

FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE  
STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION  
ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE,  
STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND  
TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES  
AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION

APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1/Amend.1  
26 November 2004

Original: ENGLISH

---

Nairobi, 29 November – 3 December 2004  
Item 14 of the revised provisional agenda

**REVISED DRAFT REVIEW  
OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE  
PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF  
ANTIPERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION: 1999-2004**

Prepared by the President-Designate

Amendment

Amend the following paragraphs as follows:

21. The destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4 is an obligation that has been, would have been or is relevant for [78] States Parties:[Sixty-eight (68)] States Parties reported, in accordance with Article 7, that they held stockpiled antipersonnel mines when the Convention entered into force for them: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen and Zimbabwe.[Nine (9)] States Parties reported that they had destroyed their stockpiled antipersonnel mines prior to entry into force: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Luxembourg, Mali, Namibia, Norway and South Africa. [One (1)] of the States Parties that has not yet provided an initial report in accordance with Article 7 holds or may hold stockpiled antipersonnel mines based on statements made elsewhere: Guyana.

22. [Sixty-eight (68)] States Parties reported, in accordance with Article 7, that they did not hold stockpiles when the Convention entered into force for them.<sup>1</sup> These States Parties are: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, the Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Nauru, New Zealand, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Timor Leste and Zambia. [Six (6)] of the States Parties that have not yet provided an initial report in accordance with Article 7 are presumed not to hold stockpiled antipersonnel mines based on statements made elsewhere: Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia and Sao Tome and Principe.

26. The number of parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled antipersonnel mines remains relevant has been narrowed considerably to include [16] States: [Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burundi, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Mauritania, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Turkey and Uruguay.] By [1 April 2008] the last of these States Parties is obliged to have completed its destruction programme. It is estimated that together these States Parties hold more than [10.2 million] antipersonnel mines. While the number of States Parties for which stockpile destruction is relevant is now small, a challenge exists in the fact that the numbers of mines held by a few individual States Parties is high. This challenge would be increased should additional stockpile-holding States join the Convention in the period following the First Review Conference. For example, the ICBL has estimated that six States not parties combined – China, India, the Republic of Korea, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United States of America – may hold more than 180 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines.

Paragraph 30, amend first line to read:

30. A small number of the [16] States Parties that must still complete the implementation of

33. In reports submitted in accordance with Article 7, the following [49] States Parties have reported areas under their jurisdiction or control that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines and hence must fulfil the obligations contained in Article 5 and the relevant reporting requirements: [Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.] Of these [3

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes those 9 States Parties mentioned above that reported that they had destroyed their stockpiled antipersonnel mines prior to entry into force.

States Parties – Costa Rica, Djibouti and Honduras – have indicated that they have completed implementation of Article 5.]

Delete paragraph 34 and renumbered subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

51. As noted, States Parties are required to report on “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5.” In reports submitted in accordance with Article 7, the following [34] States Parties provided information related to such measures having been taken: [Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen and Zimbabwe].

106. In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1, each State Party must provide an initial report in accordance with Article 7 to the depository “as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.” A total of 141 of the [143] States, which have ratified or acceded to the Convention have been required to submit such an initial report. All have done so with the exception of the following [5] States Parties: [Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Saint Lucia, and Sao Tome and Principe]. (See Annex VII.)

107. In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 2, each State Party must provide updated information to the depository annually, covering the last calendar year and reported not later than 30 April of each year. Each State Party obliged to provide such a report in 2004 has done so with the exception of the following [25] States Parties: [Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Niue, Panama, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Seychelles, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela and Zimbabwe]. (See Annex VII.)

112. The following [66] States Parties have provided technical characteristics of antipersonnel mines produced or currently held, giving information as may facilitate identification and clearance of antipersonnel mines: [Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe].

113. At the 2000 Second Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties reviewed the technical ways and means of circulating reports, adopting *Form J* to provide States Parties with an opportunity to report voluntarily on matters pertaining to compliance and implementation not covered by the formal reporting requirements contained in Article 7. The States Parties further recommended the use of this form to report on activities undertaken with respect to Article 6, in particular to report on assistance provided for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic

reintegration, of mine victims. Since the adoption of *Form J*, the following [62] States Parties have made use of this voluntary means of reporting: [Albania, Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tajikistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen and Zimbabwe].

118. An important challenge in the period following the First Review Conference will be to ensure that the remaining [5] States Parties that have not yet submitted an initial transparency report in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1, do so as soon as possible. Moreover, while the overall reporting rate has exceeded [78] percent in the year of the Review Conference, it will be a challenge to ensure that the States Parties continue to comply with their annual reporting obligations following the Review Conference. This continues to be particularly important for States Parties that are in the process of destroying stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, those that have decided to retain antipersonnel mines in accordance with Article 3 and those undertaking measures in accordance with Article 9. Moreover, annual reporting by mine-affected States Parties will become increasingly important to confirm that Article 5 obligations have been fulfilled or to communicate, at the earliest possible stage, challenges that must be overcome in order to ensure that these obligations can be fulfilled.

### Annex III

Delete: “States Parties which have not yet provided a report in accordance with Article 7 but which have mined areas in accordance with Article 5

Burundi”.

Under “States which in accordance with Article 7 have reported mined areas in accordance with Article 5”, insert Burundi after Bosnia Herzegovina.

### Annex IV

#### Afghanistan

Column B, fifth line, amend to read:

... in 2003. It aims between 2003 and 2007 to ...

Algeria

Column A, amend to read:

Algeria's areas mined by the colonial Army are located on Algeria's eastern border with Tunisia and western border with Morocco. These areas cover 5,676 hectares and contain 3,064,180 anti-personnel mines. Additionally, some areas in the north are suspected to be mined by terrorist groups.

Colombia

Column A, amend to read:

IMSMA in Colombia has registered between 1990 until 1 October 2004, 3,697 suspected mined areas of which 1,371 have been geo-referenced. Some of the minefields identified are situated around water points, schools, access routes and public infrastructure. Illegal armed groups over the last few years have continued to utilize antipersonnel mines (mostly IEDs) in a massive and indiscriminate way. To date, 30 of the 32 departments in Colombia are affected, principally in rural areas.

Column B, amend to read:

In February of 2004, a process was initiated with all the different stakeholders in mine action in the country to develop a national policy on mine action. The policy integrated lessons learned and paid particular attention to regional characteristics. The National Mine Action Plan was formulated with the specific objectives of strengthening four components of mine action in Colombia: 1) Institutional strengthening at different territorial levels, 2) Integral assistance to the population, 3) Compliance with the Convention and 4) Communications strategy. The National Mine Action Plan was approved by the National Inter-Sectorial Commission on 10 August. Under integral assistance to population component of the plan, it is detailed the elaboration, design and formulation of a National Mine Risk Education Strategy in which with the collaboration of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Communications, there will be developed publications and materials that will assist the process of prevention. The Observatory has been supported technically and financially in MRE work by UNICEF, UNDP, GICHD and national NGOs working in 10 departments of the country.

Column C, insert:

To comply with Article 5 of the Ottawa Treaty, the Colombian Government is making progress in the following areas: 1. Identification of the mined areas of the armed forces of Colombia that were previously laid to protect communications post or military bases. These minefields are under the jurisdiction of the government of Colombia and in accordance with the national plan, will be cleared in compliance with the Convention. 2. Training in the clearance of minefields and humanitarian demining with an emphasis on developing national standards for the clearance of antipersonnel mines. 3. Adoption of appropriate standards for clearance which reflect the Colombian context. 4. The formation of 7 divisionary groups of the Engineering School of the

National Army with the specific role of attending to humanitarian emergencies by the presence of anti-personnel mines and UXO and the associated threat to life, personal integrity and the right of movement of communities.

Tajikistan

Column C, amend to read:

From 1997 to 2004 Tajikistan neutralised and destroyed more than 3,250 pieces of mines and explosives. A general mine action assessment has been completed in the Central Region, reducing the amount of suspected area of 29 square kilometres and 124 linear kilometres of road/rail. In September and October of 2004, general research on frontier sites of Tajik-Uzbek border in the Sughd region, two areas of Hatlon region (in the south) and three areas of the Autonomous Region of Badakhshan (in the east) was completed. While in the central region there is a work going on actualization of technical surveys and mine clearance of the minefields. Additionally three areas were demined and handed over to the local governmental authorities for long run use.

## Annex VI

Colombia

Amend to read:

**Problems faced:** Both the military and civilian population are affected by violence in Colombia, alarmingly with the number of mine victims increasing to a point where there are on average two victims registered on IMSMA every day. Forty percent of these victims are civilians who mostly are rural poor, living below the poverty line. Colombian legislation addresses policies and programmes aimed to assist vulnerable and displaced populations affected by political violence (including victims of anti-personnel mines and UXO). It is clear that these legislative measures need to be articulated and revised to fully guarantee the rights of Colombian victims.

**Plans, progress and priorities:** In February 2004, a process was initiated with different actors working in the area of mine action where a government policy was constructed. This policy integrated lessons learnt and incorporated specifics at regional and national levels which was translated into the National Mine Action Plan. The National Mine Action Plan developed priorities, strategies and means to cover the four pillars of the plan, notably: 1) Institutional strengthening at different territorial levels, 2) Integral assistance to the population, 3) Compliance with the Ottawa Treaty and 4) Communications strategy.

The National Mine Action Plan was approved at a session of the national inter-sectorial Commission on 10 August 2004. Under the pillar of integral assistance to the population, a programming was formulated to address the issue of strengthening assistance to victims, specifically over first aid, rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration of victims. For this reason, it is necessary to formulate standards regarding attention to mine victims adopted by the country. Pilot programmes in the departments of Antioquia and Cauca have been developed with the aim of

following the route of a victim through all the stages from accident to recuperation, in conformity with the procedures established by the Colombian Government.

#### Annex VII

Under column 2004, replace N by Y for Burundi, the Central African Republic, Costa Rica and Liberia.

#### Annex VIII

##### **Table 1**

Burundi, insert a footnote to read: In its report submitted in 2004, Burundi indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

Under column 2004, amend or insert to read for

Belarus: 7530

Central African Republic: 0

Costa Rica: 0

Liberia: 0

##### **Table 2**

Delete row of Belarus

---