperation and assistance and States Parties in a position to do so committed to promptly assist States Parties that have communicated needs for support.<sup>3</sup> On the basis of information provided by States Parties in their transparency reports, in updates at the meetings of the Standing Committees and through other means, the following 28 States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 of the Convention have expressed requirements for financial, technical or other forms of assistance: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Iraq, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe. An overview of assistance obtained and national resources made available for Article 5 implementation by these States Parties is contained in annex III.

9. 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>4</sup> In this context, and based on the findings of case studies, the GICHD published a policy brief which provides mine action practitioners with an outline of key messages, main issues and recommendations related to transitioning mine action programmes to full national ownership.

10. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to contribute to further development of the United Nations' 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.<sup>5</sup> Since the 11MSP, efforts have continued to finalise IMAS on land release and information management. These will lead to a clearer and more consistent recording of released land and will facilitate progress to be measured. In addition, the GICHD has assisted two States Parties – Jordan and Mozambique – in the development of national standards and in reviewing existing standards.

11. At the Cartagena Summit, States Parties in a position to do so made a commitment, in the spirit of the Convention's aims, to endeavour to continue supporting States Parties that have completed their Article 5 obligations in their efforts to address the humanitarian

<sup>2</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #35.

<sup>3</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #34 and 37.

<sup>4</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #51.

<sup>5</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #49.

consequences resulting from mine and other explosive remnants of war contamination.<sup>6</sup> Since the 11MSP, one State Party that has completed implementation of Article 5 – Albania – has expressed the need for assistance in addressing the needs of victims of mines and other explosive remnants of war, and one other State Party – Palau – has expressed appreciation for support it receives from States Parties for addressing its challenges related to unexploded ordnance.

## **(b) Transparency and the exchange of information**

12. 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.<sup>7</sup> At the close of the 11MSP, 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, 84 States Parties had and 71 States Parties had not in 2011 provided updated information, as required, covering the previous calendar year.

13. Since the 11MSP, three States Parties have not complied with their obligation to report in accordance with Article 7.1: Equatorial Guinea, South Sudan and Tuvalu. Equatorial Guinea's initial report was due on 28 August 1999, South Sudan's on 5 January 2012 and Tuvalu's on 28 August 2012. In addition in 2012, the following 70 States Parties did not provide updated information covering calendar year 2011 in accordance with Article 7.2 as required: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niger, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

14. 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>8</sup> Since the 11MSP, 47 States Parties made use of "form J":

(a) The following 19 States Parties used "form J" to volunteer information on victim assistance efforts and needs Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mauritania, Peru, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #40.

<sup>7</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #54.

<sup>8</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #55.

(b) The following nine (9) States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on numbers of new mine incidents and victims: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Iraq, Peru, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.

(c) The following 21 States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on international cooperation and assistance: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

(d) The following three (3) States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in aspects of mine action: Afghanistan, Albania and Colombia.

(e) Several States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on other matters related to the implementation of the Convention, including information on mine action research, demining and explosive ordnance training, the destruction of explosive remnants of war other than anti-personnel mines, claymore-type munitions retained in a command-detonated mode, participation in international meetings, awareness raising activities, and plans for and actual use of anti-personnel mines retained for permitted purposes.

(f) Several States Parties used “form J” to complement the information provided elsewhere in their annual information submissions on required areas of reporting, including on programmes for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention and on measures taken to provide warnings to populations in relation to mined areas.

15. 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>9</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>10</sup>

16. Since the 11MSP, Angola reported 1,073 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2010 and indicated that the substantial decrease in the amount of retained anti-personnel mines was due to the fact that the last reports did not mention mines used for training. Mines retained are used by the Angolan Armed Forces for instruction purposes of different systems (manual, mechanic and canine) conducted by demining operators, especially the Demining Technical School located in Viana/Luanda. Argentina reported 179 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011 and that 169 anti-personnel mines were used in 2011 to train Marine Infantry engineers in techniques and procedures for the destruction of anti-personnel mines and 10 for research purposes. Argentina also reported on plans for the future use of mines for permitted purposes. Australia reported 139 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011 and that numbers are regularly reviewed, with planning underway to destroy a significant portion of training mines in the next 12 months, also indicating that only 100 anti-personnel mines in stock have serviceable detonator assemblies.

17. Belarus reported that 8 anti-personnel mines were destroyed during training in February 2012. Belgium reported that 59 anti-personnel were used in 2011 for the operational training of the Engineer Combat Units deminers and to train military former

<sup>9</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #56.

<sup>10</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #57.

combat units in “Mine Risk Education”. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported 361 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011. Brazil reported 1,063 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for military training purposes, to allow the Brazilian army to adequately participate in international demining activities. Chile reported 118 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than in 2010 and that 42 were destroyed in 2011 to train the deminers of the Chilean army and the Chilean navy in the detection, deactivation and destruction of anti-personnel mines. Croatia reported 73 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that anti-personnel mines were used during testing and evaluating of demining machines on the test polygon in Cerovec, CROMAC-CTDT Ltd. The Czech Republic reported 30 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that retained anti-personnel are used to train and/or educate EOD personnel in mine detection, mine clearance and destruction techniques and for additional courses within the framework of preparation to NATO standards for ISAF operations in Afghanistan.

18. Denmark reported 14 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and that it retains mines for research, development and training in mine detection by the Danish Defence Research. Ecuador used five anti-personnel mines in 2011 with these mines used in a National Demining School training course. Eritrea reported 71 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011 and indicated that the number of mines retained was reviewed downwards to only retain the very minimum number necessary for training. France reported 76 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011. Germany reported 71 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that the necessary amounts, types and estimated future requirements are reviewed on an annual basis. Germany reported that anti-personnel mines are retained for the development of safeguards for wheeled vehicles against the effects of mine explosions, the testing and evaluation of personal protective equipment (PPE) against the effect of mine explosions, the testing and evaluation of metal detectors and multi sensor systems, the testing and evaluation of mechanical demining equipment, the documentation of the ageing process of explosives contained in mines for the development of specific disposal / clearing methods and the training of dogs at the Federal Armed Forces School of Dog Handling.

19. Ireland retained two fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2011 and reported that the Irish Defence Forces use live anti-personnel mines in the development and validation of mine render safe procedures, in training personnel in these procedures, in testing and validating mine clearance equipment, and in the training of personnel in the use of such equipment. In addition, Ireland indicated that, as the number of anti-personnel mines currently possessed by it for permitted purposes has fallen to a very low level (with only 62 remaining as at 31 December 2011), the acquisition of replacement anti-personnel mines for the same purposes, as permitted by Article 3 of the Convention, is likely to become necessary at some stage in the future. Italy reported 26 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that Italy uses mines for a training programme for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) personnel and mine detection dogs (MDD) carried out by the Italian Army and that this programme is structured in five distinct courses, aimed at enabling engineers to perform specific tasks of increasing difficulties, with every year between 300 and 350 EOD specialists being trained and qualified.

20. Japan reported 254 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that the mines it retains are used for education and training purposes for mine detection and clearance, and the research and development for mine clearance equipment. Lithuania reported 75 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011. Luxembourg reported the destruction of all the anti-personnel mines it had reported retained under Article 3 (599 in total). Mozambique reported 252 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2011 indicating that the three demining operators in Mozambique maintain a stock of anti-personnel mines for the training of deminers and the

training and testing of mine detection animals. In addition, the Mozambique Defence Forces retain a stock of anti-personnel mines for training and refreshing courses for the Defence Forces demining platoon. The Netherlands reported 191 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011. Slovakia reported 100 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2011 and indicated that 98 anti-personnel were destroyed by the National Centre of EOD Novaky and two were destroyed for the purpose of anti-mine measurements development in the Military Technical and Testing Institute Záhorie (project MUNLIK). Spain reported 11 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that it has used mines for the development of the “Advanced Global System to Eliminate Anti-Personnel Landmines” and for demining training courses.

21. Sweden reported 56 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that the Swedish Armed Forces use anti-personnel mines in mine clearance training carried out at the Swedish Demining and EOD Centre, providing the deminer with experience of actually clearing live mines. Thailand reported 92 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it reported in 2011. Tunisia reported 20 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reported 362 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it had reported in 2011 and indicated that it retains anti-personnel mines with the objective of identifying the anti-personnel mine threat to the United Kingdom Armed Forces, together with maintaining and improving detection, protection, clearance and destruction techniques including for improvised explosive devices. Yemen reported 240 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2011. Zimbabwe reported 50 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it reported in 2011.

22. Cambodia reported 273 more anti-personnel mines retained than it reported in 2011, that it uses anti-personnel mines for refresher trainings of EOD teams and will need them for the future MDD/EDD testing site which will be accrediting all MDD/EDD in the country. The Democratic Republic of the Congo reported five more anti-personnel mines than it did in 2011 indicating that the anti-personnel mines retained were all defused. Jordan reported 50 more anti-personnel mines retained than it reported in 2011. Senegal reported nine more anti-personnel mines retained than it reported in 2011. Slovenia reported four more anti-personnel mines than it reported in 2011. South Africa reported one more anti-personnel mine than it did in 2011, indicating that while one anti-personnel mine was used in accordance with Article 3, one was also recovered during the reporting period.

23. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have maintained under the provision 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>11</sup> Algeria reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (5,970) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Bangladesh did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (12,500) that it reported retained in 2007. Benin did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (16) that it reported retained in 2007. Bhutan did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (4,491) that it reported retained in 2007. Bulgaria reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,672) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Burundi reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (four) that since 2008 it has reported retained. Cameroon did not provide new information to update the number of

<sup>11</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #58.

anti-personnel mines (1,885) that it reported retained in 2009. Canada reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,921) that since 2011 it has reported retained. Cape Verde did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (120) that it reported retained in 2009. Colombia reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (586) that since 2007 it has reported retained. Congo did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (322) that it reported retained in 2009. Cyprus reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (500) that since 2010 it has reported retained.

24. Djibouti did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (2,996) that it reported retained in 2005. Ethiopia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (303) that it reported retained in 2009. Guinea-Bissau did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (nine) that it reported retained in 2009. Honduras did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (826) that it reported retained in 2007. 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 it reported retained in 2009. Mali did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (600) that it reported retained in 2005. Mauritania reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (728) that since 2004 it has reported retained. Namibia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,634) that it reported retained in 2010.

25. Nicaragua did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (448) that it reported retained in 2011. Niger did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (146) that it reported retained in 2009. Nigeria reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,364) that since 2009 it has reported retained. Peru reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,040) that since 2011 it has reported retained. Portugal reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (694) that since 2011 it has reported retained and indicated that the 694 mines retained by the Portuguese Armed Forces are either inert or fuseless. In addition, Portugal reported that anti-personnel mines retained are used to train Explosive Ordnance Disposal teams in mine detection, clearance and destruction techniques and to provide basic mine awareness training to military personnel deployed in international missions. Twelve (12) personnel were trained in EOD skills in 2011. Romania reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,500) that it has reported retained since 2004 and indicated that it uses anti-personnel mines in regular training cycles for EOD personnel and engineers and for specific preparation of troops leaving to operational theatres. Rwanda did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (65) that it reported retained in 2008.

26. Slovenia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (2,978) that it reported retained in 2011. South Africa did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (4,355) that it reported retained in 2011. Sudan reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,938) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Turkey reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (15,100) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Uganda reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,764) that since 2005 it has reported retained. Tanzania did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,780) that it reported retained in 2009. Uruguay did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (260) that it reported retained in 2008. Venezuela reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (4,874) that since 2011 it has reported retained and indicated that it retains these mines for the development of mine detection, clearance and destruction techniques. Zambia reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,120) that since 2009 it has reported retained and indicated that training



carried out previously covered mine identification and awareness, minefield marking and layout, detection and destruction techniques for mainly military personnel preparing for United Nations Peace Keeping Operations (UNPKO) deployment, combat engineers undergoing mandatory career progression courses, and national and regional military officers undergoing Command and Staff Courses.

27. Botswana did not provide new information since it reported in 2001 that it “maintains a small quantity of anti-personnel mines for training purposes and that this is important because in the past the Botswana Defence Force soldiers have been deployed to mine-infested countries on peace keeping assignments and there is need for soldiers to be trained in handling landmines.” Burkina Faso did not provide new information since it reported in 2008 that “nothing yet” was retained.

28. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, Norway and Peru, wrote to States Parties to encourage them to make use of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention on 21 and 25 May 2012 to volunteer updated information on mines retained for permitted purposes under Article 3. The Co-Chairs also expressed an interest in hearing from States Parties that have reported the same numbers retained for a number of years without having yet volunteered information on the purposes for which these mines have been retained and on plans for the use of them for permitted purposes. The invitation to provide updates at the Standing Committees was seized by 21 States Parties.

29. Since the 11MSP, Belgium, in its capacity as Coordinator of the Article 7 Contact Group, continued to promote the importance of transparency obligations and to emphasize the role of transparency and the exchange of information as a tool in the overall implementation of the Convention. Belgium noted that, since the 11MSP, despite efforts made to remind States Parties of their obligation to report and despite assistance offered to prepare reports, the reporting rate continued to decline. In this context, Belgium organised consultations with interested delegations on possible ways and means to increase both the reporting rate and the quality of information reported by States Parties. The informal Article 7 Contact Group met in the margins of the 21-25 May meetings of the Standing Committees to take stock of matters linked to reporting. The Contact Group highlighted the main challenges associated with reporting and discussed potential courses of action that could be pursued to improve reporting.

**(c) Measures to ensure compliance**

30. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not developed national implementation measures will, as a matter of urgency, develop and adopt legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9, to fulfil their Convention obligations under this Article and thereby contributing to full compliance with the Convention.<sup>12</sup> At the close of the 11MSP, there were 63 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>13</sup> The remaining 59 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>12</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #59.

<sup>13</sup> The figures 63 and 34 are a correction with respect to the figures 62 and 35 that appeared in the 11MSP's Phnom Penh Progress Report to include Serbia in the list of States Parties that indicated that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 and remove it from the list of States Parties that consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention.

31. Since the 11MSP, one State Party, Qatar, indicated that it considered existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention.<sup>14</sup> In addition, since the 11MSP, the four States for which the Convention most recently entered into force – Finland, Somalia, South Sudan and Tuvalu – have not yet reported either having adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 or indicated that they consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. There are now 63 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 60 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 IV.)

32. Deep concern was expressed about reports alleging new use of anti-personnel mines in the territories of two States Parties (Sudan and Yemen) and calls were made for the States Parties concerned to fully investigate these allegations and to clarify matters as soon as possible. In addition, at the May 2012 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, it was 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 again 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.

33. Since the 11MSP, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) continued fulfilling the Secretary General of the United Nations' 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 11MSP, Cyprus, France, Jordan, Republic of Moldova, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Switzerland and Uruguay provided new or updated information for the list of experts.

**(d) Implementation support**

34. 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 25 May 2012 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 report recorded the lengthy set of activities consistent with this mandate and the ISU's 2012 work plan, and provided highlights of work undertaken by the ISU during the first five months of 2012.

35. With respect to its substantive efforts, in 2012 the ISU carried out its activities in accordance with its 2012 work plan and budget, which was adopted by the 11MSP. 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

---

<sup>14</sup> Note verbale sent by the Permanent Mission of Qatar in Geneva to the Implementation Support Unit, 27 January 2012.

individual States Parties in undertaking universalization efforts, providing advice on applying the lessons learned from implementing the Convention, supporting the 12MSP President-Designate and host, continuing to serve as the authoritative source of information on the Convention and maintaining the Convention's Documentation Centre.

36. 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.<sup>15</sup> At the 11MSP, the States Parties took note and encouraged action on the recommendations made by the President of the 10MSP to preserve the results of the work undertaken in 2011 by an open-ended working group to improve the ISU's present funding model and to ensure sufficient contributions are provided to the ISU as long as the financing model remains unchanged. In the first quarter of 2012, the President used targeted fundraising appeals to complement common appeals which had been traditionally distributed to all States Parties. In addition, on 11 June and 21 September 2012, the President issued follow-up appeals. Contributions in support of the ISU's 2012 work plan were received from the following States Parties: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, [France], Germany, [Italy], Malaysia, [Mexico], Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia and Switzerland.

37. 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. The ISU received funding from Australia to enable the ISU to comment two research projects related to victim assistance. The first initiative is examining the role of mine action programmes and national authorities in victim assistance, particularly with regard to the sustainability of efforts. The second initiative is advancing research undertaken by the ISU in 2011 on the role of development assistance in supporting victim assistance. In addition, the ISU received funding from Australia [and New Zealand] to enable the ISU, in collaboration with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, to support Palau in hosting a regional workshop. As well, throughout 2012 the ISU furnished information and budgetary projections to the European Union (EU) in order to conclude administrative arrangements necessary to begin implementation of an EU Council Decision in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Director of the ISU reported to the Coordinating Committee as well as to the May 2012 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention on this additional funding and these additional activities.

38. At the 11MSP, 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. Pursuant to this decision and 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 new Co-Chairs following the 12MSP. On 2 May 2012, 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. At the 21 May 2012 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Co-Chairs again reminded delegations of their 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 12MSP to serve two-year terms.]

39. As indicated above, the 11MSP noted with satisfaction the efforts undertaken pursuant to the decision of the 10MSP to request the Coordinating Committee to organise

<sup>15</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #66.

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 11MSP encouraged the Coordinating Committee to consider similar efforts in 2012. Pursuant to this, 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 Resources, Cooperation and Assistance convened one session to discuss the idea of establishing a platform for partnerships to better enable States Parties to exchange information on available assistance, particularly non-financial assistance.

40. In assessing the efforts of Co-Chairs in 2012 to explore different 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 Coordinating Committee noted that participants who provided feedback expressed mixed views, with both benefits to the format (e.g., greater scope for informal participation, more interactivity) and drawbacks (e.g., parallel sessions pose difficulties for small delegations, lack of translation) mentioned. It was noted that the feedback provided would be useful for the Coordinating Committee in 2013 to determine whether small group discussions should again be used.

41. 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>16</sup> Since the 11MSP, the Coordinating Committee met [...] times to fulfil its mandate to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the 12MSP.

42. 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.<sup>17</sup> In 2012, the following States Parties contributed to the Australian-coordinated Sponsorship Programme: Australia, Denmark, [Italy] and Norway. At the May 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees, 44 representatives of 28 States Parties were sponsored as was one representative of one State not party. At the 12MSP, [...] representatives of [...] States Parties were sponsored as were [...] representatives of [...] States not parties. In 2012, 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.

43. 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, the national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and their International Federation, the UN, the GICHD,

---

<sup>16</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #63.

<sup>17</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #67.

international and regional organisations, mine survivors and their organisations, and other civil society organisations.<sup>18</sup>

---

---

<sup>18</sup> Cartagena Action Plan, Action #64.