

Geneva, 6 November 2006

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 6 November 2006, at 10.20 a.m.

Temporary President: Mr. CAUGHLEY (Deputy Secretary-General of the
Conference on Disarmament and Director of the Geneva
Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs)

President: Mr. HUSÁK (Czech Republic)

CONTENTS

OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER OFFICERS

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

CONFIRMATION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

APPOINTMENT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE

ADOPTION OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK, INCLUDING THAT OF ANY SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF
THE CONFERENCE

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE PROTOCOL

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS ARISING FROM REPORTS BY HIGH CONTRACTING
PARTIES ACCORDING TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF ARTICLE 13 OF THE AMENDED
PROTOCOL II

CONSIDERATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGIES TO PROTECT
CIVILIANS AGAINST INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS OF MINES

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

1. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT, acting on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General, who is the depositary of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and the protocols thereto, called to order the Eighth Annual Conference of the States Parties to Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, which is annexed to the Convention.

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER OFFICERS (item 2 of the provisional agenda)

2. The TEMPORARY PRESIDENT pointed out that the States parties had decided at their Fourth Annual Conference, in order to ensure continuity in the preparatory work carried out by the Chair, that the incoming President and Vice-Presidents would be designated at the end of each annual conference. Accordingly, at the Seventh Annual Conference, the representative of the Czech Republic had been nominated as President of the Eighth Annual Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.7/2, para. 20). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Conference wished to confirm the nomination of the representative of the Czech Republic, Mr. Tomáš Husák, to take the Chair.

3. It was so decided.

4. Mr. Husák (Czech Republic) took the Chair.

5. The PRESIDENT, citing the decision taken at the Seventh Annual Conference concerning the posts of Vice-President, (CCW/AP.II/CONF.7/2, para. 20), said that after consultations with the regional groups and China, it appeared that the Conference was in agreement to confirm the appointment of the Ambassador of Germany, Mr. Bernhard Brasack, the Ambassador of China, Mr. Cheng Jingye, and the Ambassador of Jordan, Mr. Mousa Burayzat, as Vice-Presidents. He invited the Conference to confirm the appointment of those representatives as Vice-Presidents.

6. The appointment of Mr. Brasack (Germany), Mr. Cheng (China) and Mr. Burayzat (Jordan) as Vice-Presidents of the Conference was confirmed.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (item 3 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.8/1)

7. The provisional agenda was adopted.

CONFIRMATION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE (agenda item 4)

8. The PRESIDENT, drawing delegations' attention to document CCW/AP.II/CONF.6/2, containing the rules of procedure as amended at the Fourth Annual Conference, said that, at the First Annual Conference, the incumbent President had noted, with reference to rule 29 of the rules of procedure, that the high contracting parties had proceeded on the basis of consensus in

their deliberations and negotiations and had not taken any decision by vote. He proceeded from the principle that that version of the rules of procedure, read in conjunction with that statement, applied mutatis mutandis to the Eighth Annual Conference.

9. It was so decided.

APPOINTMENT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 5)

10. The PRESIDENT, referring to rule 10 of the rules of procedure, said his consultations had indicated that the delegations were in agreement to appoint Mr. Peter Kolarov, Political Affairs Officer in the Geneva Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, as Secretary-General of the Conference. He took it that it was the wish of the Conference to appoint Mr. Kolarov to that office.

11. It was so decided.

ADOPTION OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 6)

12. The PRESIDENT noted that the cost estimates for the Eighth Annual Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.7/2, annex IV) had been considered in 2005 at the Seventh Conference. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Conference wished to approve the cost estimates as presented.

13. It was so decided.

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

14. At the invitation of the President, Mr. CAUGHLEY (Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Director of the Geneva Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs) read out a message from the United Nations Secretary-General.

15. In his message, the Secretary-General said that mines, booby-traps and improvised explosive devices aggravated the suffering of combatants and prolonged the horrendous consequences of armed conflict, indiscriminately killing civilians, peacekeepers and humanitarian workers, as well as hampering the return and reintegration of refugees and displaced persons and impeding post-conflict reconstruction.

16. By adopting amended Protocol II a decade previously, the States parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons had shown that they were committed to developing international humanitarian law so as to combat the threat posed by the mines and devices in question. Yet that threat persisted, and there was much work to do to achieve the objective of eliminating mines of all shapes and sizes. The Secretary-General therefore urged the States parties to amend Protocol II to study ways of better protecting civilians against the danger of mines and to promote universal adherence to the Protocol. He urged countries which had not yet notified their consent to be bound by amended Protocol II, and particularly those which were parties to the original Protocol, to do so as soon as possible.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK, INCLUDING THAT OF ANY SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 7)

17. The PRESIDENT said that, in view of the brevity of the Conference, he hesitated to propose the establishment of a subsidiary body. Instead, he invited the participants to address, during the traditional general exchange of views, all the substantive issues of interest to them which were listed on the agenda, keeping for consideration under items 9, 10 and 11 issues arising specifically from those items.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (agenda item 8)

18. Mr. KAHILUOTO (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the acceding countries (Bulgaria and Romania), the candidate countries (Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro) - a process of which Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia continue to be part - as well as Ukraine and Moldova, said that the European Union continued to attach high priority to the full implementation of amended Protocol II, which, while complementing the Ottawa Convention by virtue of its wider scope, could, if its prohibitions and restrictions were effectively applied, enhance the security of military ground operations and curtail the impact of mines, booby-traps and other devices on civilian populations. The obligations related to recording, protection and removal of minefields, together with the provisions for international cooperation, were essential as they facilitated humanitarian assistance, post-conflict recovery and peacekeeping operations. The European Union welcomed the accession of Tunisia to amended Protocol II in 2006 and again called on all States parties to the Convention to adhere to it as soon as possible, as well as to any other protocols to which they were not yet party. It fully supported the Plan of Action on Universalization of the Convention and its Protocols which was to be adopted at the Third Conference to review the Convention. That said, the effectiveness of amended Protocol II would be measured not only by its universalization, but also by the timely submission of the States parties' annual reports, which contributed to transparency and cooperation in the implementation of the instrument. States which were not parties should prepare such reports voluntarily.

19. The European Union would like annual conferences of the States parties to amended Protocol II to offer an opportunity for interactive and more substantial discussion on the content of the annual reports. It would also be interested in exploring ways and means to use the annual conferences more concretely to strengthen the provisions of the Protocol and their implementation. As for the States parties which had opted to defer compliance with the provisions of the technical annex on detectability and the self-destruction and self-deactivation of anti-personnel mines for a period of nine years following the entry into force of the Protocol, the European Union invited them to indicate where they stood in the process of implementing the relevant provisions, as the deferral period would soon end, on 3 December 2007. The Union encouraged the States parties which had exercised that right and had become parties to the Ottawa Convention in the meantime to rescind their deferrals immediately.

20. Ms. MILLAR (Australia) said that her country, which was a party to the Ottawa Convention alongside 150 other States, and which therefore placed particular emphasis on the implementation and universalization of a total ban on anti-personnel mines, nevertheless

attached importance to amended Protocol II because of the humanitarian gains it offered, which were admittedly less substantial but not negligible, and the role it played in gathering together States which remained major users and producers of mines and had not yet acceded to the Ottawa Convention.

21. Australia remained firmly committed to the elimination of anti-personnel mines throughout the world. In 2005, it had pledged \$A 75 million over five years for international mine action, and in 2006 it had allocated \$11 million to mine clearance, mine risk education and victim assistance, principally for the benefit of Asian countries. Some government agencies, after developing a multi-sensor system now used around the world, continued to work on new methods of mine clearance. Australian companies had embarked on the development of technologies to speed up the rate at which mines could be removed from the ground; the detector devised by Minelab Electronics was currently used in United Nations demining operations and by the NATO Partnership for Peace.

22. Mr. CHENG (China) noted that amended Protocol II struck a proper balance between humanitarian concerns and the legitimate military needs of States, that the international community widely acknowledged its importance, since 86 States were now parties to it, and that it played an indispensable role in reducing the number of accidents caused by landmines in which the victims were civilians. That said, landmines continued to pose a serious threat, and in some countries remained a major obstacle to social and economic reconstruction. China had striven to fulfil its obligations under the Protocol. At the national level, it had continued to carry out public awareness and education campaigns, and had produced a television programme to disseminate information concerning the implementation of the Protocol to the armed forces and the civilian population. The Chinese military had destroyed more than 1,000 tons of obsolete anti-personnel mines and had begun to modify stockpiled mines that still functioned normally, so that they met the technical requirements of the Protocol. In that way China planned to be in a position to comply with its obligations by the end of the period during which the application of certain technical requirements under the Protocol had been deferred.

23. Internationally, China, which was a member of the Mine Action Support Group, had played an active part in demining assistance efforts. It had sent an expert team to Thailand for several months in 2005 to train 30 demining personnel, and in September 2006 had started a humanitarian demining training course in China for 42 demining personnel from Lebanon and Jordan. It also supported humanitarian demining operations in Africa. It believed that, in the field of mine action, the various existing international mechanisms were complementary, and so had maintained extensive contacts with the States parties to the Ottawa Convention, as well as the representatives of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

24. Ms. KANG (Republic of Korea) reconfirmed her country's unwavering commitment to the letter and spirit of amended Protocol II. She noted that, although the number of States parties to the Protocol was steadily increasing, efforts should nevertheless be redoubled to ensure its universalization - the Republic of Korea placed much hope in the plan of action to that end which was to be adopted at the Third Conference to review the Convention.

25. In 2006 the Republic of Korea had destroyed over 7,000 landmines and planned to complete its mine clearance activities by 2009. The Government had faithfully observed a moratorium on the export of such devices for the past nine years. Internationally, the Government continued to support humanitarian demining projects by contributing to the various United Nations trust funds, and was exploring ways to share the experience acquired and techniques developed with mine-affected countries.

26. While recognizing that amended Protocol II applied partially to mines other than anti-personnel mines, she believed that a more focused instrument was needed to address the humanitarian risks posed by such mines, and looked forward to the speedy adoption of a new Protocol specifically regulating them.

27. Mr. TURCOTTE (Canada) said that amended Protocol II, though notable in certain respects, did not provide adequate protection from the grave threats posed by anti-personnel landmines, especially in humanitarian terms. In contrast, the Ottawa Convention, which gathered together more than three quarters of the world's nations, provided a comprehensive framework for action to address those problems which went beyond the Protocol by purely and simply banning anti-personnel mines, requiring the destruction of stockpiles by a precise deadline and making provision for assistance to victims to enable them to return to their communities. At the first conference held to review the Ottawa Convention, in November 2004, the States parties had adopted an ambitious action plan for the period 2004-2009, which had enabled them to record significant progress towards the complete elimination of the scourge of anti-personnel landmines, even if much remained to be done to reach that goal. Canada urged all States to accede to the Ottawa Convention and, in the interim, to apply its norms fully, as the lives and livelihoods of civilian populations throughout the world were at stake.

28. The principal value of amended Protocol II lay in the fact that it applied to mines other than anti-personnel mines. For that reason, Canada urged all States to comply fully with their commitments regarding the prohibition of the indiscriminate use of mines, mine clearance after the cessation of active hostilities and assistance for mine clearance, not to mention the regular and timely submission of their annual reports, which were a key element in compliance with the provisions of the Protocol. It also urged them to fulfil their obligations in relation to anti-vehicle mines, which caused appalling suffering to civilians.

29. Mr. STREULI (Switzerland) pointed out that the effectiveness of amended Protocol II, and in particular that of the guarantees it laid down in relation to protection of the civilian population, depended on the effective application of its provisions, including the submission of annual reports by the States parties, in accordance with article 13, paragraph 4, and participation in their annual conferences. Switzerland welcomed the steady rise in the number of States parties to the Protocol and invited all States which had not yet done so to accede to it. It stood ready to cooperate actively at the bilateral or multilateral level in resolving any technical problems related to mines which might prevent certain States from becoming parties to the Protocol. In 2005 the Swiss Government had allocated \$12 million for mine action worldwide, and it had earmarked a similar amount in the budget for 2006, which would be used mainly to fund demining projects, awareness campaigns and victim assistance projects. It also supplied experts and equipment for mine clearance missions in many countries.

30. Mr. BIELASHOV (Ukraine), noting that Ukraine had associated itself with the statement made by the delegation of Finland on behalf of the European Union and other countries, said that his country, which was a party not only to the Convention but also to its five protocols, was fully committed to strict compliance with and the appropriate domestic application of those instruments, particularly amended Protocol II, which offered an important means of reducing the often disastrous consequences of armed conflict, both for combatants during hostilities and for civilians afterwards.

31. In Ukraine, demining experts reported that between 40,000 and 50,000 items of unexploded ordnance were extracted from the ground each year during construction work and other operations. The Government allocated considerable effort and financial resources to liquidating that scourge, a heritage of the Second World War, but the successes recorded in that area would not have been possible without substantial support from its foreign partners. Ukraine believed that the international community could, without fear of duplication of activities, continue broad support for the programmes set up by mine-affected States to combat the effects of those devices. Indeed, it was thanks to cooperation from the European Commission for the destruction of 6 million PFM anti-personnel mines in Ukraine that the country had been able to consider becoming a party to the Ottawa Convention, and had done so recently.

32. Mr. PRASAD (India) said that his country remained committed to the ultimate objective of a universal ban on anti-personnel landmines which took account of States' legitimate security requirements. Progress could be made towards the complete elimination of such mines if low-cost, militarily effective and non-lethal alternative technologies were available. By striking a balance between States' security imperatives and the concern to protect civilian populations against the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of all types of mines, amended Protocol II had made a major contribution to the gradual realization of a mine-free world. India unreservedly supported the measures taken by States parties to promote the universalization of the Protocol, and in particular the drafting of the plan of action which was to be submitted to the conference to be held in a few days' time to review the Convention. The efficacy of the consultation, cooperation and compliance mechanism laid down in articles 13 and 14 of the Protocol had been demonstrated by the large number of States parties that regularly submitted their national annual reports.

33. India had taken the requisite steps to comply with the provisions of the Protocol. Only the armed forces were authorized to use landmines, and they laid them only to protect the borders, in accordance with standard operating procedures. The Indian authorities had never used mines for maintenance of internal order, even against terrorist groups, which did use mines and improvised explosive devices indiscriminately against civilians. The moratorium on the export of landmines continued to be applied. Efforts were regularly made to disseminate information on anti-personnel mines to the armed forces and among the public, using publications, training courses and civil-society actions. The Indian army continued to contribute its skills to the implementation of United Nations-sponsored mine clearance programmes, in peacekeeping operations, principally in Africa. India would favour strengthened cooperation in mine action in all its forms. The famous "Jaipur foot" was distributed in certain mine-affected countries in Africa and Asia.

34. Mr. MINE (Japan) said that his country, which remained convinced that only a universal ban on anti-personnel mines would make it possible to end the suffering caused by those weapons, placed great importance on the Ottawa Convention and had been actively working to encourage those States which had not yet done so to become parties to the Convention. That said, Japan also believed that amended Protocol II offered a realistic and logical means of alleviating the humanitarian problems caused by those devices, so that the countries which would find it difficult to become parties to the Ottawa Convention should consider acceding to amended Protocol II, which would enable them to participate in the efforts of the international community to reduce the suffering due to mines. The Japanese delegation hoped that the countries which had opted to defer the application of the detectability and active-life requirements for anti-personnel mines until December 2007 would report on their progress in the implementation of those provisions to the current Conference. Japan had energetically supported mine action in recent years and, jointly with industry, the universities and civil society in the country, had embarked on the development of new mine detection and clearance equipment. Japan called on all States parties to reaffirm the significance of amended Protocol II, which regulated not only anti-personnel landmines but also mines other than anti-personnel mines, and to make efforts towards the steady implementation and progressive universalization of that instrument.

35. Mr. ANTONOV (Russian Federation), noting that amended Protocol II offered the unique advantage of reconciling the interests of all States, whether they were in favour of a complete ban on anti-personnel mines or had to make use of such devices to ensure their security, considered that the possibilities offered by the Protocol should be better exploited. In practical terms, efforts should be undertaken to make the Protocol universal by means of cooperation with States which had not yet acceded to it owing to a difficult military and political situation. The Russian Federation had had to overcome such difficulties itself before it was able to declare its consent to be bound by the Protocol, in December 2004. Its provisions should also be better applied. The Russian Federation was confident that the responsible implementation of the stipulations and prohibitions laid down in the Protocol would help to reduce considerably the number of victims of landmines and the damage they caused, obviating the need to adopt new instruments to address the problem.

36. For many years the Russian Federation had been taking practical steps to reduce the mine threat. It had renounced the production of blast mines more than 10 years previously, and had recently destroyed more than 8 million anti-personnel mines. The Ministry of Defence had drawn up recommendations on the laying and marking of minefields, and the armed forces had begun to implement the technical stipulations of the Protocol.

37. The Russian Federation had completed the handover to Tajikistan of all the records relating to minefields laid along the border between that country and Afghanistan. The Russian media disseminated information on the provisions of the Protocol and the steps taken by the authorities to ensure compliance. The Russian Federation had begun to develop new mine detection and neutralization techniques and had devised new means of destroying anti-personnel mines whose use was restricted by the Protocol. It offered to train foreign demining specialists as part of international cooperation.

38. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that his country attached a great deal of significance to amended Protocol II because of its very wide scope, the balance it struck between humanitarian concerns and States' security requirements, the effectiveness of its voluntary, non-intrusive and non-discriminatory compliance mechanism and the fact that the main mine-producing countries were parties to it. Pakistan fully applied its provisions and submitted its annual reports without fail.

39. In Pakistan, production of mines was restricted to the public sector, while storage of mines and emplacement during periods of active hostilities were entrusted to dedicated units of the armed forces. All necessary steps had been taken to protect civilians and military personnel against mines, in particular as regards information provided to members of the armed forces concerning the provisions of the Protocol and the risks posed by mines for the civilian population, marking of minefields, monitoring of minefields and their fencing in peacetime, education of civilians living in the vicinity of minefields, including children attending local schools, and assistance to Afghan refugees who were mine victims.

40. The States parties to the Protocol should spare no effort to universalize the instrument by emphasizing its benefits in terms of assistance for demining and rehabilitation of mine victims.

41. Ms. BAKER (United States of America) said that her country had become a party to amended Protocol II because it was committed to eliminating the risks posed to humans by all landmines, including anti-vehicle mines, and had in fact introduced prohibitions at the national level which went beyond the requirements of the Protocol. In February 2004 the Government of the United States had decided that, after the year 2010, the United States would no longer use persistent landmines, while continuing to authorize the use of mines with a short active life, which self-destructed and self-deactivated automatically and presented no significant risk for non-combatants. It had also prohibited the use of all non-detectable mines from 1 January 2005, whether they were anti-personnel mines or anti-vehicle mines.

42. At the international level, the United States had played a sustained major role in the persistent efforts of a score of donor countries and the European Commission to support mine action throughout the world. To date, the country had allocated over \$1 billion for demining, promotion of awareness of the risks posed by mines, assistance to mine accident survivors, research and development on the most effective mine detection and clearance techniques and training of foreign demining experts, in nearly 50 mine-affected countries. In fiscal year 2006 alone, United States humanitarian aid for mine action amounted to over \$76.6 million, which went to 30 mine-affected countries on four continents. Subject to approval by the United States Congress, a comparable sum would be earmarked for the same purpose in 2007. Its participation in mine action throughout the world had convinced the United States of the need to draw up a strong instrument to reduce the humanitarian impact of mines other than anti-personnel mines, and so it encouraged all States to combine their efforts to finalize such an instrument at the forthcoming third conference to review the Convention.

43. Mr. GOOSE (Human Rights Watch) noted with satisfaction that in only 10 years amended Protocol II had become largely redundant. In that time anti-personnel mines had been completely banned by the Ottawa Convention, as had anti-vehicle mines which functioned as anti-personnel mines, while the issue of post-conflict remedial measures had been resolved by the Ottawa Convention and, above all, Protocol V on explosive remnants of war. In that way, only the

provisions of Protocol II which related to anti-vehicle mines were still of effective use, although many States parties had emphasized that those provisions were too weak. He deplored the fact that States had not reached consensus on ways and means of strengthening those provisions. Moreover, amended Protocol II remained relevant only for the 10 States which were parties to it and had not yet acceded to the Ottawa Convention and accepted the stricter and more comprehensive obligations laid down in it. He considered that the Protocol should not be viewed as a convenient stage along the road to a complete ban on anti-personnel mines, in which States could still produce, stockpile and use such mines whereas the entire world community should condemn them.

44. That said, he noted with satisfaction that even States which were not parties to the Ottawa Convention acknowledged the rule it laid down and complied with it in practice. Even they had announced that they had ceased producing anti-personnel mines. World trade in anti-personnel mines had more or less stopped in 10 years, while only the Russian Federation and Myanmar had continued to lay mines during the past year. Many States which were not party to the Ottawa Convention had begun to vote in favour of the United Nations General Assembly's annual resolution on the Ottawa Convention, including China, Morocco, Sri Lanka and Finland, which were parties to amended Protocol II, and even Azerbaijan and Kuwait, which were parties to neither. He encouraged all States parties to the Protocol which had expressed support at the present Conference for the goal of a complete ban on anti-personnel mines to take the necessary steps immediately to become parties to the Ottawa Convention. Lastly, he noted with disappointment that neither China nor Pakistan had supplied details of what steps they had taken to be able to comply in December 2007 with the Protocol obligations whose application they had opted to defer.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE PROTOCOL (agenda item 9)

45. The PRESIDENT said that to date 86 had notified the depositary of their consent to be bound by the Protocol, a figure which remained relatively modest given the importance of the international instrument. He invited the States parties to examine possible ways and means of promoting the universalization of the instrument. In particular, he encouraged the six States which, at the time they declared their consent to be bound by the Protocol, had opted to defer the application of the provisions relating to detectability of anti-personnel mines and the active life of remotely delivered mines of that type to indicate, if they had not done so during the general exchange of views, where they stood in their preparations for the application of those provisions, as the deferral period would expire on 3 December 2007.

46. Ms. DUMPE (Latvia), noting that her country had opted for deferral of the implementation of the obligations relating to detectability and self-destruction of mines, said that her country had become a party to the Ottawa Convention on 1 January 2006, and had thus assumed legal obligations which rendered the deferral null and void. The Latvian Government had taken the necessary steps domestically to withdraw that reservation relating to amended Protocol II officially as soon as possible. The Latvian delegation would keep the States parties to the Protocol informed of progress with that procedure.

47. Mr. GRINEVICH (Belarus) said that there was little point at the present stage in a renunciation by Belarus of the deferral in the implementation of certain obligations it had entered into under amended Protocol II, since the country had in the meantime become a party to the

Ottawa Convention. Belarus did not intend to fit self-destruction, self-deactivation or self-neutralization mechanisms to its stocks of anti-personnel mines, since it would in any case have destroyed those stocks by 1 March 2008, in pursuance of the Ottawa Convention, with the assistance of NATO and the European Union.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS ARISING FROM REPORTS BY HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES ACCORDING TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF ARTICLE 13 OF THE AMENDED PROTOCOL II (agenda item 10)

48. The PRESIDENT noted that in 2006, 42 of the 86 States which had notified the depositary of their consent to be bound by amended Protocol II had submitted the national annual reports referred to in article 13. To date, 14 of those reports had been issued as official documents of the Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.8/NAR.1-14); 8 others would be issued when the secretariat had received them in electronic form. All the reports that had been submitted could be consulted on the Convention website, and the list of countries which had submitted them would appear in the report of the Conference.

49. At their Fifth Annual Conference, the States parties had decided to simplify the communication of national annual reports (CCW/AP.II/CONF.5/2, para. 20), and States parties could henceforth confine themselves to indicating on a sheet summarizing the situation that the information to be supplied for the current year on one or other of the forms had not changed since the previous year, and not complete the form or forms in question - in other words, they could submit only the new summary, the cover page and the forms containing new information.

50. In addition, in accordance with established practice, annual reports should be submitted no later than eight weeks prior to the convening of the annual conference. It was important for States parties to comply with that rule. The secretariat had prepared a table recapitulating the data supplied in 2006 in the national reports, which would be annexed to the final document of the Eighth Conference.

51. Mr. DALCERO (Brazil) said that Brazil would submit its national report that very day, and asked the secretariat to reflect that fact in the table.

CONSIDERATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGIES TO PROTECT CIVILIANS AGAINST INDISCRIMINATE EFFECTS OF MINES (agenda item 11)

52. The PRESIDENT noted that no delegation wished to speak under item 11.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.