

*Landmine Monitor Report 2004:  
Toward a Mine-Free World*

**Executive Summary**



Copyright © October 2004 by Human Rights Watch

*Landmine Monitor Core Group*  
Human Rights Watch  
Handicap International  
Kenya Coalition Against Landmines  
Mines Action Canada  
Norwegian People's Aid

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

This report was printed on recycled paper using vegetable based ink.

ISBN: 1-56432-327-7

Library of Congress Control Number: 2004112567

Cover photograph © Fred Clarke, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), August 2002

Cover design by Rafael Jiménez

*For a copy of Landmine Monitor Report 2004, please contact:*

International Campaign to Ban Landmines

[www.icbl.org/lm](http://www.icbl.org/lm)

Email: [lm@icbl.org](mailto:lm@icbl.org)

Human Rights Watch

1630 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20009, USA

Tel: +1 (202) 612-4321, Fax: +1 (202) 612-4333, Email: [hrwdc@hrw.org](mailto:hrwdc@hrw.org)

[www.hrw.org](http://www.hrw.org)

Handicap International

rue de Spa 67, B-1000 Brussels, BELGIUM

Tel: +32 (2) 286-50-59, Fax: +32 (2) 230-60-30, Email: [minepolicy@handicap.be](mailto:minepolicy@handicap.be)

[www.handicap-international.be](http://www.handicap-international.be)

Kenya Coalition Against Landmines

PO Box 57217, 00200 Nairobi, KENYA

Tel: +254 (20) 573-099 /572-388, Fax: + 254 (20) 573-099 Email: [kcal@africaonline.co.ke](mailto:kcal@africaonline.co.ke)

[www.k-cal.org](http://www.k-cal.org)

Mines Action Canada

1 Nicolas Street, Suite 1502, Ottawa, Ont K1N 7B7, CANADA

Tel: +1 (613) 241-3777, Fax: +1 (613) 244-3410, Email: [info@minesactioncanada.org](mailto:info@minesactioncanada.org)

[www.minesactioncanada.org](http://www.minesactioncanada.org)

Norwegian People's Aid

PO Box 8844, Youngstorget NO-0028, Oslo, NORWAY

Tel: +47 (22) 03-77-00, Fax: +47 (22) 20-08-70, Email: [lm@npaid.org](mailto:lm@npaid.org)

[www.npaid.org](http://www.npaid.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

About Landmine Monitor .....	1
Major Findings 1999-2004 .....	4
Banning Antipersonnel Mines .....	10
Universalization .....	10
Implementation – The Intersessional Work Program .....	12
Convention on Conventional Weapons.....	13
Global Use of Antipersonnel Mines.....	14
Global Production of Antipersonnel Mines .....	19
Global Trade in Antipersonnel Mines.....	20
Global Stockpiles of Antipersonnel Mines and their Destruction .....	21
Fulfilling Obligations under Article 4 of the Mine Ban Treaty .....	23
Mines Retained for Training and Research.....	24
Transparency Reporting.....	25
National Implementation Measures .....	26
Special Issues of Concern .....	27
Humanitarian Mine Action .....	36
Landmine Problem.....	36
Identification of Mined Areas.....	38
Mine Clearance .....	40
Mine Clearance Deadlines (Article 5) .....	43
Case Studies.....	45
Coordination and Planning .....	47
International Developments.....	48
Research and Development.....	50
Mine Risk Education.....	51
Landmine Casualties and Survivor Assistance .....	58
New Casualties in 2003-2004.....	59
Scale of the Problem .....	61
Casualty Data Collection .....	62
Addressing the Needs of Survivors.....	66
Capacities of Affected States to Provide Assistance .....	67
Challenges in Providing Assistance.....	76
International Developments.....	78
Mine Action Funding.....	81
Mine Action Donors .....	81
States and Victim Assistance .....	92
Major Mine Action Recipients.....	95
Mine Ban Treaty States Parties, Signatories, and Non-Signatories .....	101
Key Developments Since 1999.....	107
States Parties .....	107
Signatories .....	141

---

Non-Signatories .....	142
Other .....	152
Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction .....	155
Notes .....	170

### **ABOUT LANDMINE MONITOR**

This is the sixth Landmine Monitor report, the annual product of an unprecedented initiative by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) to monitor and report on implementation of and compliance with the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty, and more generally, to assess the international community's response to the humanitarian crisis caused by landmines. For the first time in history, non-governmental organizations have come together in a coordinated, systematic and sustained way to monitor a humanitarian law or disarmament treaty, and to regularly document progress and problems, thereby successfully putting into practice the concept of civil society-based verification.

Five previous annual reports have been released since 1999, each presented to the annual meetings of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty: in May 1999 in Maputo, Mozambique; in September 2000 in Geneva, Switzerland; in September 2001 in Managua, Nicaragua; in September 2002 in Geneva; and in Bangkok, Thailand in September 2003.

The Landmine Monitor system features a global reporting network and an annual report. A network of 110 Landmine Monitor researchers from 93 countries gathered information to prepare this report. The researchers come from the ICBL's campaigning coalition and also from other elements of civil society, including journalists, academics and research institutions.

Landmine Monitor is not a technical verification system or a formal inspection regime. It is an attempt by civil society to hold governments accountable to the obligations they have taken on with respect to antipersonnel mines. This is done through extensive collection, analysis and distribution of publicly available information. Although in some cases it does entail investigative missions, Landmine Monitor is not designed to send researchers into harm's way and does not include hot war-zone reporting.

Landmine Monitor is designed to complement the States Parties transparency reporting required under Article 7 of the Mine Ban Treaty. It reflects the shared view that transparency, trust and mutual collaboration are crucial elements of the successful eradication of antipersonnel mines. Landmine Monitor was also established in recognition of the need for independent reporting and evaluation.

Landmine Monitor and its annual reports aim to promote and advance discussion on mine-related issues, and to seek clarifications, in order to help reach the goal of a mine-free world. Landmine Monitor works in good faith to provide factual information about issues it is monitoring, in order to benefit the international community as a whole.

*Landmine Monitor Report 2004* contains information on every country in the world with respect to landmine ban policy, use, production, transfer, stockpiling, mine action funding, mine clearance, mine risk education, landmine casualties, and survivor assistance. It does not only report on States Parties and their treaty obligations, but looks at signatory states and non-signatories as well. Appendices with information from key players in mine action, such as UN agencies and the International Committee of the Red Cross, are also included.

As was the case in previous years, Landmine Monitor acknowledges that this ambitious report has its shortcomings. The Landmine Monitor is a system that is continuously updated, corrected and improved. Comments, clarifications, and corrections from governments and others are sought, in the spirit of dialogue and in the common search for accurate and reliable information on a difficult subject.

### **Landmine Monitor 2004 Process**

In June 1998, the ICBL formally agreed to create Landmine Monitor as an ICBL initiative. A Core Group was established to develop and coordinate the Landmine Monitor system, which consists of five organizations: Human Rights Watch, Handicap International, Kenya Coalition Against Landmines, Mines Action Canada, and Norwegian People's Aid. Human Rights Watch serves as the lead agency. The Core Group assumes overall responsibility for, and decision-making on, the Landmine Monitor system.

Research grants for *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* were awarded in November 2003, following a meeting of the Core Group in Washington, DC in October 2003. Members of the global research network met in six regional meetings between November 2003 and March 2004 to discuss preliminary findings, exchange information, assess what research and data gathering had already taken place, identify gaps, and ensure common research methods and reporting mechanisms for the Monitor. In March and April 2004, draft research reports were submitted to the Landmine Monitor research coordinators for review and comment. In May 2004, the global research network met in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina to discuss final reports and major findings with the research coordinators, as well as to engage in ICBL workshops and advocacy discussions. From May to September 2004, Landmine Monitor's team of regional and thematic coordinators verified sources and edited country reports, with a team at Human Rights Watch taking responsibility for final fact-checking, editing and assembly of the entire report. This report was printed during October and presented to the First Review Conference of States Parties to the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty in Nairobi, Kenya from 29 November to 3 December 2004.

*Landmine Monitor Report 2004* is available online at [www.icbl.org/lm](http://www.icbl.org/lm).

Last, but never least, we thank the donors to the Landmine Monitor initiative and this sixth report. Landmine Monitor's donors are in no way responsible for, and do not necessarily endorse, the material contained in this report. It was only possible to carry out this work with the aid of grants from:

- Government of Australia
- Government of Austria
- Government of Belgium
- Government of Canada
- Government of Denmark
- Government of France
- Government of Germany
- Government of Italy
- Government of Luxembourg
- Government of the Netherlands
- Government of New Zealand
- Government of Norway
- Government of Sweden
- Government of Switzerland
- Government of Turkey
- Government of the United Kingdom

- European Commission
- UNICEF

We also thank the donors who have contributed to the individual members of the Landmine Monitor Core Group and other participating organizations.

## **MAJOR FINDINGS 1999-2004**

It is abundantly clear from the wealth of information in *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* that the Mine Ban Treaty and the ban movement more generally are making tremendous strides in eradicating antipersonnel landmines and in saving lives and limbs in every region of the world. However, daunting challenges remain to universalize the treaty and strengthen the norm of banning antipersonnel mines, to clear mines from the ground, to destroy stockpiled antipersonnel mines, and to assist mine survivors. The ICBL believes that the only real measure of the Mine Ban Treaty's success will be the concrete impact that it has on the global antipersonnel mine problem. As with the five previous annual reports, *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* provides a means of measuring that impact.

The reporting period for *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* is May 2003 to May 2004. Editors have where possible added important information that arrived between June and September 2004. Additionally, special emphasis in this edition has been placed on the period since 1999, when the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force.

### *Key Indicators from the Past Five Years*

- 152 countries have agreed to ban antipersonnel mines.
- Sixty-two million stockpiled antipersonnel mines have been destroyed, including 37.3 million by Mine Ban Treaty States Parties.
- More than 1,100 square kilometers of land has been cleared since 1999, destroying more than four million antipersonnel mines, nearly one million antivehicle mines, and many more millions of pieces of unexploded ordnance (UXO).
- Donors provided more than \$1.35 billion to mine action from 1999-2003, and about \$2.1 billion since 1992.
- About 22.9 million people attended mine risk education sessions between 1999 and 2003.
- From 1999 to September 2004, *Landmine Monitor* has recorded more than 42,500 new landmine and UXO casualties from incidents in at least 75 countries. However, many casualties go unreported and the full number of casualties is certainly much higher, probably in the range of 15,000 to 20,000 new casualties a year.
- The only governments that have used mines continuously in the 1999-2004 period are Russia and Myanmar (Burma).
- There has been no publicly acknowledged, legal trade in antipersonnel mines.

### ✓ *Widespread international rejection of antipersonnel mines*

A total of 143 countries are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, and another nine have signed but not yet ratified, constituting more than three-quarters of the world's nations. Since the last *Landmine Monitor* report, nine countries joined the treaty including Burundi and Sudan, which are both mine-affected, and Belarus, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro, and Turkey which combined have over 10 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines to destroy. A number of other governments took significant steps toward joining and were poised to ratify or accede including Brunei, Latvia, Poland and Vanuatu.

**X** *Universalization challenges*

The fact that only two nations joined the Mine Ban Treaty from November 2003-September 2004, despite increased universalization efforts on the part of governments and NGOs in the lead-up to the Nairobi Summit, is disturbing. Forty-two countries, with a combined stockpile of some 180-185 million antipersonnel mines, remain outside of the Mine Ban Treaty. They include three of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (China, Russia, and the United States), most of the Middle East, most of the former Soviet republics, and many Asian states. In February 2004, the United States abandoned its long-held goal of eventually eliminating all antipersonnel mines. Finland announced in September 2004 that it would not join the Mine Ban Treaty until 2012, six years later than its previously stated goal.

**✓** *Fewer governments using antipersonnel mines*

The marked drop in the use of antipersonnel mines around the globe since the mid-1990s is without question one of the great achievements of the Mine Ban Treaty and the movement to ban antipersonnel mines more generally. Landmine Monitor has confirmed use of antipersonnel mines by 16 governments at some point since 1999 and there is compelling evidence that another five have used them. In looking at the trend, *Landmine Monitor Report 1999* identified confirmed or likely use by 15 governments in 1998/1999, while *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* identifies four governments that used antipersonnel mines in 2003/2004.

**X** *Antipersonnel mine use by Mine Ban Treaty non-States Parties*

The only governments that have used mines continuously in the 1999-2004 period are Russia and Myanmar (Burma). In addition, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, and Yugoslavia have admitted to using antipersonnel mines during the period; Landmine Monitor also finds that Georgia has laid antipersonnel mines on several occasions, but this is denied by the government. Two of these countries have since become States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty: Eritrea in February 2002 and Serbia and Montenegro (formerly FR Yugoslavia) in March 2004.

**X** *Antipersonnel mine use by Mine Ban Treaty States Parties and Signatories*

Landmine Monitor has found no definitive evidence of use of antipersonnel mines by any State Party, but there were serious and credible allegations regarding Uganda in 2000. Angola, Ecuador, Ethiopia, and Venezuela have acknowledged using antipersonnel mines after signing the treaty, but prior to becoming States Parties. There have been serious allegations about use by three other signatories—Burundi, Rwanda and Sudan—all of which are now States Parties.

**X** *Non-State Actors using antipersonnel mines*

Landmine Monitor has identified at least 70 armed non-state actors (NSAs) that have used antipersonnel mines since 1999. NSAs have regularly used mines in Burma, Burundi, Chechnya, Colombia, DR

Congo, India, Nepal, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda. Widespread rebel use in Sri Lanka and Angola stopped with their cease-fire and peace agreements, respectively. Rebels and other NSAs used antipersonnel mines in at least 16 countries in 2003 and 2004. In this year's report, NSA use is cited for the first time in Bolivia, Bhutan, Iraq, and Peru.

✓ *Decreased production*

Of the more than 50 states known to have produced antipersonnel mines, 36 states have formally renounced and ceased production. This includes three countries that are not party to the Mine Ban Treaty: Finland, Israel, and Poland. Since it began reporting in 1999, Landmine Monitor has removed Turkey and Serbia and Montenegro from its list of producers. Egypt has unofficially stated that it ceased production in 1988. The US has not produced antipersonnel mines since 1997. South Korea has stated it has not produced any mines since 2000. An official from China stated in September 2003 that no production is occurring there. Production of certain types of antipersonnel mines by Russia has apparently stopped.

✗ *Ongoing production*

Landmine Monitor identifies 15 countries as producers of antipersonnel mines. Nepal was added to the list in 2003, making it the first addition to the ranks of the producers since Landmine Monitor reporting started in 1999. In some cases it is unclear if production lines were active between 1999 and 2004. An Iraqi diplomat stated that production continued in recent years, including during the lead-up to the invasion in 2003, but that facilities were destroyed in the war. India and Pakistan are actively engaged in the production of antipersonnel mines, including new remotely delivered mine systems. Officials in Singapore and Vietnam admit that the production of antipersonnel mines is on-going. Burma, Cuba, and North Korea have made no public confirmation or denial of production activity since 1999.

✓ *De facto global ban on trade in antipersonnel mine*

A *de facto* global ban on the transfer or export of antipersonnel mines has been in effect since 1996. The trade in antipersonnel mines has dwindled to a very low level of illicit trafficking and unacknowledged trade. A significant number of states outside the Mine Ban Treaty have enacted or extended export moratoria in the past five years including China, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and the United States. In addition, representatives of Cuba, Egypt, and Vietnam have claimed not to export antipersonnel mines, although no formal unilateral prohibition has been put into place.

✓ *Millions of stockpiled antipersonnel mines destroyed*

At the time when the Mine Ban Treaty was negotiated and entered into force, a staggering 131 states possessed stockpiles estimated at more than 260 million antipersonnel mines. In this Landmine Monitor reporting period, some four million stockpiled antipersonnel mines were destroyed, bringing the global total to about 62 million antipersonnel mines destroyed in recent years. Sixty-five States Parties have completed the destruction of their stockpiles, collectively destroying more than 37.3 million antipersonnel mines. Italy destroyed the most mines (7.1 million), followed by Turkmenistan (6.6 million). Albania, France, Germany, Japan, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom have each destroyed more than one million antipersonnel mines.

✗ *Millions of mines stockpiled by non-States Parties*

The greatest numbers of antipersonnel mines, between 180 million and 185 million, are stockpiled by states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty. The majority of these stockpiles belong to just three states: China (estimated 110 million), Russia (estimated 50 million) and the United States (10.4 million). Other states with large stockpiles include Pakistan (estimated 6 million), India (estimated 4-5 million), and South Korea (2 million). Other states not party to the treaty believed to have large stockpiles are Burma, Egypt, Finland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, North Korea, Syria, and Vietnam.

✗ *Failure to meet transparency reporting requirement*

While the compliance rate for States Parties submitting initial transparency measures reports required by Article 7 of the Mine Ban Treaty is a very admirable 91 percent, twelve States Parties are late in submitting their reports: Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Liberia, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, and Turkey. Equatorial Guinea (due date 28 August 1999), St. Lucia (29 March 2000), and Liberia (28 November 2000) can only be considered grossly non-compliant in fulfilling the treaty's transparency obligation. All three have passed their deadlines for destroying any stockpiled antipersonnel mines, but have not informed States Parties of compliance with this core obligation.

✗ *Failure to reach understandings on the meaning of key treaty obligations*

Since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force, the ICBL has consistently raised questions about how States Parties interpret and implement certain aspects of Articles 1, 2, and 3. In particular, the ICBL has expressed concerns regarding the issues of joint military operations with non-States Parties, the prohibition on "assist," foreign stockpiling and transit of antipersonnel mines, mines with sensitive fuzes and antihandling devices, and the permissible number of mines retained for training and development purposes. The ICBL has pointed out that some States Parties have diverged from the predominant legal interpretation and predominant State practice on these matters.

✓ *Increased mine action donations*

Landmine Monitor has identified about US\$2.07 billion in donor mine action contributions from 1992-2003. Of that 12-year total, 65 percent (\$1.35 billion) was provided in the past five years (1999-2003), since the entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty. For 2003, Landmine Monitor has identified \$339 million in mine action funding by more than 24 donors. This is an increase of \$25 million, or 8 percent, from 2002, and an increase of \$102 million, or 43 percent, from 2001. Major increases were registered for the European Commission and the United States, as well as Canada and Sweden.

✗ *Donor decreases in mine action funding*

In 2003, mine action funding fell significantly for several of the major donors, including Japan, Austria, Italy, Australia, France, and the Netherlands.

✓ *Increases in funding received*

Top recipients of mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) were Afghanistan (\$200 million), Iraq (\$149 million), Cambodia (\$114 million), Kosovo (\$89 million), Angola (\$84 million), Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$82 million) and Mozambique (\$73 million). In 2003, mine action funding for Afghanistan continued to rise, to \$75 million, making a two-year total of \$141 million. Funds also poured into Iraq after the invasion and ouster of Saddam Hussein, with some \$55 million contributed in 2003. Sri Lanka and Sudan are emerging as significant recipients.

✗ *More funding needed*

An unusually large number of mine-affected countries experienced a decline in donor contributions to mine action in 2003. Mine action funding fell most severely in 2003 for Vietnam and Cambodia, but decreases were also seen for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Eritrea, Somaliland, Laos, and Ethiopia. Resources for mine victim assistance have declined since 1999, even as the number of landmine survivors requiring assistance has continued to grow every year.

✓ *Expanding mine action programs*

Some form of mine clearance was reported to have taken place in 2003 and 2004 in a total of 65 countries and seven areas, including humanitarian mine clearance that benefited the civilian population in 36 countries. In this reporting period, humanitarian mine clearance operations started for the first time in Armenia (May 2003), Chile (September 2003), Senegal (late 2003), and Tajikistan (June 2004). A combined total of more than 149 million square meters of land was cleared in 2003, destroying 174,167 antipersonnel mines, 9,330 antivehicle mines, and 2.6 million items of UXO.

✓ *Several States Parties have declared fulfillment of clearance obligations*

Countries that have declared completion of mine clearance since the publication of *Landmine Monitor Report 1999* include Bulgaria (October 1999), Moldova (August 2000), Costa Rica (December 2002),

Czech Republic (April 2003), Djibouti (January 2004) and, most recently, Honduras (June 2004). In June 2004, Namibia stated that while there was still a problem on the country's border with Angola, the country could be viewed as mine safe.

*✘ Still too many mine-affected countries and not enough being done*

Uncleared landmines and UXO affect millions of people living in 83 countries. In 2003 and 2004, no clearance activities were recorded in 20 of those countries, including Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Republic of Congo, Cuba, Denmark, France (Djibouti), Liberia, Malawi, Morocco, Niger, North Korea, Oman, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Syria, Tunisia, Uzbekistan, and Venezuela. In 2003 and 2004, no mine risk education activities were recorded in 23 mine-affected countries, including 13 States Parties.

*✓ Fewer new mine victims in some countries*

The number of reported new casualties declined in 2003 from those reported in 2002 in the majority of mine-affected countries; in some cases significantly, such as in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Lebanon, Senegal, and Sri Lanka. However, civilians account for the vast majority of new landmine casualties; 86 percent of reported casualties in 2004 were identified as civilians.

*✘ More mine victims needing assistance*

For 2003, Landmine Monitor identified over 8,065 new casualties, of which 23 percent were children, in 65 countries. Compared to last year's Landmine Monitor Report, there were four new countries with reported casualties from mine-related incidents: Armenia, Bolivia, Cyprus, and Liberia. Landmine Monitor has identified more than 230,000 mine survivors recorded in 97 countries and nine areas; some are from incidents dating back to the end of the World War II, but the vast majority of survivors are from the mid-1970s onwards. Given the high number of casualties that likely have never been recorded, it is reasonable to assume that there are somewhere between 300,000 and 400,000 mine survivors in the world today.

### **BANNING ANTIPERSONNEL MINES**

Since March 1999, pursuing a ban on antipersonnel mines through cooperative implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty has produced impressive results. The compliance rate for States Parties submitting initial transparency measures reports is an admirable 91 percent.<sup>1</sup> A total of 80 States Parties declared stockpiles totaling over 48 million antipersonnel mines, 37.3 million of which have been destroyed. Sixty-five States Parties have completed stockpile destruction. Another 51 States Parties have declared that they did not possess stockpiles to be destroyed. Forty States Parties have enacted national legislation to implement the treaty. Some states not party to the treaty have voluntarily submitted transparency reports and states globally observe an unofficial ban on the transfer and export of antipersonnel mines.

Unfortunately, antipersonnel mines continued to be used albeit at lower rates and scale than in previous decades. At least 13 non-signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty have used antipersonnel mines in the past five years.<sup>2</sup> Another four states have admitted using antipersonnel mines after signing the treaty, and there have been serious allegations about use by three other signatories and one State Party.<sup>3</sup> Fifteen states actively produce or retain the right to produce antipersonnel mines. Stockpiles of antipersonnel mines globally remain considerable and in some cases appear to be unsecured. While the global trade in antipersonnel mines has collapsed, armed non-state actors continue to have access to manufactured antipersonnel mines. Landmine Monitor has identified at least 70 armed non-state groups that have used antipersonnel mines in the past five years.

As an alternative to a total ban, ten states follow regulations on the use of antipersonnel mines contained in the 1996 amendment of Protocol II of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW).<sup>4</sup> Sixty-nine states are party to both this agreement and the Mine Ban Treaty.<sup>5</sup> There are 27 states that have not joined either the Mine Ban Treaty, Protocol II, or Amended Protocol II.<sup>6</sup>

#### **Universalization**

Sustained and extensive outreach efforts by States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty have helped to expand the ban on antipersonnel mines to countries that at one time expressed difficulties with joining. A total of 76 states have ratified or acceded (57 ratified and 19 acceded) to the treaty since 1 March 1999, and 67 before that date. There are nine states that have signed but not yet ratified the treaty: Brunei, Cook Islands, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Marshall Islands, Poland, Ukraine, and Vanuatu. The numbers of states that ratified or acceded to the treaty each year since it opened for signature are as follows: 1997 (December only)—3; 1998—55; 1999—32 (23 after 1 March); 2000—19; 2001—13; 2002—8; 2003—11; 2004 (as of Oct.)—2.

A total of nine states joined the treaty since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. Guyana ratified in August 2003; Greece ratified and Belarus, Serbia & Montenegro, and Turkey acceded in September 2003; Burundi and Sudan ratified in October 2003; Estonia acceded in May 2004; and Papua New Guinea acceded in June 2004. Four of these states hold over 10 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines combined (Belarus, Greece, Serbia & Montenegro, Turkey). Two are significantly mine-affected and experiencing internal conflict in which antipersonnel mines are still being used (Burundi and Sudan). While these are very important additions, the fact that only two nations joined from November 2003-September 2004, despite increased universalization efforts on the part of governments and NGOs in the lead-up to the Nairobi Summit, is disturbing.

There are positive indications from a number of states that they will join the treaty in the near-term. Latvia has declared that it intends to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty by November 2004. Likewise, in June 2004, an official from Vanuatu told States Parties that ratification should “definitely” be completed by the opening of the Review Conference in November 2004. The ratification process in Brunei has progressed and as of August 2004 was reportedly in its final stage. On 10 September 2004, Bhutan formally indicated that it intends to accede, but must wait until its national assembly next meets in mid-2005. On 24 September 2004, the Council of Ministers in Ethiopia reportedly approved ratification legislation and unanimously agreed to send it to the national parliament for consideration. It was also reported in September 2004 that Poland’s Defense Ministry supported ratification of the treaty and that the Defense Minister did not see any obstacles to beginning the process of ratification.

There has been less encouraging progress toward ratification for the other signatories. In March 2004, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Haiti stated that ratification legislation would soon be published, but this had not occurred by September 2004. Indonesia has repeatedly stated its commitment to the Mine Ban Treaty, but has not prioritized ratification. The government of Ukraine is still seeking guarantees from the international community to address the stockpile destruction issue of almost 6 million PFM mines before ratification can proceed. No apparent progress has been made toward ratification by the Cook Islands and Marshall Islands.

A number of other non-signatory States have made statements indicating that they intend to eventually accede. Morocco has stressed that it is in *de facto* compliance with the treaty. In February 2004, Sri Lanka set a goal of becoming mine-free by the end of 2006 and said that it is working toward possible accession. Also in February, Palau said it is taking every step to make sure it will soon join the treaty. Laos is showing increasing interest in accession and officials made positive comments at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in Bangkok. Mongolia has repeatedly expressed its commitment to the ultimate goal of a total ban of landmines and a process to assess accession to the treaty had been initiated.

One opportunity for states to indicate their support for a ban on antipersonnel mines has been annual voting for UN General Assembly (UNGA) resolutions. In December 1995, a US-proposed resolution called for the “eventual elimination” of antipersonnel mines, attracted 110 co-sponsors, and was adopted without a vote. A year later, UNGA Resolution 51/45S unambiguously called for states to pursue a legally-binding agreement to ban the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of antipersonnel mines as soon as possible. A total of 155 states supported the resolution, no state voted against it, but ten states abstained.<sup>7</sup> Two of the ten have subsequently joined the treaty: Belarus and Turkey.

Beginning in 1997, the annual UNGA resolution on antipersonnel mines was recast to indicate support for the universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty.<sup>8</sup> Many non-States Parties consistently voted in favor of these resolutions from 1997-2003, including Armenia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Mongolia, Nepal, Oman, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tonga, and the United Arab Emirates.<sup>9</sup> The 20 or so states habitually abstaining in voting on the resolution have also remained relatively consistent, including Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Libya, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Morocco, Myanmar (Burma), Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Syria, United States, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam. Lebanon is the only state to ever vote against a resolution, in 1999. Tajikistan is in the anomalous position of being the only State Party to abstain from voting, in both 2002 and 2003. The vote on the resolution in 2003 totaled the highest number of favorable votes, 153.

Despite the growing list of states committed to banning antipersonnel mines, there were discouraging actions and inactions among some of the 42 states not party to the treaty. Most egregious, government forces in Georgia, Myanmar (Burma), Nepal and Russia continued to use antipersonnel mines. In February 2004, the United States abandoned its goal of joining the Mine Ban Treaty in 2006, and instead indicated it would keep self-destruct and self-deactivating antipersonnel mines in its arsenals indefinitely. On 10 September 2004, Finland announced that it would not join the Mine Ban Treaty until 2012, six years later than its previously stated goal.

### **Implementation – The Intersessional Work Program**

States Parties have created an array of structures and processes to ensure progress is made in implementing the Mine Ban Treaty. These include the intersessional work program (established in 1999); the Coordinating Committee (2000); the Contact Groups on Universalization (1999), Articles 7 and 9 (2000), and Resource Mobilization (2002); the Sponsorship Program (2000); and the Implementation Support Unit (2001).

During 2003-2004, the intersessional work program, established to carry the work of the Mine Ban Treaty forward between the annual Meetings of States Parties, focused on the needs, gaps, and resources available for the implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. The landmark “Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World” formed a central focus for Standing Committees’ decision-making and planning. The intersessional meetings are unique for their informality, inclusiveness and sense of cooperation. The ICBL and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) remained full and active participants in the intersessional process, showing that the strong partnership with governments continues.

The four Standing Committees—Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration; Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies; Stockpile Destruction; and General Status and Operation of the Convention—each met twice in 2003 and twice in 2004 at the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) in Geneva. An Action Program endorsed at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties served as the basis for planning for the fifth year of intersessional work. Approximately 535 participants representing 120 countries, ICBL members, and international, UN and regional organizations attended intersessional Standing Committee meetings held in February and June 2004.

The Coordinating Committee (CC) of the States Parties met monthly in 2003 and 2004 to discuss practical coordination matters relating to the intersessional work program and the Mine Ban Treaty more generally. The President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties chairs the CC, which includes the co-chairs and co-rapporteurs of the intersessional Standing Committees, the chairs of the ad hoc contact groups for Universalization (Canada), Articles 7 & 9 (Belgium), Resource Mobilization (Norway), and the Sponsorship Group (UK), and the presidents of past and forthcoming Meetings of States Parties. The ICBL and ICRC continued to participate in these meetings on a regular basis.

Since the Mine Ban Treaty’s Implementation Support Unit (ISU) became operational in January 2002, it has more than proven its worth by ensuring better preparations for the intersessional meetings, providing valuable support to all interested States, serving as an information source, and contributing to strategic thinking on how to achieve the overall goals of the treaty. The ICBL works very closely with

the ISU. The ISU together with the Sponsorship Group of interested States Parties helps to enable full participation in the intersessional program of mine-affected countries with limited resources.

### **Convention on Conventional Weapons**

A total of 97 states were party to the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) as of 1 October 2004. In December 2001, States Parties to the CCW agreed to expand the scope of the CCW to apply to internal as well as international armed conflicts; by 1 October 2004, 35 had ratified this amendment to Article 1 of the Convention.<sup>10</sup> The amendment entered into force on 18 May 2004. The States Parties also agreed to form a Group of Governmental Experts to explore the problems posed by explosive remnants of war (ERW) and mines other than antipersonnel mines (MOTAPM).

In December 2003, the States Parties agreed to adopt a legally binding instrument on generic, post-conflict remedial measures for ERW. Three states have ratified this Protocol V so far: Sweden, Lithuania, and Sierra Leone. Work on MOTAPM continued in 2004 as did discussions on measures to prevent specific weapons, including cluster munitions, from becoming ERW.

A total of 80 countries were States Parties to Amended Protocol II of the CCW, as of 1 October 2004. Amended Protocol II regulates landmines, booby-traps and other explosive devices; it took effect on 3 December 1998. A total of 11 states have joined since the publication of *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*: Belarus, Burkina Faso, Chile, Honduras, Malta, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and Turkmenistan. All are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty except Sri Lanka and Poland (a signatory). Ten of the 80 States Parties to Amended Protocol II have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty: China, Finland, India, Israel, Latvia, Morocco, Pakistan, South Korea, Sri Lanka, and the United States.

Two States Parties to Amended Protocol II are known to have used antipersonnel mines since December 1998: India and Pakistan.<sup>11</sup> US forces in Afghanistan have incorporated Soviet-era minefields into their perimeter defense, deriving military advantage from these minefields. India, Pakistan, and the US are obligated to comply with CCW Amended Protocol II requirements to mark and monitor minefields to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians. But none of these countries provided detailed information on measures taken in their annual national reports for Amended Protocol II submitted in December 2002 or December 2003.

China and Pakistan deferred compliance with the requirements on detectability of antipersonnel mines, as provided for in the Technical Annex of Amended Protocol II, until 3 December 2007. Neither country has provided detailed information on the steps taken thus far to meet the detectability requirement.

Remotely-delivered antipersonnel mine systems are stockpiled by Belarus, China, Greece, Israel, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and the US, while India is developing such systems. Bulgaria, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Turkmenistan, and the UK have destroyed their stockpiles of remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines in order to comply with Article 4 of the Mine Ban Treaty. Belarus, Greece, and Turkey will also have to destroy their remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines by 1 March 2008.

Amended Protocol II States Parties China, Pakistan, and Ukraine have deferred compliance with the self-destruction and self-deactivation requirements for remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines provided in the Technical Annex. They have up to nine years to come into full compliance with the technical

specifications. The deadlines for this action are 3 December 2007 for China and Pakistan, and 15 May 2008 for Ukraine. Ukraine, a signatory of the Mine Ban Treaty, is taking steps to destroy its stockpile of nearly six million PFM-type remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines. India and Pakistan have reported that new compliant remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines are being developed and tested.

### **Global Use of Antipersonnel Mines**

The marked drop in the use of antipersonnel mines around the globe since the mid-1990s is without question one of the great achievements of the Mine Ban Treaty and the movement to ban antipersonnel mines more generally. Antipersonnel mines have been used by fewer countries and in lesser numbers than seen from the 1960s through the early 1990s, when the global landmine crisis was created.

Since 1999, there have been three instances in which government forces have made very extensive use of antipersonnel mines. India and Pakistan mined their border during a period of tensions from December 2001 to mid-2002, laying perhaps two million or more mines. Russian forces used perhaps hundreds of thousands of hand-emplaced and scatterable mines in Chechnya in 1999 and 2000. Ethiopia and Eritrea laid hundreds of thousands of antipersonnel mines during their border war from 1998 to mid-2000.

The only governments that have used mines continuously in the 1999-2004 period are Russia and Myanmar (Burma). Landmine Monitor has confirmed use of antipersonnel mines by 16 governments at some point since 1999.<sup>12</sup> There is compelling evidence that another five have used them.<sup>13</sup> In looking at the trend, *Landmine Monitor Report 1999* identified confirmed use by eight governments, and compelling evidence of use by another seven; in 2000, the totals were eight and four; in 2001, nine and four; in 2002, nine and five, in 2003, six and three; and in 2004, three and one.

In the current reporting period (since May 2003), there is confirmed use of antipersonnel mines by three governments: Burma/Myanmar, Nepal and Russia. There is compelling evidence of use by one other government: Georgia. Additionally, there have been serious allegations of ongoing use by the armed forces of Burundi (a signatory since 1997 and a State Party since April 2004). There have also been some reports of use in this reporting period by Cuba and Uzbekistan.

### ***Antipersonnel Mine Use Since May 2003***

*Mine Ban Treaty States Parties:* In this reporting period, Landmine Monitor has found no definitive evidence of use of antipersonnel mines by any State Party. However, in Burundi, a number of mine incidents, as well as statements by Burundi officials, UN representatives, and local populations, give rise to concerns of continued mine use by the Burundi Armed Forces, though Landmine Monitor cannot determine with certainty when the mines were laid, or by whom. Burundi ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 22 October 2003 and became a State Party on 1 April 2004. Burundi strongly denies any use of mines.

*Mine Ban Treaty Signatories:* Other than Burundi, there have not been any serious allegations of use of antipersonnel mines by signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty in this reporting period.

*Mine Ban Treaty Non-Signatories:* The government of Nepal acknowledges using antipersonnel mines in this reporting period, and it is clear that the government forces in Myanmar and Russia

continued to lay mines. There have been credible reports of use by Georgian forces. There have also been isolated reports of new use of antipersonnel mines by Cuba and Uzbekistan.

*Armed Non-State Actors (NSAs):* Armed opposition groups have used antipersonnel mines in at least 16 countries in this reporting period. In some cases this involved use of standard, factory-manufactured mines, but often involved homemade mines, improvised explosive devices and explosive booby-traps. Mine use by NSAs was reported in the following States Parties: Bolivia, Burundi, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Peru, Philippines, Turkey, and Uganda. NSAs used antipersonnel mines in these non-States Parties: Bhutan, Burma/Myanmar, Georgia, India, Iraq, Nepal, Russia (in Chechnya and North Ossetia), and Somalia.

Use of antipersonnel mines by NSAs is cited in four countries for the first time since Landmine Monitor began reporting in 1999: Bolivia, Bhutan, Iraq and Peru. Renewed use of antipersonnel mines by the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) has returned Turkey to the list, and fresh evidence of use by the Lord's Resistance Army has returned Uganda to the list.

The use of antipersonnel mines by Non-State Actors in 16 countries in this reporting period compares to reported NSA use in 11 countries in *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, 14 countries in *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, and 18 countries in *Landmine Monitor Reports 2001, 2000, and 1999*.

Sporadic and small-scale use, including by criminals, was reported in Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Serbia and Montenegro.

#### *Initiation of Use of Antipersonnel Mines*

In Sudan, Landmine Monitor has received reports in 2004 of use of antipersonnel mines by government-supported militias in Upper Nile. In the DR Congo, the Army accused insurgent troops of new mine use when their forces took the town of Bukavu in May/June 2004.

In Bolivia, there were numerous incidents involving the use of Improvised Explosive Devices by cocaleros (coca leaf-growing farmers). In Peru, in June and July 2003, the media reported that the Shining Path had used landmines in various villages in the department of Ayacucho, Huanta province. According to some media sources, Cuba has planted mines in the wake of the US invasion of Iraq and increased tensions with the US.

In Nepal, there were no confirmed instances of new mine use by security forces or Maoist rebels during the cease-fire from January to August 2003, but in the wake of renewed fighting since then, both sides are again laying mines or improvised explosive devices in significant numbers. In Bhutan, Indian rebels are reported to have used antipersonnel mines during a Bhutanese military offensive to oust them in December 2003.

In Georgia, a group of insurgents in Ajaria province reportedly laid landmines in 2004. In February 2004, Kyrgyzstan accused Uzbekistan of replanting mines in areas that Kyrgyzstan had recently cleared. In Turkey, the government reported that in 2004, attacks by the PKK increased, including use of mines; this is the first time in several years the PKK has been accused of laying mines.

Since August 2003, Iraqi insurgents have greatly increased their use of improvised explosive devices.

*Ongoing and Increased Use of Antipersonnel Mines*

In Burundi, FNL rebel forces have continued to use antipersonnel mines, and there have been continued allegations and indicators of use of antipersonnel mines by government forces as well. In Uganda, the government has stated that the Lord's Resistance Army has continued to lay antipersonnel mines in the north in 2003 and 2004. Various factions in Somalia continued to lay landmines, impeding the initiation of any mine action activities.

It appears that rebel and paramilitary forces in Colombia are among the most prolific users of antipersonnel mines in the world. In 2003 and 2004, the use of mines, especially by FARC, continued at a significant level.

Myanmar's military and at least 15 rebel groups have continued to use antipersonnel mines; there are some indications of increased mine warfare. In India there continue to be numerous reports of armed NSAs using improvised explosive devices, and sometimes landmines, including insurgent groups in Jammu and Kashmir and Naxalite militants in Central and Eastern Indian states. In the Philippines, the rebel New People's Army and Abu Sayyaf Group used improvised landmines; the armed forces also accused the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, which denied laying mines. In Pakistan, antivehicle mines and improvised explosive devices have been used in tribal conflicts and against government law enforcement agencies, most notably in Baluchistan. In Afghanistan there have been some reports indicating new use of antipersonnel mines by Taliban or other opposition forces.

Russian forces and Chechen fighters continued to use antipersonnel mines. The rebels who seized the school in Beslan, North Ossetia in 2004 with disastrous consequences emplaced both antipersonnel mines and improvised explosive devices throughout the school. Despite a formal moratorium on use of antipersonnel mines, it appears that Georgian forces have used antipersonnel several years in a row, in various locations. In September 2004, the OSCE expressed concern about new mine-laying by both Georgian and South Ossetian forces.

**Use of Antipersonnel Mines Since May 2003\***

<b>Africa</b>	<b>Americas</b>	<b>Asia/Pacific</b>	<b>Europe/ Central Asia</b>	<b>Middle East/ North Africa</b>
Burundi: <i>rebels</i> DR Congo: <i>NSAs</i> Somalia: <i>various factions</i> Uganda: <i>LRA rebels</i>	Bolivia: <i>NSAs</i> Colombia: <i>FARC and other rebels, AUC paramilitaries</i> Peru: <i>Shining Path rebels</i>	Bhutan: <i>Indian rebels</i> Burma/Myanmar: <i>government and 15 rebel groups</i> India: <i>rebels</i> Nepal: <i>government and Maoist rebels</i> Philippines: <i>rebels</i>	Georgia: <i>government and NSAs</i> Russia: <i>government and rebels (in Chechnya and North Ossetia)</i> Turkey: <i>PKK rebels</i>	Iraq: <i>NSAs</i>

\*In addition, there have been serious allegations of use by government troops in Burundi and government-backed militia in Sudan. There were also reports of new use by Cuba and Uzbekistan.

### ***Key Developments Since 1999***

#### *Cessation of Use of Antipersonnel Mines*

Since 1999, government and rebel forces in three of the most mine-affected countries in the world have foresworn use. Use stopped in Afghanistan (aside from sporadic instances) with the fall of the Taliban in late 2001, in Sri Lanka with the cease-fires in December 2001, and in Angola with the peace agreement in April 2002.

#### *Mine Use in Africa*

Angola signed the Mine Ban Treaty on 4 December 1997, but acknowledged that it continued to use antipersonnel landmines until the peace agreement signed with UNITA forces in April 2002; UNITA forces also used mines until the agreement. There have been credible, though unconfirmed, allegations of antipersonnel landmine use by the Burundi Army throughout the period since 1999. The government has strongly denied the charges. Rebels have admitted to using antipersonnel mines in Burundi. Since 1999, many armed forces have been accused of using antipersonnel mines in the Democratic Republic of Congo, including those of Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda. All have denied it. There were serious and credible allegations indicating a strong possibility of Ugandan use of antipersonnel mines in the DRC, particularly in the June 2000 battle for Kisangani; Uganda was already a State Party at the time.

In Sudan, from 1999-2002, Landmine Monitor reported serious allegations about use of antipersonnel mines by government forces, the SPLM/A and other rebel groups. The government has consistently denied any use. During their 1998–2000 border conflict, Eritrean forces laid an estimated 240,000 mines, and Ethiopian forces laid an estimated 150,000 to 200,000. Eritrea has admitted to using mines, but Ethiopia has been reluctant to do so.

#### *Mine Use in the Americas*

Landmines have been used more extensively in Colombia than anywhere else in the Americas; at many points since 1999, Colombia has been the only location in the hemisphere where mines were being used. FARC guerrillas have been the main users, but other guerrilla groups as well as the AUC paramilitaries are also responsible. The government reports very significant increases in use in 2003 and 2004; the number of mine-affected municipalities increased from 125 in 1999 to 422 in 2003.

In its 2002 and 2003 Article 7 reports, Venezuela revealed that it had laid antipersonnel mines in May 1998, five months after signing the Mine Ban Treaty, but prior to entry-into-force. Similarly, in its Article 7 report, Ecuador revealed that it laid antipersonnel mines from 1995 to 1998, confirming mine use after it had signed the Mine Ban Treaty in December 1997, but prior to entry-into-force. The United States apparently did not use antipersonnel mines in Iraq in 2003, and according to the government's statements, has not used antipersonnel mines since the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

#### *Mine Use in Asia/Pacific*

In Afghanistan, the Taliban declared an end to the use of mines in 1998, but began using them again in 2001 after the Coalition invasion. The Northern Alliance used landmines throughout the period since 1999. During the military operations in late 2001 and 2002, Northern Alliance, Taliban, and Al-Qaeda

fighters all used landmines and booby-traps. There has been continuous use of antipersonnel mines in Burma (Myanmar) since 1999 by Myanmar's military and at least 15 rebel groups. It appears that mine warfare has increased during much of the period.

India's massive mine-laying operation on its border in late 2001 and early 2002 was characterized as one of the biggest in years or decades anywhere in the world; apparently millions of mines were emplaced. Pakistan also laid large numbers of mines at that time. In Nepal, government forces and Maoist rebels have used antipersonnel landmines and improvised explosive devices in the internal conflict since 1996. The Maoists have used mines/IEDs much more extensively than security forces. The use of mines and IEDs increased every year from 1999 to 2002, until the cease-fire which lasted from January to August 2003. Since then, both sides are again laying mines or IEDs in significant numbers. All 75 districts are now affected, compared to four in 1999. The government did not officially acknowledge using mines until 2002.

In Sri Lanka, increased fighting in 2000 and 2001 with the LTTE rebels resulted in increased use of antipersonnel mines by both sides, increased military and civilian mine casualties, and the termination of UN mine action programs. Fighting stopped in December 2001 and a formal cease-fire agreement came into force in February 2002. There have been no confirmed reports of new use of mines by either government or LTTE forces since December 2001.

#### *Mine Use in Europe/Central Asia*

During the 1999 crisis in Kosovo, Yugoslav forces laid significant numbers of antipersonnel mines, and the NATO bombing campaign left extensive contamination from cluster bomblets and other UXO. Over the past five years, the most extensive antipersonnel mine use in Europe and Central Asia has consistently been in Chechnya, by both Russian forces and Chechen fighters. Since 1999, Russia has also deployed mines inside Tajikistan along its Afghan border, and in its pursuit of rebels, Russia dropped mines on Georgia on at least two occasions.

Uzbekistan has laid antipersonnel mines on its borders with Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, and both governments have accused Uzbekistan of emplacing mines across the border in their territory. Kyrgyzstan used landmines in 1999 and 2000 to prevent infiltration across its border with Tajikistan. It appears that Georgian Armed Forces have used antipersonnel mines each year from 2001-2004, despite repeated government denials and Georgia's 1996 moratorium on the use of antipersonnel mines. Abkhazian troops have also mined contested territory. In addition, private armed groups from Georgia have infiltrated into Abkhazia and laid antipersonnel mines.

#### *Mine Use in the Middle East/North Africa*

Saddam Hussein's forces used antipersonnel mines in the lead-up to and during the conflict in Iraq in early 2003. Iraqi forces planted mines extensively, and also abandoned caches of weapons that included landmines, in many parts of the country. There were also reports of the PKK using landmines in northern Iraq in 1999. Israel acknowledged use of antipersonnel mines in South Lebanon prior to its withdrawal from the area in 2000, and there were allegations of use in the Occupied Palestinian Territories until 2002. There have been allegations of Palestinian mine use as well.

### **Global Production of Antipersonnel Mines**

More than 50 states are known to have produced antipersonnel mines.<sup>14</sup> This number has been dramatically and permanently reduced in recent years due in large part to the public outcry against the continued production of the weapon. Thirty-six states have formally renounced and ceased the production of antipersonnel mines.<sup>15</sup> This includes three countries that are not party to the Mine Ban Treaty: Finland, Israel, and Poland.<sup>16</sup> Taiwan has also stopped production. Twenty-three treaty members have reported on the status of programs for the conversion or de-commissioning of antipersonnel mine production facilities.<sup>17</sup> Since it began reporting in 1999, Landmine Monitor has removed Turkey and FR Yugoslavia (now Serbia and Montenegro) from its list of producers.

Among those who have stopped manufacturing are a majority of the big producers from the 1970s to mid-1990s; with the notable exceptions of the China, Russia and the United States, the biggest producers and exporters from the past 35 years are now States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty.<sup>18</sup> Landmine Monitor identifies 15 countries that continue to produce, or retain the right to produce, antipersonnel landmines. Nepal was added to the list in 2003 following admissions by military officers that production was occurring in state factories. This was the first time that the number of antipersonnel mine producers has increased since Landmine Monitor reporting started in 1999.

#### **Antipersonnel Landmine Producers**

Burma, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, South Korea, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, United States, Vietnam
--

India and Pakistan are actively engaged in the production of antipersonnel mines that are compliant with Amended Protocol II of the CCW, including new remotely delivered mine systems. Officials in Singapore and Vietnam admit that the production of antipersonnel mines is on-going. Burma, Cuba, and North Korea have made no public confirmation or denial of production activity since 1999.

In some cases it is unclear if production lines were active between 1999 and 2004. Egypt has unofficially stated that it ceased production in 1988. While the US has not produced antipersonnel mines since 1997, two research and development programs are under way that could result in the resumption of production in 2007. South Korea has stated it has not produced any mines since 2000. An official from China stated in September 2003 that no production is occurring there. Production of certain types of antipersonnel mines by Russia has apparently stopped.

In September 2002, Iran said it had not produced antipersonnel mines since the end of its war with Iraq in 1988. Landmine Monitor reported in 2001, however, that demining organizations in Afghanistan were encountering hundreds of Iran-manufactured antipersonnel mines with production stamps of 1999 and 2000.

An Iraqi diplomat told Landmine Monitor in February 2004 that production continued in recent years, including during the lead-up to the invasion in 2003. Since the coalition occupation of Iraq, any industrial production of antipersonnel mines has, presumably, ceased. Landmine Monitor will keep Iraq on the list of producers until a new government officially renounces antipersonnel mine production.

On the positive side, the investment community in several countries has taken up the recommendations of NGOs to further stigmatize the production of the antipersonnel mines. Several North American and European socially responsible investment managers have created filters that preclude their funds from investing in publicly traded companies associated with antipersonnel mine production. The Norwegian Petroleum Fund removed Singapore Technologies Ltd. from its investment portfolio in 2002, due to the company's involvement in production of antipersonnel mines.

### **Global Trade in Antipersonnel Mines**

A *de facto* global ban on the transfer or export of antipersonnel mines has been in effect since 1996. This ban is directly attributable to the mine ban movement and the stigma attached to the weapon, the unilateral actions of key countries, and the subsequent implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. Landmine Monitor has not documented any state-to-state transfers or exports of antipersonnel mines since then. It is believed that the trade in antipersonnel mines has dwindled to a very low level of illicit trafficking and unacknowledged trade.

A significant number of states outside the Mine Ban Treaty have enacted or extended export moratoria in the past five years including China, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and the United States. In addition, representatives of Cuba, Egypt, and Vietnam have claimed not to export antipersonnel mines, but no formal unilateral prohibition has been put into place. While there is no evidence of transfers by them since 1999, Burma, Nepal, and North Korea still produce antipersonnel mines and apparently do not observe any restrictions on transfers or exports.

Questions remain about exports from Iran. Newly produced Iranian antipersonnel mines were found in Afghanistan in 2001 and others were intercepted en-route to Palestine. An export moratorium was instituted by Iran in 1997, but it is not known if it is still formally in effect.

The scope of the now defunct global landmine trade is reflected in Mine Ban Treaty transparency reports. Of the over 48 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines declared so far by 80 States Parties, 29 million antipersonnel mines appear to have been domestically produced, 13.6 million were inherited, and 6 million were imported from other countries.<sup>19</sup> Successor states of the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia that are now States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty inherited 11.3 million and 2.3 million antipersonnel mines respectively.<sup>20</sup> Three exporting states account for the vast majority of the imported antipersonnel mines declared by States Parties between 1999 and 2004: United States (1.7 million), China (1.4 million), and Russia/USSR (1.06 million). Another 22 countries contributed to the stockpiles of States Parties.<sup>21</sup>

There are a number of instances of possible continuing illicit trade involving antipersonnel mines. According to a media account, in May 2003, a Panamanian court imprisoned four Panamanians and three Colombians for attempting to import into Colombia weapons acquired in Nicaragua, which included thirteen Russian antipersonnel mines. In July 2003, the head of the Transitional National Government in Somalia accused Ethiopia of supplying arms, including landmines, to Somali factions; Ethiopia dismissed the claim. A 2003 report to the UN Security Council said that landmines had been shipped from Yemen and Ethiopia to Somalia. A media report in November 2002 claimed that Turkish customs officials had detained a truck containing a large load of weapons, including antipersonnel mines, at the border with Georgia, allegedly coming from Kazakhstan. There were also reports of attempts by Pakistan Ordnance

Factories to sell antipersonnel mines to British journalists posing as representatives of private companies in both November 1999 and April 2002.

In July 2004, the United States announced its intent to pursue negotiations on an international ban on the sale or export of non-self-destructing landmines in the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament. Canada noted that the 42 CD member states that are already part of the Mine Ban Treaty “will not be in a position to enter negotiations on a lesser ban, aimed at arresting trade in one category of antipersonnel mines alone but implying the acceptability of trade in other categories of these weapons.”<sup>22</sup> The CD has not been able to agree on its agenda since 1997.

#### *Transfers for Purposes Permitted by the Mine Ban Treaty*

Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty permits the transfer of antipersonnel mines for the purpose of their destruction or for training and research needs. In the past five years, Denmark, Netherlands, United States, and Taiwan have transferred antipersonnel mines to companies in Germany for destruction. Ecuador and Romania reported transferring antipersonnel mines to the United States, a non-State Party, for demining research and training purposes. Canada, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and possibly Sweden reported acquiring foreign antipersonnel mines for research and training purposes.

#### **Global Stockpiles of Antipersonnel Mines and their Destruction**

At the time when the Mine Ban Treaty was negotiated and entered into force, a staggering 131 states possessed stockpiles estimated at more than 260 million antipersonnel mines. This stunning global total has been significantly reduced due in large part to five years of implementing the Mine Ban Treaty and the widespread rejection of the weapon, even among states not party to the ban on antipersonnel mines. Landmine Monitor estimates that there are approximately 200 million antipersonnel mines currently stockpiled by 67 countries. In this Landmine Monitor reporting period, some four million stockpiled antipersonnel mines were destroyed, bringing the global total to about 62 million in recent years.

#### *States Parties*

A total of 78 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty reported holding stockpiles of antipersonnel mines. Of these States Parties, 65 have completed the destruction of their stockpiles. In this Landmine Monitor reporting period, since May 2003, Argentina, Chile, Republic of Congo, Kenya, Lithuania, Mauritius, Romania, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay, and Venezuela reached this milestone. The remaining 13 States Parties that have reported stockpiles have either started destruction or are in the planning process.<sup>23</sup>

States Parties collectively have destroyed more than 37.3 million antipersonnel mines.<sup>24</sup> Italy destroyed the most mines (7.1 million), followed by Turkmenistan (6.6 million). Others destroying more than one million antipersonnel mines included: Albania, France, Germany, Japan, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Landmine Monitor estimates that 18 States Parties currently stockpile at least 11 million antipersonnel mines.<sup>25</sup> This number has fluctuated over the years as mine stockpiles are destroyed and states with significant stockpiles join the treaty. For example, over 10 million newly declared

antipersonnel mines are now required to be destroyed since Belarus (4.6 million), Greece (1.56 million), Serbia and Montenegro (1.32 million), and Turkey (3.04 million) all joined the treaty in September 2003.

A total of 51 States Parties reported that they did not possess stockpiles of antipersonnel mines, except in some cases those retained for research and training purposes.<sup>26</sup> Since May 2003, Cote d'Ivoire, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Solomon Islands, and Timor-Leste have officially confirmed that they do not possess stockpiles of antipersonnel mines.

Fourteen States Parties need to officially declare the presence or absence of stockpiles; only three of these have informally indicated that they possess stocks to be destroyed (Guyana, Serbia & Montenegro, and Turkey).<sup>27</sup>

### *Signatories*

Landmine Monitor estimates that five signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty stockpile 7-8 million antipersonnel mines. The majority of these mines are held by Ukraine (5.95 million) and Poland (996,860). Ukraine destroyed 404,000 conventional antipersonnel mines with NATO support between July 2002 and May 2003 and now only PFM-type scatterable antipersonnel mines remain in stocks. Poland dismantled 58,291 POMZ-2(2M) mines due to the expiry of their shelf-life during 2003. Indonesia in May 2002 revealed it has a stockpile of 16,000 antipersonnel mines. Ethiopia also likely holds stockpiles and Brunei has acknowledged possessing antipersonnel mines (possibly Claymore-type only). It is unlikely that the four other signatories stockpile antipersonnel mines (Cook Islands, Haiti, Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu).

### *Non-States Parties*

Landmine Monitor estimates that the greatest numbers of antipersonnel mines, between 180 million and 185 million, are stockpiled by states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty. The majority of these stockpiles belong to just three states: China (estimated 110 million), Russia (estimated 50 million)<sup>28</sup> and the United States (10.4 million). Other states with large stockpiles include Pakistan (estimated 6 million), India (estimated 4-5 million), and South Korea (2 million). Other states not party to the treaty believed to have large stockpiles are Burma, Egypt, Finland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, North Korea, Syria, and Vietnam.

Non-States Parties have destroyed significant numbers of stockpiled antipersonnel mines in recent years. Some have chosen to take this action as a confidence building measure prior to fully joining the Mine Ban Treaty. Others have destroyed antipersonnel mines that were not in compliance with the technical requirements of CCW Amended Protocol II. For others, the destruction of stockpiles reflects routine ammunition management practice. Russia surprisingly reported in 2003 that it had destroyed 16.8 million antipersonnel mines from 1996 to 2002. Russian military sources told Landmine Monitor that Russia destroyed another 1.85 million antipersonnel mines in 2003. The United States completed destroying over 3.3 million non-self-destructing M14 and M16 antipersonnel mines in 1998. In late 1999, China reported that it had destroyed over 1.7 million old antipersonnel mines. Between 1992 and January 2004, Belarus, prior to becoming a State Party, destroyed an estimated 300,000 antipersonnel mines without any international assistance, including approximately 223,000 mines in 2003 alone.

In addition to governments, many armed non-state actors also have stockpiles of antipersonnel mines, including groups in Afghanistan, Burma, Chechnya, Colombia, DR Congo, Iraq, Kashmir, Philippines, Russia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, and Uganda.

### **Fulfilling Obligations under Article 4 of the Mine Ban Treaty**

An important milestone in the implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty was reached on 1 March 2003: the four-year deadline for destruction of stockpiled antipersonnel mines for all states that were party to the treaty when it first entered into force on 1 March 1999. States Parties are obligated to destroy stockpiles under their jurisdiction and control four years after entry into force of the treaty for that state.

It would appear that all States Parties with a 1 March 2003 deadline met their obligation, with the minor exception of Djibouti, which was two days late, and an issue of serious concern regarding Turkmenistan.

Turkmenistan notified the United Nations that it completed destruction of its antipersonnel mine stockpiles on 28 February 2003, except for 69,200 mines retained for training purposes. Turkmenistan's decision to retain such a large number of mines was roundly criticized in the international community and engendered claims that Turkmenistan was violating both Article 3 by retaining an excessive number of mines for training, and Article 4 for still holding an operational stockpile after the destruction deadline. In a reversal announced 11 February 2004, Turkmenistan said it had started to destroy 60,000 of the antipersonnel mines retained for training; it later indicated that all 69,200 mines would be destroyed by the end of 2004.

Since this 1 March 2003 milestone passed, all States Parties, except one, have met their respective deadlines; all are now in compliance with this important arms control aspect of the Mine Ban Treaty. Guinea did not meet its stockpile destruction deadline of 1 April 2003. A significant amount of uncertainty and contradictory information existed about whether Guinea possessed a stockpile of antipersonnel mines from the date its initial transparency measures report was due (1 September 1999) until it submitted a report on 24 June 2004. The report revealed that Guinea destroyed 3,174 antipersonnel mines between 26 September and 11 November 2003, six months past its deadline.

The Mine Ban Treaty requires that States destroy their stockpiles "as soon as possible," but no later than four years after entry into force. Most States Parties completed the destruction of their stockpiles a year or more before their deadline:

- Twelve States Parties destroyed their stockpiles prior to entry into force of the treaty: Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Guatemala, Germany, Luxembourg, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, and South Africa;
- Twenty-two States Parties destroyed their stockpiles more than two years ahead of their deadline: Albania, Australia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Republic of Congo, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Gabon, Honduras, Hungary, Lithuania, Malaysia, Moldova, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe;
- Six States Parties destroyed their stockpiles between one and two years ahead of their deadline: Ecuador, Kenya, Peru, Romania, Sweden, and Uruguay;
- Twenty-two States Parties destroyed their stockpiles in the year before their deadline: Argentina, Brazil, Chad, Croatia, El Salvador, Italy, Japan, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Mozambique, Netherlands,

Nicaragua, Portugal, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Venezuela, and Yemen.

A number of States Parties, including Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, and Croatia have reported discovering and destroying previously unknown stockpiles of antipersonnel mines after formally completing their destruction programs. The Mine Ban Treaty does not explicitly deal with this phenomenon. The ICBL has stressed the importance of timely destruction of these newly found mines, no later than one year after discovery, and has urged complete transparency about numbers and types discovered and the destruction process.

The costs of stockpile destruction have varied greatly, depending on the types of mines in stockpile, their location, and the amount of transport and preparation necessary to destroy the mines. Most States Parties have chosen to dispose of their stockpiles by open detonation or open burning techniques. Others have disassembled the mines for recovery of materials as a way to demilitarize part or all of their stockpiles.

There are examples in the past five years of armed non-state actors getting access to factory-manufactured stockpiled antipersonnel mines. For example, several types of Russian antipersonnel mines were among the weapons used by Chechen insurgents during the disastrous siege at a school in Beslan, North Ossetia in early September 2004. Significant supplies of unsecured conventional weapons and ammunition are now quite common in conflict zones including Afghanistan, DR Congo, Iraq, and Somalia. Antipersonnel mines among these stocks will continue to pose a threat for years to come if they remain unsecured and available to non-state actors.

### **Mines Retained for Training and Research**

Declaring a stockpile of antipersonnel mines obligates a state to destroy it within four years, with a permissible exception under Article 3 for the minimum number of mines absolutely necessary to develop and train in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques. The ICBL has urged that all states should declare the intended purposes and actual uses of antipersonnel mines retained under Article 3. During the Oslo negotiations in 1997 and during Standing Committee discussions from 1999-2004, most States Parties have agreed that the minimum number of mines retained should number in the hundreds or thousands or less, but not tens of thousands. The ICBL believes that states that retain thousands of antipersonnel mines and apparently do not use any of these mines for permitted purposes abuse the exception permitted by Article 3.

Of the current 143 States Parties, 66 retain over 233,000 antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes under Article 3. At least 62 have chosen not to retain any mines. New additions to this latter group since May 2003 include Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lithuania, Mauritius, and Timor-Leste. A total of 17 States Parties once possessed stockpiles but have chosen not to retain any mines.<sup>29</sup> Fifteen States Parties have not made clear if they intend to retain any mines.<sup>30</sup>

Only four States Parties accounted for nearly a third of all retained mines: Brazil (16,545), Sweden (15,706), Algeria (15,030), and Bangladesh (15,000). Brazil reported the destruction of 455 mines between March 2000 and December 2001. Sweden has fully reported on the intended purposes and actual uses of retained mines, but the number of mines retained by a private company is greater than initially

reported thus increasing Sweden's totals. Algeria and Bangladesh have not detailed the intended purposes or requirements for retaining so many antipersonnel mines. Turkey has indicated to Landmine Monitor its intention to retain 16,000 antipersonnel mines, but it has not submitted its initial transparency measures report as of 1 October 2004.

A total of eight States Parties retain between 5,000 and 10,000 mines: Namibia, (9,997), Japan (8,359), Belarus (7,530), Australia (7,465), Greece (7,224), Croatia (6,478), Chile (6,245), and Tunisia (5,000). Namibia, Belarus, and Greece joined this list in 2004.

A total of 34 States Parties retain between 1,000 and 5,000 mines.<sup>31</sup> Nigeria (3,364 retained mines) and Angola (1,390 retained mines) are notable additions to this group since May 2003. Another 20 States Parties retain less than 1,000 mines.<sup>32</sup> Joining this group in this reporting period are the Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, and Suriname.

One encouraging trend is the significant number of States Parties that have reduced the number of mines retained from high levels originally proposed. Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Italy, Lithuania, Mauritania, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Kingdom, and Zambia have taken this step between March 1999 and September 2004. Nine of these States Parties originally intended to retain 10,000 mines or more.<sup>33</sup> On 11 August 2004, Ecuador destroyed 1,970 of the 3,970 antipersonnel mines previously retained for training. Venezuela intends to destroy 3,960 mines by October 2004, leaving 1,000 mines for training.

A total of 17 States Parties reported consuming 3,112 mines for training and research in 2003. In 2002, 16 States Parties reported consuming 2,540 mines in 2002. At least 26 States apparently did not consume any retained mines in 2003: Bangladesh, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Republic of Congo, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, FYR Macedonia, Peru, Portugal, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Similarly, 29 States Parties did not report consuming any in 2002. Too many states retain thousands of mines without any evidence of consuming those mines for permitted purposes or plans stated for their intended and actual use. Retained stockpiles of this scale without a declared plan or evidence of actual consumption of the mines raises the specter that these States Parties possess a residual operational stockpile of antipersonnel mines.

Chad, Lithuania, Mauritius, and Turkmenistan have reconsidered their retention of mines and now have chosen not to retain any live mines. In contrast, El Salvador, Hungary, and Mozambique changed their initial decision not to keep any mines and subsequently retained mines. Against the trend of reducing the numbers of mines retained, Bosnia & Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia, and Sweden have actually increased their holdings significantly.

### **Transparency Reporting**

As of 1 October 2004, the UN has received initial Article 7 transparency measures reports from 129 States Parties. The overall compliance rate of States Parties submitting initial transparency reports is an impressive 91 percent, up from 88 percent reported last year, 75 percent reported in 2002, and 63 percent reported in 2001. A total of 14 States Parties have submitted initial reports since May 2003: Angola, Belarus, Cote d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Eritrea, Greece, Guinea, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, and Timor-Leste.

Through concerted efforts to promote full transparency, the number of late initial reports has dramatically declined. As of 1 October 2004, a total of 12 States Parties were late in submitting their initial report: Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Liberia, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, and Turkey. This number has been significantly reduced over the past five years: *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* reported that 15 States Parties were late in submitting their initial reports; the 2002 edition listed 30 states being late; in 2001 the number was 37; and in 2000 the number of late reports was 36.

Equatorial Guinea (due date 28 August 1999), St. Lucia (29 March 2000), and Liberia (28 November 2000) can only be considered grossly non-compliant in fulfilling the treaty's transparency obligation. All three have passed their deadlines for destroying any stockpiled antipersonnel mines (respectively, 1 March 2003, 1 October 2003 and 1 June 2004), but have not informed States Parties of compliance with this core obligation.

States Parties have commendably improved the rate of annual updates submitted for the previous calendar year. As of 1 October 2004, the rate of compliance for annual reports due on 30 April 2004 for calendar year 2003 was 78 percent. The rate for calendar year 2002 was 62 percent. Of the 27 States Parties not submitting an annual update in 2004, 15 of them also did not submit reports in 2003. Eight States Parties have not submitted annual updates for any subsequent years after submitting their initial reports in 1999 or 2000: Andorra, Antigua & Barbuda, Bolivia, Botswana, Madagascar, St. Kitts and Nevis, Swaziland, and Trinidad & Tobago.

In a very encouraging development, several states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty have submitted voluntary Article 7 reports, including Cameroon in 2001 and Lithuania in 2002 when they were signatories. Non-State Party Latvia and signatory Poland submitted initial reports in 2003 and annual updates in 2004. Other non-States Parties have announced their intention of voluntarily submitting a transparency report in the future, including Sri Lanka and the Ukraine.

Belgium has coordinated an informal contact group aimed at promoting transparency reporting since 2000. In November 2002, Belgium hosted a seminar in Brussels for African countries on transparency reporting under Article 7. The NGO VERTIC, in cooperation with the ICBL and the ICRC, developed the "Guide to Reporting under Article 7 of the Ottawa Convention."

### **National Implementation Measures**

Only 40 of 143 States Parties have passed new domestic laws to implement the Mine Ban Treaty and fulfill the obligations of Article 9.<sup>34</sup> This is an increase of five States Parties since publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*: Belize, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Seychelles, South Africa, and Zambia. A total of 27 States Parties report that steps to enact legislation are underway.<sup>35</sup> Those initiating the process in the past year include DR Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, and Guinea. However, legislation has been reported to be in progress for more than two years in Benin, Cameroon, Mauritania, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Swaziland, and Uganda.

A total of 34 States Parties have indicated that they do not believe any new law is required to implement the treaty.<sup>36</sup> Belarus and Chile joined this category in the past year. The Dominican Republic, Holy See, Kiribati, Lesotho, Madagascar, and Qatar believe that no steps are necessary because they have never produced, stockpiled, or used antipersonnel mines and are not mine-affected. The ICBL is

concerned, however, about the need for all states to pass legislation that includes penal sanctions for any potential future violations of the treaty, and provides for full implementation of all aspects of the treaty.

Landmine Monitor is unaware of any progress in 42 States Parties to enact appropriate domestic measures to implement the Mine Ban Treaty.<sup>37</sup> States Parties where antipersonnel mines have been used remain the greatest concern: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Cyprus, Ecuador, Eritrea, Greece, and Serbia and Montenegro.

The ICRC has produced an “Information Kit on the Development of National Legislation to Implement the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines.” This kit is available from the ICRC in English, French, and Spanish and is also available on the Internet.<sup>38</sup>

### **Special Issues of Concern**

Since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force, the ICBL has consistently raised questions about how States Parties interpret and implement certain aspects of Articles 1, 2, and 3. In particular, the ICBL has expressed concerns regarding the issues of joint military operations with non-States Parties, the prohibition on “assist,” foreign stockpiling and transit of antipersonnel mines, mines with sensitive fuzes and antihandling devices, and the permissible number of mines retained for training and development purposes. (The latter issue, related to Article 3, has been discussed above). The ICBL has pointed out that some States Parties have diverged from the predominant legal interpretation and predominant State practice on these matters. The ICBL and ICRC have urged States Parties to reach common understandings on these matters, in order to eliminate ambiguity and preserve the integrity of the treaty.

Discussions on Articles 1, 2, and 3 have occurred at every Meeting of States Parties and during every intersessional week. The need to promote further clarity on how States Parties fulfill their obligations on these issues has been repeatedly recognized, including in the Final Report and President’s Action Program agreed upon at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in Bangkok in September 2003. The Final Report states that “the meeting called upon States parties to continue to share information and views, particularly with respect to Articles 1, 2, and 3, with a view to developing understandings on various matters by the First Review Conference.”

Despite efforts by the co-chairs of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention at the February and June 2004 intersessional meetings, a number of States Parties remained opposed to reaching understandings or conclusions on Articles 1, 2 and 3 before or during the Review Conference.

#### *Joint Military Operations and the Meaning of “Assist” (Article 1)*

Article 1 of the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty obligates States Parties to “never under any circumstances...assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention.” There has been a lack of clarity, however, regarding what types of acts are permitted or banned within the context of the prohibition on assistance, especially during joint military operations with non-States Parties that may use antipersonnel mines.

States have recognized the need to address this issue and to share views on policy and practice. Over the past five years of treaty implementation, an understanding of how Article 1 applies to joint military operations and the meaning of “assist” has begun to emerge. A total of 35 States Parties have declared

that they will not participate in planning and implementation of activities related to the use of antipersonnel mines in joint operations. Kenya, Tanzania, Turkey, and Zambia provided new statements since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*.<sup>39</sup> Australia, Czech Republic, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe, and most recently Zambia have interpreted participation as “active” or “direct,” but each country’s understanding of what constitutes “active” or “direct” assistance varies. Brazil, Mexico, and the United Kingdom would reject participation in joint operations if its military forces derived direct military benefit from antipersonnel mine use. Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and United Kingdom would reject rules of engagement permitting antipersonnel mine use or orders to use antipersonnel mines. Norway obtains written precondition for placing forces under the command of a non-State Party.

Though often discussed in terms of potential US use of antipersonnel mines in NATO operations, this is by no means a problem limited to the NATO alliance. It appears that a number of States Parties in Africa have engaged in military operations with (or in support of) armed forces or armed non-state actors that may be using antipersonnel mines. In this reporting period, *Landmine Monitor* raises serious concerns about Rwanda’s possible assistance to rebels in the DR Congo that are using antipersonnel mines, and about Sudan’s support for militia in the South who have also been accused of using antipersonnel mines. In the past, *Landmine Monitor* has expressed concern with regard to Namibia (assisting Angola against UNITA), as well as Uganda, Rwanda and Zimbabwe assisting various forces in the DR Congo. All have denied any activities that contravene the Mine Ban Treaty.

US-led coalition military operations in Afghanistan in 2001-2002 and Iraq in 2003 made the issue of joint operations a concrete reality for many. States Parties Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom contributed either ground forces that engaged in combat operations or peacekeepers for one or both conflicts. Other States Parties participated in the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, commanded at various periods by the United Kingdom and Turkey (then a non-State Party), and now operating under NATO command. There is no evidence that any Coalition troops or peacekeepers, including those of non-States Parties, have used antipersonnel mines in Afghanistan or Iraq. Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, and Spain used this circumstance to publicly reiterate their operational understanding of their obligations under the Mine Ban Treaty in joint operations with non-States Parties.

Some States Parties made new policy statements or announced concrete steps taken nationally on these issues since publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here, see individual country reports for details.

- In comments to *Landmine Monitor* in August 2004, Australia said, “The Australian Defence Force’s activities in military coalitions conducted with non-Ottawa States are governed by rules of engagement which comply, without exception, with the terms of the Convention (including the Declaration made by Australia when depositing its instrument of ratification) as incorporated into domestic legislation by the Anti-Personnel Mines Convention Act 1998.”
- The Ministry of Defense of Croatia confirmed in April 2004 that its soldiers are not allowed to use or assist in the use of antipersonnel mines within Croatia or in other countries, including those not party to the Mine Ban Treaty.

- At the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, Italy confirmed previous statements that national legislation permits joint military activities with non-States Parties only if the activities are compatible with Article 1 of the Mine Ban Treaty. The armed forces “continue to receive strict instructions to abstain from participating in actions contrary to the letter and spirit of the Ottawa Convention.”
- Kenya’s draft implementation bill does not permit the military to participate in joint operations or drills where antipersonnel mines are being used. The government reiterated this position in interventions on Article 1 at the February 2004 Standing Committee meeting on General Status and Operation of the Convention, and urged that in order to embrace the spirit of the ban treaty, it was necessary for States Parties to review the status and contents of memoranda of understanding allowing for joint operations.
- Serbia and Montenegro submitted a formal declaration with its instrument of accession stating that, “it is the understanding of Serbia and Montenegro that the mere participation in the planning or conduct of operations, exercises or any other military activities by the armed forces of Serbia and Montenegro, or by any of its nationals, if carried out in conjunction with armed forces of the non-States Parties (to the Convention), which engage in activities prohibited under the Convention, does not in any way imply an assistance, encouragement or inducement as referred to in subparagraph 1 (c) of the Convention.”
- The Spanish government, in response to a parliamentarian’s question, said that Spanish military personnel were forbidden to use antipersonnel mines under any circumstances, that operations in which antipersonnel mines are used will not be planned, directed or carried out, and that no forces under Spanish command will use antipersonnel mines other than under the exceptions allowed by Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty.
- Tanzania informed the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention that it does not subscribe to the use of antipersonnel mines in joint operations and would not provide assistance “to anyone in activities prohibited to a State Party under this Convention.” Similarly, in its June 2004 Article 7 report, Tanzania states, “Since the United Republic of Tanzania became a party to ‘The Landmine Ban Treaty of 1997,’ the state has not used any type of APMs on either joint military operations or provision of assistance to anyone in activities prohibited to a state party under this convention.”
- According to its diplomatic mission in Geneva, Turkey will not permit the use of antipersonnel mines in Turkey by other States during joint military operations.
- Zambia’s new national legislation says that members of its armed forces can participate in operations or other military activities with the armed forces of a State not party to the Convention, “Provided that the operation, exercise or military activity is not in contravention of the Convention and that such participation does not amount to active assistance in any activity prohibited by the Convention and this Act.”

Over the years, Landmine Monitor has raised concerns about certain national declarations and certain clauses in the national implementation legislation of several nations with respect to joint operations and “assist.” Among others, it has raised these concerns regarding Australia, Canada, Czech

Republic, New Zealand, Serbia and Montenegro, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe. A highly regarded new legal commentary on the Mine Ban Treaty examines Australia's National Declaration and a statement by Zimbabwe on the prohibition on "assist," and concludes that "it is not clear how these interpretations can be legally sustained. Reservations are prohibited by Article 19" of the treaty.<sup>40</sup> The commentary draws particular attention to Australia's position that the treaty would allow "indirect support such as the provision of security for the personnel of a State not party to the Convention engaging in such [prohibited] activities," including presumably the laying of antipersonnel mines by the non-State Party.

*Foreign Stockpiling and Transit of Antipersonnel Mines (Articles 1 and 2)*

It appears that at least a small number of States Parties have differing views about whether the Mine Ban Treaty's prohibition on "transfer" of antipersonnel mines also applies to "transit." The main issue is whether a non-State Party's aircraft, ships, or vehicles carrying antipersonnel mines can pass through (and presumably depart from, refuel in, restock in) a State Party on their way to a conflict in which those mines would be used. The ICBL believes that if a State Party willfully permits transit of antipersonnel mines which are destined for use in combat, that government is certainly violating the spirit of the Mine Ban Treaty, is likely violating the Article 1 ban on assistance to an act prohibited by the treaty, and possibly violating the Article 1 prohibition on transfer. The ICRC has also expressed its view that the treaty prohibits transiting of antipersonnel mines.

A total of 26 States Parties have declared they prohibit transfer through, foreign stockpiling on, or authorizing foreign antipersonnel mines on national territory. Turkey and Zambia provided new statements to this effect since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*.<sup>41</sup>

As reported in the past, Canada, Germany, Japan, and Norway believe that the Mine Ban Treaty does not prohibit the transit of antipersonnel mines, at least in certain circumstances. Germany and Japan view the issue in terms of the US mines stored in their countries, and maintain that because they do not exercise jurisdiction or control over the mines, they cannot prohibit transit. Canada states that it discourages the use of Canadian territory, equipment or personnel for the purpose of transit of antipersonnel mines.

With respect to foreign stockpiling of antipersonnel mines, US antipersonnel mines have been removed from Italy (announced in May 2000), Norway (November 2002), and Spain (November 1999). However, Germany, Japan, Qatar, and the United Kingdom state that US antipersonnel mine stocks are not under their national jurisdiction or control. Tajikistan is the only State Party to declare in its Article 7 report the number of antipersonnel mines stockpiled by a non-State Party on its territory. Russian forces hold 18,200 antipersonnel mines in Tajikistan.

Some States Parties made new policy statements or announced concrete steps taken nationally since publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here, see individual country reports for details.

- In December 2003, the Bulgarian parliament supported in principle the stationing of US military bases in the country. Regarding the legality under the Mine Ban Treaty of transit and stockpiling of foreign antipersonnel mines on Bulgarian national territory, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated in March 2004 that Bulgaria's position is "based on its obligations in accordance with Article 1 and Article 2, paragraph 2 of the Ottawa Convention."

- At the Fifth Meeting of States Parties Sweden announced its “preliminary interpretation that transit of antipersonnel mines (for military use in an armed conflict) through the territory of a State Party to the Convention would in fact be prohibited.” The final position was stated in February 2004: “With regard to the aim and purpose of the Convention it is suggested that transit should be regarded as prohibited by the Convention. This shall mean that antipersonnel mines cannot be transferred over Swedish land, sea or air territory in violation of the regulations of the Convention.”
- According to its diplomatic mission in Geneva, Turkey considers the stockpiling or transit of foreign antipersonnel mines on its territory as a breach of the Mine Ban Treaty, and “will never permit stockpiling or transfer of any type of antipersonnel landmine on its territory.”
- Zambia’s new legislation states that “transfer” includes “the transit of anti-personnel mines into, out of, or through Zambia by any means....”

Prior events demonstrate that this issue is not theoretical. In 1999, US Army engineer units deployed to Albania with antipersonnel mines and their delivery systems (MOPMS and Volcano mixed mine systems) as part of Task Force Hawk to support operations in Kosovo. Most of the US Army units deployed from bases in Germany. At the time of this deployment, Albania was a signatory to the Mine Ban Treaty and Germany was a State Party. Bulgaria, Hungary, and Portugal have addressed this issue in light of the use of facilities in their countries by the US.

Landmine Monitor has previously reported that the United States stored antipersonnel mines on the territory of at least 14 countries, including seven States Parties.<sup>42</sup> US antipersonnel mines have been removed from States Parties Italy, Norway, and Spain, at the request of those countries. Germany, Japan, the UK, and informally Qatar, state that US stockpiles of antipersonnel mines on their territory are not under their jurisdiction or control. It is not possible to confirm current locations or numbers of US antipersonnel mines in foreign countries following the significant movements of equipment and ammunition during the military build-up in the Persian Gulf region preceding the invasion of Iraq in March 2003.

#### *Mines with Sensitive Fuzes and Antihandling Devices (Article 2)*

Since the conclusion of the negotiations of the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty, the ICBL has emphasized that, according to the treaty’s definitions, any mine equipped with a fuze or antihandling device that causes the mine to explode from an unintentional or innocent act of a person is considered to be an antipersonnel mine and therefore prohibited. Applying the definition in Article 2 to all mines that function as antipersonnel mines, including those designated as antivehicle mines, remains a highly contentious issue. The way that States Parties agree—or disagree—on what practices are acceptable may have a significant impact on how the Mine Ban Treaty is implemented and universalized.

Many States Parties support the view that any mine, despite its label or design intent, capable of being detonated by the unintentional act of a person is an antipersonnel mine and is prohibited. Among the States Parties that have publicly expressed this understanding of what was agreed upon during the treaty negotiations in Oslo in 1997 are Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Kenya, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, and Zambia. Unfortunately only a small number of States Parties, 27 of the current 143, have expressed views or

shared national practice on this issue.<sup>43</sup> Commendably, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Switzerland have reported on specific details regarding this issue, including the types of mines other than antipersonnel mines possessed and their method of initiation. However, some States steadfastly refuse to accept that an antipersonnel mine is a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact with a person. Their key argument is that the requirement that the mine was designed to fulfill is the determining factor, and not the consequence of the design. Denmark, France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom are the only States Parties that have publicly stated the view that the Mine Ban Treaty does not apply to antivehicle mines at all, regardless of their employment with sensitive fuzes or antihandling devices. Australia and Sweden, while not directly subscribing to this position, expressed the view that the CCW is the more appropriate forum to consider any restrictions on mines other than antipersonnel mines.

A dangerous loophole may be created by the unwillingness of States Parties to address this issue and the possibility exists of heretofore prohibited mines being re-defined as to be permissible. A potentially slippery slope may be developing wherein mines possessing inherent and irreversible victim-activated design features are considered to be beyond the treaty's definition of an antipersonnel mine. If the issue remains unaddressed, other mines with features and design consequences that serve the same function as an antipersonnel mine could conceivably be viewed by some as "compliant" with the Mine Ban Treaty. Thus, a mine equipped with a tripwire would not be considered an antipersonnel mine if it is simply called something other than an antipersonnel mine. A confusing situation is beginning to develop wherein some States Parties have chosen to keep for future use and export mines that other States Parties have determined are antipersonnel mines and destroyed. Notably, Italy destroyed its stocks of the MUSPA and MIFF mines, which another State Party, Germany, does not classify as antipersonnel mines and has not destroyed.

While state practice in this area is not yet universal, some progress has been made on clarifying what specific types of fuzes and mines pose unacceptable dangers to civilians. Within the context of the CCW, Germany and the United Kingdom made statements in 2003 and 2004 supporting the view that mines equipped with tilt rod, tripwire, and breakwire fuzes are inappropriate and cannot be designed in a way to prevent detonation by a person.

There appears to be broad agreement that a mine that relies on a tripwire as its sole firing mechanism should be considered an antipersonnel mine. Sweden has prohibited its forces from using tripwire fuzes with mines if they are ever removed from storage for use. However, the Czech Republic continues to market a mine with a tripwire fuze, stating it does not consider the use of tripwires with an antivehicle mine to be a violation of the Mine Ban Treaty.

The low amount of lateral pressure necessary to activate a mine with a tilt rod fuze makes it quite susceptible to victim activation. Canada, France, Mali, and the United Kingdom have removed tilt rod fuzes from their inventories. Hungary has withdrawn from service and destroyed some of its mines equipped with tilt rod fuzes; it will not export these mines and plans to destroy all of them. Croatia and Slovenia have stated their willingness to discuss the appropriateness of tilt rod fuzes within the context of the Mine Ban Treaty. The Czech Republic admits possessing tilt rod fuzes but stated that the mines that are capable of using them are considered to be obsolete and will be retired within 15 years.

Breakwire fuzes should not be used as the sole fuze mechanism for a mine because a person can easily activate a breakwire, much like a tripwire. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom have retired from service mines with a breakwire fuze. France is exploring alternative fuzing mechanisms for its mines with breakwire fuzes.

Several other States Parties have reported that they have removed from service and destroyed certain ordnance items that when used with mines can cause them to function as antipersonnel mines. Germany and Slovakia have retired and destroyed antilift mechanisms that could be attached to mines.

Some States Parties made new policy statements or announced concrete steps taken nationally on these matters since publication of *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here, see individual country reports for details.

- Bulgaria reported that existing stocks of TM-46 antivehicle mines, the only type in stockpiles capable of having an antihandling device, have been decommissioned, and the destruction process is expected to be completed by the end of 2005.
- In October 2003, the German Initiative to Ban Landmines reported that the Croatian company Agencija Alan offered the TMRP-6 for sale at the IDEF weapons exhibition in Ankara, Turkey. The ICBL believes that the sale of TMRP-6 mines with tilt rods would constitute a violation of the Mine Ban Treaty.
- During the June 2004 intersessional meetings, Colombia made a strong and unequivocal statement that any mine that is victim-activated is an antipersonnel mine and therefore banned. Colombia expressed concern that the threshold of what constitutes an antipersonnel mine was being limited or narrowed, and stressed that the treaty is a comprehensive ban.
- At the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in September 2003, the Czech delegation gave its opinion that Article 2 of the Mine Ban Treaty “does not ban sensitive fuses that may have unintended effects,” but if States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty “find it more appropriate to discuss the problem within this forum, we will not be against this effort.”
- At the Meeting of States Parties in September 2003, Kenya stated, “Any mine that functions as an antipersonnel mine or can be modified to function like an antipersonnel mine, should be considered an antipersonnel mine and therefore banned within the context of the definition of a mine and in cognizance of the letter and spirit of the convention.”
- A legal advisor from Mozambique stated that Mozambique believes that the effect of the mine should be taken into account, and that, “The emphasis must be on the humanitarian character of the convention.” More specifically, he indicated that while Mozambique considers mines that detonate with more than 150 kilos of pressure to be antivehicle mines, any mine that is capable of exploding from the contact of a person is prohibited by the convention.
- In February 2004, New Zealand’s Ambassador for Disarmament stated, “New Zealand regards anti-vehicle mines that can be ‘exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person’ to be anti-personnel mines.... It would leave open the possibility that States Parties could deploy excessively sensitive [antivehicle mines]...which were capable of being detonated by the presence of a person, relying on the exception under Article 2.1 as a defence by asserting that the mines were designed to be detonated by vehicles. Such an interpretation would leave a worrying loophole in the Convention,

effectively giving States Parties scope to interpret their obligations under this provision in a manner that could compromise the humanitarian objectives of the Convention.”

- In September 2003, Norway reiterated its position that the treaty text negotiated in Oslo in 1997 establishes an effect-oriented definition of antipersonnel mines which includes any mine which functions as an antipersonnel mine: “The definition of an anti-personnel mine in the Mine Ban Convention simply lays down that any mine designed to explode by human contact is defined as an antipersonnel mine. This is the ordinary meaning to be given to the text, in accordance with the principles of international law.... It does not matter whether the main purpose of usage for that mine is directed towards vehicles. It does not matter whether it is called something else than anti-personnel mine. If it falls within the definition, then it is an anti-personnel mine.”
- During 2003, Slovakia carried out a study of which antivehicle mines may be prohibited or permissible under the Mine Ban Treaty. As a result, Slovakia has adopted a “Best Practice Policy for Antivehicle Mines” which involves taking “appropriate measures to ban the use of antivehicle mines which are activated by sensitive fuses and which are able to function as antipersonnel mines.” These include “antivehicle and antitank mines activated by trip wire running over the blocked stage of terrain or activated by tilt rod.” The Ministry added that, “Slovakia has also taken best practice measures banning the use of antihandling/explosive device Ro-3 together with mines.”
- Zambia’s national legislation passed in December 2003 prohibits antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes and antihandling devices that function as antipersonnel mines, including those equipped with tripwires, breakwires, and pressure-activated fuzes that operate at thresholds less than 150 kilograms.

#### *Claymore Mines (Article 2)*

Claymore-type mines (directional fragmentation munitions) are not prohibited by the Mine Ban Treaty in all instances. They are inherently dual-use, designed to be command-initiated by electric means or victim-activated by using mechanical pull/tension release tripwire fuzes. In many cases, options for both means are packaged with the mine. In order to be compliant and fully transparent, States Parties should take steps, and report on them, to ensure that the means for victim-activation is permanently removed and that their armed forces are instructed as to their legal obligations. Some States Parties have chosen to physically modify the mine to accept only electric detonation and some have physically removed and destroyed the tripwire assembly and appropriate blasting cap.

This notion has recently been extended to include the OZM-72, a bounding fragmentation mine, because according to available technical information it was designed and issued to be dual use with both victim-activated and command-detonated features. Both Lithuania and Moldova have reported modifying OZM-72 mines so that they no longer consider them antipersonnel mines, and count them as neither mines to be destroyed or mines retained for training. At the June 2004 Standing Committee meetings, the ICBL expressed concerns that this was not a desirable practice in that it could open the door for attempts to modify many types of mines in ways that may not be effective in protecting civilians.

A total of 24 States Parties have declared that they retain stocks of Claymore-type mines.<sup>44</sup> New among this group since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* are Belarus, Lithuania, and Serbia & Montenegro. A majority of these states (17) have reported on the measures taken to ensure that their Claymore-type mines cannot be used in the victim-activated mode, including destruction of the

tripwire assemblies and mechanical fuzes. Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, and Moldova have not made such statements.

Another 27 States Parties have declared that they do not possess Claymore-type mines.<sup>45</sup> New among this group since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* are Qatar, Tanzania, Turkmenistan, and Uruguay. For one of these, the Philippines, there are some contradictory indicators whether the armed forces possess Claymore-type mines.

The vast majority of States Parties, a total of 92, have not declared whether their forces possess Claymore-type mines. While 45 of these States Parties have declared that they do not possess antipersonnel mine stockpiles, in some cases it cannot be presumed that this includes Claymore-type mines. In September 2003, Bangladesh said, “The development of command-detonated mines, their use and sale would be another source of concern, if not humanitarian, of strategic import. This would be another case of vertical proliferation establishing discriminatory regimes and disparity between countries.”

The ICBL urges these 93 States Parties to declare whether they possess Claymore-type mines, and if so, include in their Article 7 transparency reports the measures that have been taken to ensure that they cannot be used in the victim-activated mode.

States Parties should also include Claymore-type antivehicle mines (“off route” directional mines) in this category. When equipped with a tripwire fuze, this mine meets the definition of antipersonnel mine in Article 2 of the Mine Ban Treaty and is therefore prohibited. The Czech Republic continues to market a Claymore-type antivehicle mine with a tripwire fuze, stating it does not consider the use of tripwires with antivehicle mines to be a violation of the Mine Ban Treaty.

### **HUMANITARIAN MINE ACTION**

In its first report issued in 1999, Landmine Monitor described the Mine Ban Treaty as “an opportunity to bring the landmine crisis under control during the next decade, a major step towards the realization of a mine-free world.” Five years on, it is clear that tremendous progress has been made in the field of humanitarian mine action using the comprehensive framework presented by the Mine Ban Treaty. Progress cannot be limited to States affiliated with the Mine Ban Treaty, however, and the achievements of some non-States Parties in supporting and implementing humanitarian mine action are commendable.

A lot more is known in 2004 about the varying degrees to which uncleared landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) affect millions of people living in 83 countries. This has been achieved through increased transparency, better research, continued and dedicated efforts of field operators, and the development of new tools, including the Landmine Impact Survey, the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), and other important but less systematic and not internationally institutionalized tools for the improvement of mine action operations, information management, and coordination.

Humanitarian mine action (HMA) has become widely accepted as the best means to address the global landmine crisis and is far more prevalent than five years ago. This includes survey and assessment; marking, mapping and clearing of mines; mine risk education; and quality assurance. Many of the most mine-affected countries have sophisticated programs in place implementing integrated mine action activities and doing so within the broader context of the overall development of the country. Landmine Monitor estimates that since 1999, more than 1,100 square kilometers of land has been cleared, destroying more than four million antipersonnel mines, nearly one million antivehicle mines, and many more millions of pieces of unexploded ordnance.

Over the coming five years, between the First and Second Review Conferences of the Mine Ban Treaty, there must be increased attention and focus on the task of removing the mines from the ground and reducing their impact on affected communities. For the 47 Mine Ban Treaty States Parties that declare themselves to be mine-affected, 22 are now half-way to their ten-year deadline in 2009 to clear all mined areas within their jurisdiction or control.

### **Landmine Problem**

As the Mine Ban Treaty took effect in March 1999, the international community was realizing that a concerted effort was needed to reshape the contours of the global mine problem. Early attempts by the United Nations, the United States, and others to define and explain the problems posed by uncleared landmines often focused on unverified estimates of millions of mines in various countries. It has come to be understood that from the perspective of mine action, the actual number of mines in the ground is not as important as, for example, the actual impact the landmines are having on each community in terms of causing suffering and economic setbacks. Over the past five years, the global problem has become ever more carefully defined to take into account the communities impacted by landmines.

Starting at the global level, *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* has identified 83 countries that are affected to varying degrees by the presence of uncleared landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO), as well as eight other areas that are included in Landmine Monitor’s reporting due to their particular mine-affected status.

**Landmine/UXO Problem in the World**

<b>Africa</b>	<b>Americas</b>	<b>Asia/Pacific</b>	<b>Europe/ Central Asia</b>	<b>Middle East/ North Africa</b>
Angola	Chile	Afghanistan	Albania	Algeria
Burundi	Colombia	Bangladesh	<b>Armenia</b>	Egypt
Chad	<b>Cuba</b>	<b>Burma (Myanmar)</b>	<b>Azerbaijan</b>	Iran
Rep. of Congo	Ecuador	Cambodia	Belarus	Iraq
DR Congo	Guatemala	<b>China</b>	Bosnia &	Israel
Eritrea	Nicaragua	<b>India</b>	Herzegovina	Jordan
<b>Ethiopia</b>	Peru	<b>Korea, North</b>	Croatia	Kuwait
Guinea-Bissau	Suriname	<b>Korea, South</b>	Cyprus	Lebanon
Liberia	Venezuela	<b>Laos</b>	Denmark	Libya
Malawi		<b>Nepal</b>	France (Djibouti)	Morocco
Mauritania		<b>Pakistan</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	Oman
Mozambique		Philippines	Greece	Syria
Namibia		<b>Sri Lanka</b>	<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	Tunisia
Niger		Thailand	Macedonia FYR	Yemen
Rwanda		<b>Vietnam</b>	Moldova	<i>Palestine</i>
Senegal		<i>Taiwan</i>	<b>Poland</b>	<i>Western Sahara</i>
Sierra Leone			<b>Russia</b>	
<b>Somalia</b>			Serbia & Montenegro	
Sudan			Tajikistan	
Swaziland			Turkey	
Uganda			<b>Ukraine</b>	
Zambia			United Kingdom	
Zimbabwe			(Falklands)	
<i>Somaliland</i>			<b>Uzbekistan</b>	
			<i>Abkhazia</i>	
			<i>Chechnya</i>	
			<i>Kosovo</i>	
			<i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i>	

**Bold:** Non-States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty

Countries leading the list of the most significantly affected countries include many of the same countries as five or ten years ago, namely Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Cambodia. Some are no longer considered as heavily affected, such as Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Yemen, while others are increasingly seen as representing new, more serious challenges, such as Burma, Colombia,

Iraq, and Nepal. In October 2003, the UN reported that available casualty data suggests Iraq is the country most affected by landmines and explosive remnants of war.

The list of affected countries varies some from that reported in 2003. Honduras and Djibouti have been removed, as they have declared the completion of mine clearance. Suriname has been added, as it revealed in its initial Article 7 report that it has a mined area. The status of France and UK has not changed, but Landmine Monitor has added them to the list because of their acknowledged responsibility for clearing mined areas under their jurisdiction in Djibouti and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), respectively.

Since 1999, the annual tally of mine and UXO affected countries has changed due to new mines being laid (adding FYR Macedonia and Uzbekistan), to new information about previously unknown mined areas (adding Venezuela and Suriname), to completion of mine clearance (removing Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Djibouti and Honduras), to clarifications regarding mine-affected status (removing Slovenia and Tanzania), and to Landmine Monitor's decision to remove those countries that are marginally affected by UXO and which suffer few if any casualties (El Salvador, Estonia, Hungary, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, and Mongolia); the Czech Republic arguably fits into this latter category and has been removed from the list this year with the completion of clearance of the former military area at Ralsko.

Countries that have completed mine clearance and declared themselves mine-free since the publication of *Landmine Monitor Report 1999*, include Moldova (August 2000), Bulgaria (October 1999), Costa Rica (December 2002), Czech Republic (April 2003), Djibouti (January 2004)<sup>46</sup> and, most recently, Honduras (June 2004). In June 2004, Namibia stated that while there was still a problem on the country's border with Angola, the country could be viewed as mine safe. Landmine Monitor still lists Moldova as affected due to significant UXO contamination.

### **Identification of Mined Areas: Surveys, Assessments, and Information Management**

Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty requires the identification of mined areas and suspected mined areas. While the global mine contamination problem is now much better defined than in 1999, there remain several significantly mine-affected countries where little or no information is available on the scope or scale of the problem. Through assessment, survey, and better information management, mine-affected countries can better prepare strategic plans and prioritize mine clearance operations.

There has been a steady increase in the number of assessments made to determine the scope of the landmine problem in affected countries. Landmine Monitor noted that 30 countries had undergone assessments or surveys from 1997-2000. It reported 34 ongoing surveys or assessments in 2001 and 32 in 2002. In 2003 and 2004, assessment and/or survey were conducted in approximately 37 countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Croatia, Cyprus, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, and Vietnam, as well as Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Somaliland.

Surveys or assessments were initiated in 2003 and 2004 in Burundi, Ecuador, Iraq, Liberia, FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Peru, Senegal, Tajikistan, Vietnam and Zambia, in addition to Puntland (Somalia). Burundi reports that while mapping and marking has not been conducted, it has carried out preliminary

assessments in six of 17 provinces. Tajikistan began general mine action assessments in its Central Region in late 2003. The Zambian Mine Action Center began a national impact survey in August 2003.

Assessments include interagency missions taken by the United Nations at the invitation of the government to determine the political will of the country to address its mine problem and the extent to which the UN can be of assistance. Since 2001, the UN has carried out assessment missions in fifteen countries. Recent missions included Uganda (April 2004), Senegal (March 2004), Liberia (September 2003), Malawi (August 2003), and Tunisia (January 2003). Mine clearance organizations and donor agencies frequently conduct assessments to evaluate mine action programs or determine mine action needs.

Landmine Impact Surveys (LIS) are designed to look at the impact of landmines on communities in order to help authorities develop strategic plans to reduce the impact and use limited resources more efficiently. The LIS includes community mapping, sketch drawings of individual suspected hazard areas, and gathering of information on victims from mine incidents two years or less prior to the survey. It also includes the socio-economic impacts that landmines have on each community. The LIS is community-focused as opposed to minefield-focused. General or Level One Surveys typically include minefield mapping, sketch drawings of individual minefields, and the gathering of technical data for the initiation or continuation of mine clearance operations.

At least seven nationwide impact surveys have been completed since 1999 and another eight were underway in 2003/2004. The Survey Working Group is the coordinating body for most LIS operations, with the Survey Action Center (SAC) as the executing agency. It has completed impact surveys in Yemen (2000); Chad, Mozambique, and Thailand (2001); Cambodia (2002); and in Azerbaijan and Somaliland (2003). In 2004, surveys were scheduled for completion in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Eritrea, and Ethiopia, while surveys in Afghanistan, Angola and Somalia (Puntland) should be completed in 2005. In addition, the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation was coordinating nationwide surveys in Lebanon, Vietnam, and Iraq in 2003 and 2004.

According to the SAC, of the ten countries surveyed, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, and Ethiopia are in the top rank of seriously affected countries, Mozambique is in the middle rank, while Azerbaijan, Chad, Eritrea, Lebanon, Thailand and Yemen have definable and serious problems, but are overall less impacted.

In some places, Landmine Impact Surveys have been criticized for overestimating the mine problem, for not being detailed and thorough enough, and for not covering all affected areas. In Mozambique, HALO Trust resurveyed some areas covered by the LIS and found that 282 sites identified by the LIS as mined were in fact not affected, while HALO also identified 89 contaminated sites that had been missed in the survey. In Thailand, the LIS reported a total mine-contaminated area of approximately 2,556 square kilometers, three times more than the previous estimate, and considered unrealistic by some.

Most mine-affected countries with operational mine action bodies have progressively compiled substantial amounts of information that, although perhaps not consistent, can serve both priority-setting and strategic planning purposes. Prior to the Landmine Impact Survey in Cambodia, several organizations had conducted numerous smaller technical surveys and gathered data in individual databases as well as in the database held by national authorities.

Initiated in 1999, the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) assists mine action programs with data collection and mapping of information collected on affected areas, mine clearance, mine casualties and other relevant information. According to the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), the database has been installed in 35 countries, and four areas.<sup>47</sup> In February 2004, five key mine action operators stated, “The IMSMA system in its current format is too complicated and is not working as intended. A more simple and user friendly system should be introduced to assist in the coordination of mine information, and this information should be shared and made freely available.”<sup>48</sup>

### **Mine Clearance**

Following the identification of mined areas, Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty requires: 1) the marking, monitoring, and fencing or protection of such areas to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians; and 2) the destruction of emplaced mines as soon as possible, but not more than ten years after entry into force of the treaty for a particular State Party. Equally relevant and important is Article 6, which states the right of each party to seek and receive assistance to the extent possible. This article implies a responsibility of the international community to provide funding and support for mine action programs in mine-affected countries with limited resources.

Mine clearance has continued to evolve from a strictly military activity to a more sophisticated and systematic humanitarian and developmental initiative. Most NGOs involved in mine clearance have aims that go beyond the clearance of mines; for example the opening up of affected areas for productive use by marginalized groups. A comprehensive framework for this kind of development-oriented mine action was first formulated through initiatives such as the “Bad Honnef” guidelines issued in 1997. Mine clearance involves a variety of techniques, primarily manual deminers, canine mine detection, and mechanical systems.

Some form of mine clearance was reported to have taken place in 2003 and 2004 in a total of 65 countries, including 41 States Parties, 24 non-States Parties, and seven areas.

Humanitarian mine clearance by an international or national NGO, or by any other entity conducting clearance that benefited the civilian population, was recorded in 36 countries, including 28 States Parties, eight non-States Parties and four areas. Among the key accomplishments during 2003 and 2004, Djibouti declared itself “mine-safe” on 29 January 2004, and Honduras completed its mine clearance operations in June 2004. In January 2004, the Yemeni government declared the Aden governorate to be free of landmines. For the first time, humanitarian mine clearance operations started in Armenia (May 2003), Chile (September 2003), Senegal (late 2003), and Tajikistan (June 2004).

Humanitarian mine clearance took place in the following States Parties in 2003/2004: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, DR Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Perú, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Yemen. The non-States Parties included: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Iraq, Laos, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. The areas were: Abkhazia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Somaliland.

As can be seen from the listing below, a combined total of more than 149 million square meters of land was cleared in 2003, and a total of 174,167 antipersonnel mines, 9,330 antivehicle mines, and

2,570,200 UXO were destroyed.<sup>49</sup> Inconsistent and incomplete reporting of clearance results is improving, but these figures should still be regarded with caution.

- In Afghanistan, 30 million square meters of mined land and 59.5 million square meters of former battlefield were cleared, destroying 17,884 antipersonnel mines, 5,259 antivehicle mines, and 1,347,238 UXO;
- In Albania, a total 310,800 square meters of land was cleared and another 799,601 square meters reduced through survey;
- Angola reported an area of 3,525,197 square meters was cleared, destroying 14,726 antipersonnel mines, 1,045 antivehicle mines and 71,596 UXO;
- In Armenia, deminers cleared 100,000 square meters in one province between May and November 2003;
- In Azerbaijan, the two national demining NGOs reporting clearance of some 1.3 million square meters of land;
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, a total of 6.4 million square meters land was cleared;
- In Cambodia, a total of 41.7 million square meters of land was cleared, destroying 60,626 antipersonnel mines, 1,096 antivehicle mines and 118,307 UXO. This was 20 percent more land cleared than in 2002 and the largest annual clearance total ever;
- In Croatia, 28.5 million square meters of land was cleared;
- In Ecuador, a total of 24,971 square meters of land was cleared, destroying 60 antipersonnel mines.
- In Eritrea, approximately 4.8 million square meters of land and 2,375 kilometers of road was cleared in the Temporary Security Zone and adjacent areas, destroying 439 antipersonnel mines, 187 antivehicle mines, and 5,785 UXO;
- In Guinea-Bissau, two mine clearance NGOs demined 442,292 square meters of land, destroying 102 antipersonnel mines and 2,123 UXO;
- In northern Iraq, two NGOs cleared a combined total of 988,811 square meters of land, destroying 29,667 mines and 905,137 UXO;
- In Jordan, the Army Engineer Corps cleared approximately 4 million square meters of land, destroying 556 mines;
- UXO Lao cleared 8.8 million square meters of land, destroying 54,420 pieces of UXO;
- In Lebanon, the Army reported demining 1.6 million square meters of land, and destroying 2,200 antipersonnel mines, 250 antivehicle mines, and 8,000 UXO;
- In FYR Macedonia, more than 1.6 million square meters of land were released through clearance and survey operations;
- In Mozambique, a total of 7,058,095 square meters of affected land was cleared, and 9,263 antipersonnel mines, 1,395 antivehicle mines, and 13,455 UXO were destroyed;
- In Nicaragua, between March 2003 and March 2004, 376,517 square meters of land were cleared, and 14,451 landmines and 27,033 UXO were destroyed;
- Perú reported that humanitarian clearance in the departments of Piura and Tumbes was completed in December 2003;
- In Rwanda, a total of 26,752 square meters of land was cleared;

- In Serbia and Montenegro, a total of 1,460,000 square meters of land was cleared of mines and UXO;
- In Sri Lanka, a total of 2,155,364 square meters of land was cleared, and 24,038 antipersonnel mines, 54 antivehicle mines and 13,231 UXO were destroyed;
- According to the Sudan Emergency Mine Action Program, almost 450,000 square meters of land was cleared;
- In Thailand, a total of 718,910 square meters of land was cleared;
- Yemen cleared about 2.8 million square meters of land, destroying 155 antipersonnel mines, 44 antivehicle mines, and 9,660 UXO.

In 2003 and 2004, other types of clearance besides HMA, such as explosive ordnance disposal (EOD), clearance for commercial purposes, and limited demining tasks was carried out in 29 countries. This included 13 States Parties: Belarus, Colombia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Moldova, Namibia, Philippines, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom (Falklands), Zambia, and Zimbabwe. It also included 16 non-States Parties (Burma/Myanmar, China, Egypt, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Nepal, South Korea, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine), as well as Chechnya, Taiwan and Western Sahara.

In 2003 and 2004, no clearance activities were recorded in 20 countries. This included 13 States Parties: Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Republic of Congo, Denmark, France (Djibouti), Liberia, Malawi, Niger, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tunisia and Venezuela. It also included seven non-States Parties (Cuba, Morocco, North Korea, Oman, Somalia, Syria, and Uzbekistan), as well as Palestine. Four countries (Algeria, Niger, Tunisia and Venezuela) reported that they are planning to undertake humanitarian mine clearance. *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* indicated that no clearance activities were taking place in 16 mine-affected countries, including 12 States Parties.

Landmine Monitor has recorded clearance initiatives conducted or implemented by civilians living in mine-affected communities in countries including Afghanistan, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, DR Congo, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Laos, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. In some locations, such as Cambodia, the practice is systematic and widespread in parts of the country, while elsewhere, such as Nicaragua, there may be spontaneous instances of clearance. The practice represents a grassroots attempt to meet the urgent need for arable land and other economic resources denied to local inhabitants by the presence or suspected presence of mine-contaminated areas. According to a study released in September 2003, one of the major reasons why “village demining” still exists in Cambodia is: “For many villagers, the risk of not being able to provide for a family is greater than taking the risk of clearing mines by themselves and reducing the overall risk in contaminated land to a tolerable level.”<sup>50</sup>

It is difficult to arrive at a reliable statistic on the number of square meters of land that have been cleared in the past five years. Major problems are encountered with inconsistent and incomplete reporting of clearance from many countries. In many cases it is hard to distinguish between clearance of mined land, area reduction through survey, and battle area surface clearance. With those caveats, Landmine Monitor reporting from 1999-2003 indicates that nearly 1,100,000,000 square meters of land have been cleared through all these methods. More than four million antipersonnel mines, nearly one million antivehicle mines, and more than eight million pieces of unexploded ordnance have been destroyed in clearance operations.

### Mine Clearance Deadlines (Article 5)

A total of 42 States Parties have declared emplaced mines and must meet the Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 requirement to destroy all antipersonnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. Both Argentina and the United Kingdom have declared with respect to the Falkland/Malvinas Islands. Five other States Parties have not submitted their initial Article 7 reports, but are expected to officially declare a mine problem: Burundi, Liberia, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, and Turkey. Landmine Monitor identifies six other States Parties as mine-affected, but they have not officially declared areas containing or suspected of containing antipersonnel mines in their Article 7 transparency reporting: Bangladesh, Belarus, Moldova, Namibia, Philippines, and Sierra Leone; these six are not included in the “Deadlines” chart below.

#### Mine Clearance Deadlines (Article 5)

2009 (22)	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, France (Djibouti), Guatemala, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Perú, Senegal, Swaziland, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom (Falklands), Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe
2010 (7)	Albania, Argentina (Malvinas), Cambodia, <i>Liberia</i> , Rwanda, Tajikistan, Tunisia
2011 (5)	Colombia, Rep. of Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Zambia
2012 (5)	Algeria, Chile, DR Congo, Eritrea, Suriname
2013 (3)	Afghanistan, Angola, Cyprus
2014 (5)	<i>Burundi, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Turkey</i>

*Italics:* No Article 7 report yet submitted declaring mined areas.

Twenty-two of these 47 States Parties face a deadline in 2009 to destroy or ensure the destruction of antipersonnel mines in known or suspected mined areas under their jurisdiction or control, including thirteen by 1 March 2009.<sup>51</sup>

Of those with 2009 deadlines, it appears about 12 have clearly set goals to meet the deadline.

- Croatia’s mine action plan was due to be revised in 2004 to ensure the country meets the 2009 treaty deadline;
- Guatemala stated in August 2004 that clearance operations throughout the country were scheduled to end by June 2005;
- Jordan’s three-phase demining plan should see mine clearance in the country completed by May 2009;
- Malawi stated in June 2004 that it is taking the necessary steps to ensure the country is free from mines and UXO by 2009;
- Nicaragua reported in April 2004 that, depending on available funding, the completion date for the country’s demining operations may be pushed back from 2005 to 2006;

- Niger presented a draft mine action plan in February 2004 for the period from 2004 to 2006 and it is seeking international assistance;
- Perú's mine action coordination body Contraminas told Landmine Monitor in April 2004 that Perú should meet its treaty-mandated clearance deadline of 1 March 2009;
- Senegal announced in June 2004 that a five-year national mine action plan to clear Casamance is awaiting the approval of the government;
- The United Kingdom confirmed in February 2004 that the government is "fully committed" to destroying all mines in areas under UK jurisdiction, meaning the Falklands, but there has been no progress on a mine clearance feasibility study, first proposed in October 2001;
- Venezuela has not yet begun clearance operations of mined areas located at six Naval posts, but the task is not expected to take long;
- In Yemen, a five-year strategic plan is in place to clear fourteen high impact communities by 2004.

Some States Parties have set clearance goals that stretch past their 2009 treaty-mandated deadline, while others have acknowledged their doubts that they will be able to meet the goal. Several report their primary goal is to become "impact-free" or free from the risk of mines ("mine-safe"). Some countries have indicated increased assistance as a condition for them to successfully complete the Article 5 obligation by 1 March 2009.

- Bosnia and Herzegovina's mine action strategy approved in April 2003 required \$333 million to "become free from the negative impact of mines" and UXO by 2010; a draft new strategy of August 2004 required \$104 million to clear and reduce first priority areas in highly impacted communities by 2009 and fence and mark other suspected areas;
- Chad's mine action plan, updated in January 2003, aims to free the country from the impact of mines and UXO by 2015;
- Mozambique's first mine action plan set the goal of becoming "mine-impact free" within ten years, which would mean 2012;
- Thailand confirmed in June 2004 that while it is committed, it doubts it will be possible to meet its mine clearance deadline of 1 May 2009;
- Zimbabwe told Landmine Monitor in February 2004 that unless sufficient funds are obtained, it will not be able to meet the 2009 deadline.

Some have taken no steps toward even establishing a plan to meet their clearance deadline. In March 2004, Denmark confirmed the country has no plan in place to clear mined areas in a nature reserve on the Skallingen peninsula. Ecuador's Army, which is responsible for mine action in the country, has not made its mine clearance plan public, including how it intends to meet its treaty deadline. Swaziland has remained silent on its intent to clear its one minefield.

Some States Parties face ongoing mine-use and no humanitarian mine clearance has been initiated, which calls into question the viability of the goal to remove emplaced mines within the 2009 treaty deadline. Uganda stated that the Lord's Resistance Army continued to lay antipersonnel mines in the

north of the country in 2003 and 2004, while two recent assessment missions stressed the need for a mine action coordination center and a national mine action plan. The experience of Angola showed that it was possible to conduct a nationwide mine clearance program in the midst of a conflict. Exactly how more recent States Parties in similar states of conflict, such as Burundi, Colombia, DR Congo, and Sudan, will manage to meet their clearance deadline is a looming challenge.

The ultimate goal of eradicating antipersonnel mines has usually been termed “mine-free.” However, an increasing number of States Parties are focusing on objectives other than “mine-free,” and utilizing terms such as “mine-safe,” “risk-free” or “impact-free.” Such terms are indicative of a need to discuss more thoroughly and articulate more precisely the objective of Article 5 of the treaty, which requires destruction of “all anti-personnel mines in mined areas.” An integral component is discussion of the provision in the Mine Ban Treaty for a mine clearance deadline extension. As stated in Article 5(3), a request for an extension of the deadline can be made to a Meeting of States Parties or a Review Conference, and must include, among other things, a detailed explanation of the reasons for the requested extension with information on financial and technical means available and the circumstances hindering the clearance and destruction of all antipersonnel mines in all mined areas. Some outside the Mine Ban Treaty believe that the mine-free objective is economically unachievable and morally questionable. In June 2004, the United States called the “mine-free” goal, “an unnecessary action regardless of whether or not the mine generates any adverse impacts or poses a threat to civilians.”<sup>52</sup>

Apart from the discussion on “mine-free,” some States Parties, such as Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Mozambique are emphasizing area reduction measures to mark and/or fence mined areas and suspected land rather than physical mine clearance. This approach is grounded in Article 5(2), which obligates States Parties to take every effort to implement the minimum standard of protection of civilians from the effects of antipersonnel mines contained in CCW Amended Protocol II. Mine action operators recognize that survey operations and area reduction are important and necessary steps, which not only bring down the number of new mine incidents but are also cost-efficient planning and priority setting measures. But these activities have to be followed up by actual clearance operations, and there is concern that overemphasis on survey and area reduction could make it difficult for a country to comply with its obligation to destroy all antipersonnel mines from mined areas within ten years.

### **Case Studies**

A review of the mine action achievements in seven major mine-affected States Parties provides a window into some of the activity taken over the past five years: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Yemen. The first four countries listed are, as was the case five years ago, still believed to be among the most mine-affected countries in the world. The last three countries are included in this analysis in an attempt to provide a well-rounded overview of the state of mine action in every part of the world.

Between the seven countries, in the five years since the Mine Ban Treaty became international law at the start of 1999 and the end of 2003, a total of about 513 million square meters of mined land was cleared during which a total of 367,856 antipersonnel mines, 19,615 antivehicle mines, and 32.7 million UXO were destroyed. A handful of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operate in several of these States Parties, led by three long-established groups: HALO Trust, Mines Advisory Group, and Norwegian

People's Aid. Each country includes a coordination body that despite some instances of funding crises, mismanagement, and statistical clearance discrepancies, continues to play a central role in building the capacity of the governing institutions to manage the country's mine problem.

- *Afghanistan*: The Mine Action Program in Afghanistan (MAPA), established 1989, is the oldest and largest demining program in the world. In 2004, the program consisted of the UN Mine Action Center for Afghanistan and sixteen NGO implementing partners. The Mine Action Program in Afghanistan experienced a severe shortage of funds in 2000 and had to lay-off mine action teams. Additionally, mine action operations were virtually brought to a halt following 11 September 2001 and all mine action activities experienced great difficulties during the subsequent military conflict. However, by March 2002, mine action had returned to earlier levels. In February 2004, a planning process was initiated to transfer responsibility for the MAPA from the United Nations to the national government. Afghanistan has estimated that \$300 million will be needed between 2003 and 2007, and an additional \$200 million for 2008 and 2012 to make the country “mine-effect free.” Between 1999 and 2003, a total of about 131 million square meters of mined land was cleared, as well as 373 million square meters of battlefield areas. In that period, a total of 105,072 antipersonnel mines, 10,775 antivehicle mines, and 2.54 million UXO were destroyed.
- *Angola*: In 2004, there were ten operators engaged in mine clearance-related activities in Angola: eight NGOs (HALO, MAG, NPA, Intersos, SBF, BTS, MgM, and DCA), the National Demining Institute and the Angolan Armed Forces. In the time that it has been reporting, Landmine Monitor has faced difficulties in reconciling conflicting data on mine clearance for Angola, particularly as reported by INAROOE and its successor. Between 2000 and 2003, an estimated total of about 18.9 million square meters of mined land was cleared. In that period, a total of 21,061 antipersonnel mines, 1,096 antivehicle mines, and 159,613 UXO were destroyed.
- *Bosnia and Herzegovina*: Eight years after the end of the war, Bosnia and Herzegovina remains the most heavily mine-contaminated country in Europe, with a least four percent of the country mine-affected. There are 18,600 recorded minefields, which is said to represent only about 60 percent of the actual number of mined areas. In 2003, BHMIC had accredited 37 demining organizations to work in the country: three Entity Armed Forces and three Civil Protection agencies, 14 NGOs and 17 commercial companies. Between 1999 and 2003, a total of about 31.9 million square meters of mined land was cleared and a total of 15,467 mines and 10,038 UXO were destroyed.
- *Cambodia*: In 2003, there were four demining operators in Cambodia, including three NGOs (CMAC, HALO Trust, MAG). Proper humanitarian mine clearance started in 1992, initiated by the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC). After establishing mine clearance operations in 1992 and 1993, the rate of clearance annually remained fairly steady from 1994 to 1999, averaging 18.1 million square meters per year. The totals are up sharply since then, with the exception of 2001, due to a CMAC mismanagement and funding crisis. Cambodia aims to reach “zero impact” from landmines and UXO by 2012. Between 1999 and 2003, a total of approximately 146 million square meters of mined land was cleared and a total of 161,633 antipersonnel mines, 3,866 antivehicle mines, and 450,012 UXO were destroyed.

- *Nicaragua:* Mine clearance in Nicaragua is the responsibility of the Engineer Corps of the Nicaraguan Army, with technical supervision and support provided by the OAS Assistance Mission for Mine Clearance in Central America (MARMINCA). As is the case for most mine clearance in the region, annual demining figures for Nicaragua have proven elusive for Landmine Monitor. Between 2001 and 2003, a total of 1,110,899 square meters was cleared. In 2000, as well as between 2002 and 2003, a total of 26,085 antipersonnel mines were destroyed. In 2000 and in 2003, a total of 43,205 UXO was destroyed.
- *Mozambique:* Demining in Mozambique started at the end of the war in 1992, as the United Nations prepared to return refugees and IDP as part of the UNOMOZ operation. In 2004, seven operators were engaged in mine clearance-related activities in Mozambique: five NGOs, two commercial firms, and the Armed Forces. Between 1999 and 2003, a total of about 35 million square meters of mined land was cleared and a total of 34,416 antipersonnel mines, 2,680 antivehicle mines, and 22,765 UXO were destroyed.
- *Yemen:* The Mine Clearance Unit of the National Demining Program completed its first clearance task in December 1999. Between 2000 and 2003, a total of about 6.84 million square meters of mined land was cleared and a total of 4,663 antipersonnel mines, 677 antivehicle mines, and 44,270 UXO were destroyed.

An often-neglected aspect of mine clearance has been that carried out in areas that are not sovereign states. The ICBL and others have periodically been criticized for focusing too much attention on the mine action needs of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty without addressing equally pressing humanitarian needs in non-States Parties and entities that are not internationally-recognized. For years, a handful of NGOs have engaged in mine clearance that has made a significant impact in post-conflict areas largely ignored by the international community. The Mines Advisory Group has carried out mine action operations in northern Iraq since 1992. Between 1999 and 2003, MAG cleared a total of 3,640,093 square meters of mined land and destroyed a total of 42,542 landmines and 886,955 UXO. NPA has also engaged in northern Iraq for many years. The HALO Trust has operated in Nagorno-Karabakh since 2000. Between 2000 and 2003, HALO cleared a total of 2,691,097 square meters of mined land, surveyed another 7,767,500 square meters and did battle area clearance of 45,414,190. In this period, it cleared and destroyed a total of 2,167 antipersonnel mines, 977 antivehicle mines and 8,710 UXO.

### **Coordination and Planning**

In 2003 and 2004, there was some form of coordination and planning body in place in 42 of the mine-affected countries, plus four areas: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Burundi, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Djibouti, DR Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, and Lebanon, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Perú, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe, plus Abkhazia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, and Somaliland.<sup>53</sup>

This was three more countries than reported in *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. In Burundi, a Mine Action Center was created in June 2004 in the headquarters of the UN peacekeeping operation. A

Georgian Mine Action Center was formed by a local NGO in early 2004. In Iraq, the Coalition Provisional Authority established the Iraq National Mine Action Authority and Iraq Mine Action Center in Baghdad.

The creation of a mine action center was included in a mine action plan drafted by Senegal in June 2004. In FYR Macedonia, the UN Mine Action Office closed and the Ministry of Defense took over responsibility for the coordination of mine action.

A national plan for removing landmines helps to ensure that priority areas most needed by the population are cleared and helps to establish a measure against which to assess the social and economic impact of mine clearance. There is now greater recognition of the importance of putting mine action planning into the broader context of development plans, such as those included in Poverty Reduction Strategies, UN Development Assistance Frameworks and other mechanisms.

In 2004, Landmine Monitor recorded national mine action plans in-place in 23 countries and two areas, one more than reported in 2003 with the addition of Zambia: Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea Bissau, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, Sudan, Thailand, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

In March 2004, the government of Laos issued a National Strategic Plan that sets mine/UXO action objectives and priorities over a ten-year period (2003-2013) and creates a new National Regulatory Authority to oversee and coordinate UXO/mine action activities. The Army in Senegal developed a plan, with the support of the French military, to clear the Casamance region in three phases over a five-year period. The Zambian Mine Action Center has developed a strategic demining work plan, employing IMSMA.

### **International Developments**

The Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies met in February and June 2004, co-chaired by Cambodia and Japan with Algeria and Sweden as co-rapporteurs. The Committee focused on the status of implementation and updates on activities and problems faced by mine-affected States Parties. A total of 25 countries made statements in February 2004 using the “4P” framework (“Problems, Plans, Progress and Priorities”). In June 2004, 30 countries presented this information, with many focusing on their anticipated needs to fulfill the Article 5 obligation. There was an increase in the number of non-mine-affected countries reporting on bilateral support efforts, in addition to support provided to international organizations such as the UN and to operational mine clearance organizations.

Over the past five years, first NGOs and later larger institutions and donor bodies have advocated for the inclusion of mine clearance planning and priority-setting in national development and poverty reduction plans. As noted above, another trend in recent years is the focus for some mine-affected States Parties on achievement levels other than mine-free, such as impact-free or mine-safe within the ten-year deadline of the Mine Ban Treaty.

The ICBL Mine Action Working Group (MAWG), co-chaired by Norwegian People's Aid and the Afghan Mine Detection and Dog Center, presented at both Standing Committee meetings held in 2004. In February, it focused on the future of mine action, particularly in relation to the First Review Conference,

and proposed that the Committee consider three related concepts: exit strategies and achievement levels, mine-impact free and mine-free, and impact versus control of mined areas.

Norway continued to chair the informal Resource Mobilization Contact Group that provided a review of resources currently available to achieve Article 5 obligations to the June 2004 Committee meeting. This review identified over \$2.2 billion in international, national and in-kind resources applied to mine action in the past seven years and concluded that “ensuring a sufficient flow of resources over the next several years will be crucial.” In addition to the sufficient flow of resources, increased in-country coordination and better prioritization of mine action activities is required.

Five humanitarian demining NGOs formed the NGO Perspective on the Debris of War in August 2002 that has argued that too many mine action programs are unnecessarily costly and complicated, and called for a larger percentage of available funds to be directed toward practical clearance activities.<sup>54</sup> On 22-24 March 2004, the NGO Perspective met in Oslo together with UN mine action representatives to discuss and agree on best practices for improving cooperation and effectiveness in the conduct of mine action. Four areas of concern were raised and discussed: coordination, personnel, costs and International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Some conclusions from the meeting, agreed upon by both the UN and the NGOs were:

- All mine action stakeholders should be included in the development of realistic and achievable national mine action plans;
- The development of mine action plans and activities should be undertaken locally;
- Mine action plans should be broad enough to secure national infrastructure priorities and other macro priorities, and contribute to the development of a national plan;
- Relevant actors should be engaged to improve national and international policies and development strategies, enhance effectiveness in mine action, reduce the need for expensive expatriate personnel and ensure assistance in mine action is based on needs analysis and cost-effective approaches; and
- IMAS should be reviewed and simplified where appropriate.

The United Nations Development Programme’s mine action work promotes the development of national and local capacities through integrated and sustainable mine action programs. One activity is the creation of national mine action centers to coordinate, prioritize, and ensure the quality of the various mine action operations.<sup>55</sup> According to UNDP, it is currently involved in mine action capacity-building in 27 countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, Ukraine, and Yemen.

A number of studies have been conducted and published at the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) in 2003 and 2004. The following are examples: “Study of Explosive Remnants of War – Warning and Risk Education,” published in May 2003; “A Guide to International Mine Action Standards,” published in January 2004; “Mine Detection Dogs: Training, Operations and Odor Detection,” published in June 2003; and “The Role of the Military in Mine Action,” published in June 2003.

The International Mine Action Standards are guidelines for mine action practitioners with the objective of helping national governments, mine action centers and demining organizations conduct consistent and safe mine action activities in accordance with international standards. First proposed in July 1996, the first international standards for mine action were issued by UNMAS in March 1997. These were re-developed by GICHD, reissued in 1999, and continue to be refined and reviewed regularly to reflect developing norms and practices, and to incorporate changes to international regulations and standards. The IMAS can be viewed online at [www.mineactionstandards.org](http://www.mineactionstandards.org).

### **Research and Development**

Article 6 of the Mine Ban Treaty allows States Parties to exercise their “right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information” concerning implementation of the treaty. Since 1999, *Landmine Monitor* has taken note of various projects by donors, mine-affected countries, international agencies, and commercial companies to research and development better methods to detect and destroy emplaced mines. A comprehensive overview has proven to be beyond the scope of the Monitor, but other actors, most notably the GICHD, have undertaken several studies into demining methodology and technology projects. Measuring the impact of these projects in the field remains a difficult task.

While basic manual demining techniques have essentially remained unchanged since World War II, progress has steadily been made over the past five years to enhance, expand and improve the “toolbox” of equipment available and thereby increase the efficiency and safety of deminers.

The ICBL has continued to challenge technology experts to develop affordable, locally adaptable, and culturally appropriate tools for use in mine action. The distance between research and development experts and end users remains wide, despite several efforts to bridge the divide. NGO practitioners and mine-affected countries continue to extend a standing invitation to researchers to visit the field and visualize the real needs and characteristics of humanitarian mine clearance environments.

On 17 July 2000, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the European Commission, Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States establishing an International Test and Evaluation Program to promote the development of new technologies for humanitarian demining and share information among different actors. These governments together with Australia, South Africa and others have been at the forefront of the funding and promotion of research and development initiatives in mine action.

On the recipient end, CROMAC in Croatia has several projects involving research and development and has been engaged in the testing new methods of mine detection as has CMAC in Cambodia. Cambodia co-chaired the short-lived Standing Committee on Technologies for Mine Action in 1999-2000. Several mine action NGOs test and develop detection and clearance equipment that is affordable, appropriate, and sustainable. Mine action practitioners have long supported the development of new technologies as long as these efforts do not divert funds from their ongoing mine action efforts. This requires transparency concerning investments in R&D, coordination to avoid duplication of efforts and careful consideration of humanitarian end-user requirements.

## **MINE RISK EDUCATION**

Mine risk education (MRE) has evolved considerably since 1999, both quantitatively and qualitatively. While programs of varying sizes were reported in 25 countries in 1999, mine risk education programs were recorded in 63 countries in 2003 and 2004, including significant MRE programs in 46 countries. Mine risk education programs in 1999 generally consisted of lecture-type presentations and dissemination of posters, but in 2004 an increasing number of MRE programs were closely linked with survey, marking and clearance, and worked within the framework of official school curricula. In addition, in some countries mine risk education developed from teaching people basic mine recognition skills and warning messages, in the expectation that they would learn to avoid mines, to implementing detailed qualitative surveys which uncover primary factors that contribute to landmine accidents and risk-taking, such as poverty, displacement and social exclusion. In 2003, Landmine Monitor recorded 8.4 million people who attended MRE sessions, a significant increase in comparison to the 4.8 million reported in 2002. Between 1999 and 2003, about 22.9 million people attended MRE sessions. Despite this progress, much still needs to be done to ensure that the needs and priorities of affected communities are prioritized. In June 2004, the ICBL and UNICEF stated, “Future thinking in MRE will require a more strategic approach in more countries, whereby MRE will need to be mainstreamed to ensure its sustainability. This will come through the inclusion of MRE in the school syllabus, into injury surveillance and public health planning, and by integrating MRE processes in community organisations and structures along with mine clearance.”<sup>56</sup>

In 2001, the term “mine risk education” replaced the previously used term “mine awareness.”<sup>57</sup> MRE “seeks to reduce the risk of injury from mines/UXO by raising awareness and promoting behavioral change; including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison.”<sup>58</sup> The term MRE is now used by most operators, including the International Committee of the Red Cross.<sup>59</sup>

### *MRE Programs*

The number of countries with mine risk education programs increased from 25 in 1999, to 43 in 2000, to 44 in 2001, with smaller scale MRE activities in another 14. In 2002, significant MRE programs were reported in 36 countries, with basic or limited MRE activities in 21 countries.

In 2003 and 2004, Landmine Monitor recorded some form of mine risk education in 63 countries. There were significant MRE programs in 46 countries, and more basic or limited MRE activities in another 17 countries. No mine risk education activities were recorded in 23 mine-affected countries.

The 46 countries with MRE programs in 2003 and 2004, included 30 States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, DR Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Perú, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe) and 16 non-States Parties (Azerbaijan, Burma/Myanmar, Ethiopia, Georgia, India, Iran, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, Syria, and Vietnam), as well as five other areas that Landmine Monitor monitors due to their mine-affected status (Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Palestine).

### *New MRE Programs*

In 2003 and 2004, new mine risk education programs and activities were recorded in 14 countries: Burma/Myanmar, Burundi, Chad, DR Congo, Georgia, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Sudan, Tanzania, and Zambia. New small-scale MRE activities were also recorded in Armenia, Bangladesh, Chechnya, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Ukraine.

### *Limited MRE Activities*

Basic or limited mine risk education activities were recorded in 14 mine-affected countries in 2003 and 2004, including nine States Parties (Bangladesh, Belarus, Chile, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Moldova, Sierra Leone, and Tunisia) and five non-States Parties (Armenia, Israel, Poland, Somalia, and Ukraine), as well as in the Falklands/Malvinas and Somaliland. In addition, in three countries not considered as mine-affected by Landmine Monitor (Estonia, Kenya and Latvia), there are MRE activities aimed at reducing the risk from unexploded ordnance.

### *No MRE Activities*

In 2003 and 2004, no mine risk education activities were recorded in 23 countries, including 13 States Parties--Algeria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti (which has now declared itself to be "mine-safe"), Greece, Niger, Philippines, Rwanda, Suriname, Swaziland, Turkey, and Venezuela--and 10 non-States Parties--China, Cuba, Egypt, North Korea, South Korea, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Oman, and Uzbekistan--as well as in Taiwan and Western Sahara. This does not suggest, however, that mine risk education is needed in all these countries.

In 2003 and 2004, mine risk education programs ended in Ethiopia, FYR Macedonia, and Namibia. Mine risk education has been severely hampered by security in Iraq, where some key MRE operators were forced to suspend their operations and pull out of the country.

### *MRE Needs*

A pressing need for mine risk education, or increased MRE, was apparent from the number of civilian casualties in 14 countries: Burma/Myanmar, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Georgia, India, Iran, Iraq, Nepal, Pakistan, southern Sudan, Somalia, Turkey, Vietnam, as well as in Somaliland. A need for effective MRE coordination was reported in Colombia.

Other countries where calls for MRE, or increased MRE, were recorded include El Salvador, Liberia, Mauritania, Rwanda, Tanzania, Ukraine, Zimbabwe, as well as Western Sahara. The number of new casualties in these countries suggests, however, that the need for MRE is less acute than in countries mentioned previously.

Operators reported difficulties in obtaining funding for MRE activities in Rwanda, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

### **Integration of MRE with Other Mine Action Activities**

Since 1999, the integration of mine risk education with survey, clearance, or marking activities has considerably increased. Most MRE programs reported in 1999 had only limited links with survey, marking, or clearance. In 2003 and 2004, indicators of a growing integration between MRE and survey,

marking, or clearance were recorded in Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iraq, Lebanon, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Uganda. Such integration generally resulted in a better response to the clearance requests put forward by mine-affected communities.

- In Afghanistan, Afghan Red Crescent volunteers pass clearance requests from affected communities to demining agencies, while Handicap International (HI) developed its own explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) capacity in response to the high number of clearance requests received through its MRE program; at a national level though, the integration between MRE and clearance is limited.
- In Angola, most MRE operators collect mine-affected communities' requests for clearance or marking; they then provide these data to demining agencies, encouraging them to clear or mark the areas. Most requests are reported to receive a response.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, a Task Assessment and Planning pilot project was carried out by survey teams to provide the local data needed to prioritize mine action. The community mine action plans represent an integrated approach to mine action, combining clearance and survey with mine risk education and victim assistance.
- In Cambodia, new approaches developed since 2002 aim to prevent mine and UXO incidents through a combination of limited clearance, long-term marking, UXO disposal, MRE, and community liaison.
- In Croatia, Norwegian People's Aid developed a program that combines MRE with survey, impact assessment, clearance, and post-clearance community liaison.
- In Eritrea, MRE teams can travel with demining units and provide post-clearance MRE in communities.
- In Ethiopia, community liaison staff and deminers live in the same camp; in 2003, mine-affected communities reported 1,495 landmines or UXO to community liaison personnel; all devices were subsequently cleared.
- In Iraq, the Mines Advisory Group conducted community liaison while Iraqi Red Crescent volunteers gathered information and relayed it to the Coalition forces/occupying powers that were urged to address the issue immediately.
- In Lebanon, the Landmines Resource Center conducts community liaison, linking the demining companies and the communities targeted by the demining operations, enabling mine-affected communities to express their needs and to report dangerous areas for verification and clearance.
- In Mozambique, HI reviewed its strategy and developed three EOD teams that respond to communities' clearance requests channeled through the community liaison teams.
- In Nicaragua, MRE activities are leading to the discovery of new unregistered minefields.
- In Sri Lanka, MRE activities have been closely linked with resettlement of internally displaced persons and with mine clearance, with MRE operators acting as liaison between communities and the demining teams before, during, and after clearance operations.
- In Somaliland, some demining groups have been conducting MRE as part of their overall mine action work.
- In Sudan, three organizations have been conducting MRE along with clearance.

- In Uganda, the government reports that MRE has been instrumental in providing the army with information about mines and UXO to be removed.

#### *Other Forms of Integration*

The training of large numbers of teachers and/or the integration of mine risk education in the school curriculum was recorded in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chechnya, Eritrea, Estonia, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Laos, Mozambique, Palestine, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Vietnam, and to a lesser extent in Russia and Syria. In the DR Congo, DanChurchAid and Eglise du Christ au Congo began a combined HIV/AIDS awareness and mine risk education project.

#### *Emergency MRE*

Since 1999, new approaches were developed in order to provide mine risk education in emergency contexts such as Afghanistan, Chad/Sudan, Iraq, and Kosovo. Methods used included quick impact briefings, massive dissemination of field-tested leaflets, radio and TV spots and soap operas, as well as the training of large numbers of teachers and community leaders.

#### **MRE Numbers and Indicators of Success**

The changing nature of mine risk education, from traditional lecture-type presentations to a broader set of activities that are more targeted toward highly mine-affected communities, leads some key MRE actors to believe that the number of people "reached" or "trained" no longer adequately reflects the impact of their work. In Croatia, for instance, the ICRC considers that traditional lecture-type presentations are of limited value, as people are generally aware of the risk. Other agencies, in Senegal for example, prefer to report the number of teachers or trainers that they trained, rather than the number of people that attended MRE sessions. In addition, the increased integration of MRE into clearance and marking activities leads some agencies to look for new indicators to measure the success of their programs. New indicators identified in various countries in this Landmine Monitor Report include results of Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices (KAP) Surveys, as well as numbers of clearance/marketing requests received and responded to.<sup>60</sup>

In 2003, Landmine Monitor recorded 8.4 million people who attended mine risk education sessions, a significant increase compared to the 4.8 million reported in 2002. Between 1999 and 2003, about 22.9 million people attended MRE sessions. These numbers do not include the millions more that received MRE through radio and television as well as through short briefings, such as those scheduled in 2002 for refugees returning to Afghanistan. Significant increases between 2002 and 2003 were recorded in Angola, Cambodia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guatemala, Iraq, Lebanon, Mozambique, Namibia, and Sri Lanka, as well as in Abkhazia and Chechnya. In a number of programs, a reduction in numbers was related to a closer integration of MRE into clearance and marking, as well as to a stronger focus given to highly impacted communities.

#### **Key Actors**

Since 1999, the number of mine risk education programs implemented by national NGOs and Red Cross/Crescent societies has considerably grown. National NGOs and Red Cross/Crescent societies

conducted MRE programs in 34 countries in this reporting period,<sup>61</sup> an increase from 28 countries in the previous reporting period,<sup>62</sup> and 20 countries in 1999 and 2000.

Internationally, the principal mine risk education operators are the International Committee of the Red Cross, Handicap International, the International Save the Children Alliance (Save the Children Sweden, UK, and US), Mines Advisory Group, DanChurchAid, and the HALO Trust.<sup>63</sup> In the United Nations system, UNICEF is the primary MRE actor and supports NGOs, mine action centers, and ministries of education.<sup>64</sup> The OAS supports a number of MRE programs in Central and South America.

#### *MRE by the Military*

A recent study by the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) on the role of the military in mine action states that military forces should "refrain from involvement in broad-based MRE campaigns until they have acquired the ability to develop MRE communication strategies that minimize the use of one-way communication channels, such as lectures and printed media, and emphasize the active participation of the community in the program."<sup>65</sup> The authors of the study add, "While the military may be able to provide warnings about the technical dangers of landmines and UXO, they are not suited to undertake community-based MRE, where social issues and helping to develop alternative coping mechanisms are important."<sup>66</sup>

Mine risk education activities conducted or supported by the military were reported in 24 countries in 2003 and 2004, including Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Ecuador, Estonia, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kenya, South Korea, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Zambia, Zimbabwe, as well as in Falklands/Malvinas. However, most of these activities were basic or limited.

#### **Evaluations and Assessments**

In 2003 and 2004, external evaluations and KAP surveys<sup>67</sup> were recorded in Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Serbia and Montenegro, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, and Vietnam. Between 1999 and 2002, external evaluations and KAP surveys were recorded in Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia,<sup>68</sup> Kosovo, Senegal, Somaliland, Thailand,<sup>69</sup> and Yemen.<sup>70</sup>

- In Afghanistan, an evaluation that took place in 2002 revealed that "MRE agencies are omitting to measure the impact of their work among their target groups in a systematic and regular manner." In response, the Afghan NGO META developed a system to enable KAP surveys to take place every four months.
- In Albania, a survey that was completed in August 2002 showed good MRE coverage but revealed that 70 percent of people had an economic need to enter mine-affected areas.
- In Burundi, an external evaluation of a MRE program developed by UNICEF and the Ministry of Interior indicates that, if the number of returning refugees increases, it will be necessary to review and strengthen the process.
- In Cambodia, MAG, HI, and NPA are conducting a study on the deliberate handling and usage of live ordnance.

- In Ethiopia, an evaluation of RaDO's program called for reporting to be more focused on qualitative results than on numbers.
- In Lebanon, an external evaluation called for MRE to be more focused on schools through trained teachers.
- In Serbia and Montenegro, following an evaluation that showed a high level of knowledge and awareness of the danger from mines and UXO, the ICRC concluded that its involvement could be handed over to local bodies, provided that clearance continued.
- In Sri Lanka, an impact evaluation found that almost 99 percent of the targeted communities were aware of the mine threat, while areas that had not received MRE showed a higher rate of mine incidents and a lesser number of people aware of the risk.
- In Sudan, two agencies conducted KAP surveys.
- In Vietnam, an evaluation of RENEW's MRE project calls for closer linkages with mobile ordnance removal.

#### *MRE Standards and Guides*

A first edition of the international mine risk education standards was released in December 2003.<sup>71</sup> UNICEF has been developing MRE standards since 2001. In September 2003, during the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, UNICEF and Cranfield University presented a second draft of the MRE standards to MRE operators gathered for a meeting of the international MRE Working Group. The standards were written by Cranfield University for UNICEF. During the meeting, MRE operators raised strong concerns, in particular about the accreditation process as defined in the standards.<sup>72</sup>

Since 1999, two agencies, HI and GICHD, have released a number of mine risk education guides and methodological documents.<sup>73</sup>

In August 1999, UNMAS launched its "Landmine Safety Project" (LSP) in partnership with CARE and Mine Tech (replaced in September 2002 by HI and UNOPS). The project aimed at providing mine risk education to aid workers. An internal review by UNMAS indicates that 230 people from 27 countries participated in 14 workshops, but "the reach of the workshops was limited." The total budget amounted to \$1.3 million.<sup>74</sup>

#### *International Developments and State Reporting on MRE*

ICBL's Mine Risk Education Sub-Working Group was created in September 1999 to serve as a resource on MRE issues for the ICBL, with its co-chair, HI, acting as Landmine Monitor's thematic research coordinator for MRE.<sup>75</sup> In addition, ICBL and UNICEF have co-convened twice a year since 2002 the international MRE Working Group (MREWG). The MREWG met on 19 September 2003 in Bangkok and on 23 June 2004 in Geneva.

In 2001, States Parties responded positively to an ICBL proposal, originally made in 1999, to move "mine awareness" from the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance and Related Technologies. At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, States Parties agreed to change the name of the Standing Committee on

---

Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies.

Since then, at Standing Committee meetings in February and May 2003, and February and June 2004, States Parties reported on mine risk education programs in accordance with the “4P approach” (problems, plans, progress and priorities). In June 2004, 21 mine-affected States Parties mentioned MRE in their reports at the Standing Committee meeting.<sup>76</sup>

As of 30 September 2004, 35 mine-affected States Parties had reported on mine risk education in their Article 7 Reports, under Form I (measures to provide warning to the population): Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, DR Congo, Croatia, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Perú, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe. This represents a significant increase compared to 24 States in 2003.

## LANDMINE CASUALTIES AND SURVIVOR ASSISTANCE

### Overview

The objective of the Mine Ban Treaty is to alleviate human suffering, and progress has been made since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force. The number of reported new mine casualties has dropped significantly in some heavily mine-affected countries. From 1999 to September 2004, Landmine Monitor has recorded more than 42,500 new landmine and unexploded ordnance (UXO) casualties from incidents in at least 75 countries. However, many casualties go unreported and the full number of casualties is certainly much higher, probably in the range of 15,000 to 20,000 new casualties a year. For 2003, Landmine Monitor identified over 8,065 new casualties, of which 23 percent were children. Landmine Monitor has also identified another 25 countries with casualties caused only by UXO. Landmine Monitor has identified more than 230,000 mine survivors recorded in 97 countries and nine areas; some are from incidents dating back to the end of the Second World War, but the vast majority of survivors are from the mid-1970s onwards. Given the high number of casualties that likely have never been recorded, it is reasonable to assume that there are somewhere between 300,000 and 400,000 mine survivors in the world today. Since 1999, greater attention has been placed on the importance of accurate and up-to-date data on mine casualties and mine survivors to better understand their needs and to ensure that limited resources are used most effectively where the needs are greatest.

Many countries with no new reported landmine casualties nevertheless have landmine survivors that continue to require assistance. Consequently, around two-thirds of the countries in the world – at least 121 countries – are affected to some extent by the landmine/UXO problem and the issue of survivors. In 53 of the 66 countries with new mine casualties in 2003, Landmine Monitor identified one or more aspects of survivor assistance that are reportedly inadequate to meet the needs of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Even when services exist, they are often long distances from mine-affected areas, making them inaccessible to many survivors, are too expensive for survivors to afford, or are bureaucratically off-limits to one group or another. Assistance in the area that has been identified as the top priority for many mine survivors – socio-economic reintegration – continues to be lacking in the majority of countries.

From the research undertaken by Landmine Monitor, it can be concluded that since 1999 through the efforts of States Parties, the ICBL, the ICRC and NGOs in the field, the Mine Ban Treaty has had an impact in raising awareness of the rights and needs of mine survivors and has enabled mine survivors themselves to advocate for services to address their needs. New programs have been implemented in many mine-affected countries, and the survivors that have access to these and other pre-existing services report an improved quality of life. Nevertheless, significant gaps remain in areas such as geographic coverage, affordability, and quality of available facilities. While more is known about the numbers of mine survivors receiving assistance, the extent to which landmine survivors' needs are not being met is generally still unknown. Furthermore, a lack of resources to implement or maintain programs continues to limit activities.

The Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World in November/December 2004 marks an important milestone in global efforts to alleviate the suffering caused by antipersonnel landmines. Mine-affected States Parties, through the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration,

have shown a greater willingness in the past few years to acknowledge their responsibilities and to make their needs known through the presentation of their plans, priorities, progress and problems in providing for the rehabilitation and reintegration of mine survivors. At least 22 mine-affected States are now taking, or have taken, steps to develop a plan of action to address the needs of mine survivors, or more generally to improve services for all persons with disabilities. Some donor States are also acknowledging their responsibilities to provide resources to assist mine-affected States in fulfilling their obligations.<sup>77</sup> The draft Nairobi Action Plan for the period 2005-2009 gives hope to mine survivors that the promise implied by the Mine Ban Treaty for their “care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration,” can be realized.

It is without doubt that many mine survivors have benefited from the increased attention given to the issue of victim assistance by States Parties since 1999. There is a greater understanding of the extent of the problem, and the knowledge that existing programs are far from meeting the needs. Progress has been made since 1999, but challenges remain to ensure that mine survivor assistance programs are adequate, appropriate and sustainable and that limited resources are used to most effectively match services with needs so that all mine survivors can benefit from the increased attention generated by the Mine Ban Treaty.

#### **New Casualties in 2003-2004**

The number of landmine survivors continues to grow as new casualties are reported in every region of the world.<sup>78</sup> In 2003 and through September 2004, Landmine Monitor finds that there were new landmine/UXO casualties reported in 66 countries, one more than the number reported in *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. Landmine Monitor also registered mine casualties in seven areas that it monitors because of a significant landmine problem.<sup>79</sup> In calendar year 2003, new landmine casualties were recorded in 65 countries and all seven areas. In early 2004, new mine casualties were also recorded in Ecuador.

**New Landmine Casualties January 2003-September 2004**

<b>Africa</b>	<b>Americas</b>	<b>Asia/Pacific</b>	<b>Europe/ Central Asia</b>	<b>Middle East/ North Africa</b>
Angola	Bolivia	Afghanistan	Albania	Algeria
Burundi	Chile	<b>Burma (Myanmar)</b>	<b>Armenia</b>	<b>Egypt</b>
Chad	Colombia	Cambodia	<b>Azerbaijan</b>	<b>Iran</b>
DR Congo	Ecuador	<b>China</b>	Bosnia & Herzegovina	<b>Iraq</b>
Eritrea	Nicaragua	<b>India</b>	Croatia	Jordan
<b>Ethiopia</b>	Perú	<b>Indonesia</b>	Cyprus	<b>Kuwait</b>
Guinea-Bissau		<b>Korea, RO</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Lebanon</b>
Kenya		<b>Laos</b>	Greece	<b>Syria</b>
Liberia		<b>Nepal</b>	<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	Yemen
Malawi		<b>Pakistan</b>	FYR Macedonia	<i>Palestine</i>
Mauritania		Philippines	<b>Russia</b>	<i>Western Sahara</i>
Mozambique		<b>Sri Lanka</b>	Serbia & Montenegro	
Namibia		Thailand	Tajikistan	
Niger		<b>Vietnam</b>	Turkey	
Rwanda			<b>Ukraine</b>	
Senegal			<b>Uzbekistan</b>	
<b>Somalia</b>			<i>Abkhazia</i>	
Sudan			<i>Chechnya</i>	
Uganda			<i>Kosovo</i>	
Zambia			<i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i>	
Zimbabwe				
<i>Somaliland</i>				

**Bold:** Non-States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty

Compared to last year's *Landmine Monitor Report*, there are four new countries with reported casualties from mine-related incidents: Armenia, Bolivia, Cyprus, and Liberia. There are three countries that had reported landmine casualties previously, but not since the end of 2002: Belarus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Tunisia. Between 1999 and 2001, new landmine casualties were also reported in Bangladesh, Cuba, Djibouti, Israel, Morocco, and Tanzania, making a total of 75 countries reporting new landmine casualties since 1999. No tangible evidence has been found of new mine casualties in Libya since 1999; however, given the high numbers of mine casualties reported in the past it is highly likely that there have been new mine casualties in the past five years.

Since 1999, Landmine Monitor has also identified another 25 countries with no new landmine casualties, but with casualties caused by unexploded ordnance (UXO) left over from earlier conflicts. This includes 14 countries with new casualties in 2003-2004: Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Republic of Congo, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Panamá, Poland, Slovenia, Timor Leste, and

Venezuela. Other countries reporting UXO casualties since 1999 are Argentina, Belgium, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Latvia, Mongolia, Nigeria, Oman, Sierra Leone, and Slovakia.

### **Scale of the Problem**

Progress has been made since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force. In 1999, it was estimated that landmines claimed 26,000 new casualties every year. The number of reported new mine casualties has dropped significantly in some heavily mine-affected countries. While acknowledging that it is not possible to know with absolute certainty, it is now likely that there are between 15,000 and 20,000 new landmine casualties each year. Nevertheless, landmines continue to claim too many new casualties in too many countries. Based on the information gathered for *Landmine Monitor Report 2004*, it is clear that:

- Landmines continue to pose a significant, lasting and non-discriminatory threat;
- Civilians account for the vast majority of new landmine casualties, since less than 14 percent of reported casualties in 2004 were identified as military personnel;
- Not only mine-affected countries have a problem with landmines; nationals from 26 countries (including 11 mine-free countries) were killed or injured by landmines while outside their own borders in 2003-2004. Since 1999, nationals from a total of 53 countries (including 25 mine-free countries) were affected.

In 2003-2004, as shown in the table, mine casualties were still occurring in every region of the world: in 21 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in 16 countries in Europe and Central Asia, in 14 Asia-Pacific countries, in nine countries in the Middle East and North Africa, and in six countries in the Americas. Ongoing conflict is a significant problem in some of these countries, but *Landmine Monitor* finds that 40 of the 66 countries that suffered new mine casualties in 2003-2004 had not experienced any active armed conflict during the research period. In many cases, the conflict had ended a decade or more ago; for example, casualties occurred in Cambodia, Nicaragua and Vietnam. For the four countries added to the list in 2003-2004, the reason for inclusion was that new incidents of casualties were reported, rather than the onset of a new conflict.

In 2003-2004, mine/UXO casualties also included nationals from 26 countries killed or injured while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities. These countries include: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Canada, France, Germany, Georgia, Iran, Italy, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Perú, Poland, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Somalia, Syria, Tanzania, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, and Uzbekistan.

Since 1999, nationals from another 27 countries have also been killed or injured while abroad: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cambodia, Croatia, Denmark, Fiji, The Gambia, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, Turkey, and Zimbabwe.

In 2003 and through July 2004, mine accidents during clearance operations or in training exercises caused casualties among deminers and soldiers in Abkhazia, Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Croatia, DR Congo, Georgia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Mozambique, Perú, Philippines, Russia (Chechnya), Serbia and Montenegro, Sri Lanka,

Thailand, the United States, Vietnam, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. There were also unconfirmed reports of demining casualties in other countries.

Since 1999, mine accidents during clearance operations or in training exercises were also reported in Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Colombia, Cyprus, Greece, Iran, Israel, Kosovo, Kuwait, Nicaragua, Republic of Korea, and Slovenia.

### **Casualty Data Collection**

Comprehensive data on landmine/UXO casualties is difficult to obtain, particularly in countries experiencing ongoing conflict, or with minefields in remote areas, or with limited resources to monitor public health services. The sources used to identify new casualties include databases, government records, hospital records, media reports, surveys, assessments, and interviews.

Landmine Monitor identified over 8,065 new landmine/UXO casualties in calendar year 2003, including at least 1,833 children (23 percent) and 258 women (3 percent).<sup>80</sup> Less than 14 percent of reported casualties were identified as military personnel. It is important to remember, however, that the 8,065 figure represents only the *reported* casualties and does not take into account the many casualties that are believed to go unreported, as innocent civilians are killed or injured in remote areas away from any form of assistance or means of communication, and others are not reported for military or political reasons. Since 1999, Landmine Monitor has recorded more than 42,540 new mine/UXO casualties.<sup>81</sup>

Since 1999, greater attention has been placed on the importance of accurate and up-to-date data on mine casualties and mine survivors to better understand the needs and to ensure that limited resources are used most effectively where the needs are greatest. In 1999, reports of new mine casualties, albeit limited, were only available for 42 countries. By 2004, new mine casualties have been identified in 75 countries. In several mine-affected countries, mine incident and casualty data is now collected and stored using the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) or other comparable databases. Of the 66 countries and seven areas reporting new mine casualties in 2003-2004, only 36 countries and six areas report using IMSMA, or other comparable databases, to record casualty data. Of those, only 22 countries and three areas were able to provide Landmine Monitor with full year data or data collected in all mine-affected regions. Even with a functioning data collection system in place it is believed that not all mine casualties are reported. IMSMA has the capacity to record mine casualty data; however, a reported lack of human and financial resources sometimes prevents this system from being used effectively. The principal collectors of mine casualty data are mine action centers, the ICRC, UNICEF, and some NGOs.

The number of reported new casualties declined in 2003 from 2002 in the majority of mine-affected countries; in some cases significantly, such as in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Lebanon, Senegal, and Sri Lanka. In some cases, significant decreases in reported new casualties would appear to be the result of a lack of resources to undertake comprehensive data collection, as in Chad and Somaliland. In the case of Chechnya, the number of reported new casualties has decreased significantly as a result of further analysis of previously reported statistics.

Where an increase was reported in 2003 this generally appears to be due to a new or expanded conflict, as in Iraq and Turkey. In other mine-affected countries, the increase appears to be largely the result of improved data collection: Azerbaijan, Burundi, Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Vietnam, and Zimbabwe.

In Burma, Colombia, DR Congo, Nepal, and Uganda both factors contributed to significantly higher numbers of reported mine casualties in 2003.

Although Landmine Monitor considers that in some instances reported casualty figures are incomplete and understated, a sampling of the findings for calendar year 2003 from countries and areas with mine casualty databases gives an indication of downward or upward trends in reported mine casualties. The following list is in order of highest recorded casualties.

- In Afghanistan, 847 casualties recorded, down from 1,460 recorded by ICRC in 2002. It is still, however, estimated that there are around 100 new casualties each month;
- In Cambodia, 772 casualties recorded, down from 847 in 2002.
- In Colombia, 668 casualties recorded, up from 626 in 2002.
- In Angola, 226 casualties recorded, down from 287 in 2002; since 1999, at least 2,998 new casualties reported.
- In Chechnya, 218 civilian mine/UXO casualties recorded, down from 383 in 2002. The figure of 5,695 casualties reported by the Chechen Ministry of Health in 2002 included all war-related injuries and not only casualties caused by landmines and UXO.
- In Burundi, 174 civilian casualties recorded, up from 114 in 2002.
- In DR Congo, 152 casualties recorded, up from 115 in 2002; since 1999, 780 new casualties reported.
- In Laos, 118 casualties recorded, up from 99 in 2002.
- In Sri Lanka, 99 casualties recorded, down from 142 in 2002.
- In Eritrea, 62 casualties recorded by UNMEE MAC, down from 78 in 2002; however, 87 casualties recorded by Landmine Impact Survey, down from 116 in 2002. Since 2000, 428 new casualties recorded.
- In Sudan, 79 new casualties recorded, up from 46 recorded in 2002, but the data is incomplete; since 1999, 666 new casualties recorded.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, 54 casualties recorded, down from 72 in 2002.
- In Somaliland, 50 casualties recorded between July and December, down from 129 in 2002, but data collection severely limited by a lack of funding; since 2000, 459 new casualties recorded.
- In Azerbaijan, 39 casualties recorded, up from 17 in 2002, since 2000, 172 new casualties recorded.
- In Ethiopia, 39 casualties reported by RaDO, down from 67 in 2002 (data is only available for the Tigray and Afar regions); since 1999, at least 530 new casualties in Tigray and Afar. The Landmine Impact Survey reports significantly higher casualty figures than previously available with 297 casualties recorded for 2003.
- In Thailand, 29 casualties recorded in four provinces, down from 36 in 2002; since 2000, 217 new casualties reported.
- In Lebanon, 26 casualties recorded, down from 49 in 2002; since 2000, 291 new casualties recorded.
- In Zimbabwe, 26 casualties recorded, up from nine in 2002; since 1999, 57 new casualties reported.
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, 21 casualties recorded, up from 17 in 2002.
- In Kosovo, 19 casualties recorded, up from 15 in 2002; since June 1999, 512 new casualties recorded.
- In Senegal, 19 casualties recorded, down from 48 in 2002; since 1999, 286 casualties recorded.

- In Chad, only 18 casualties recorded, down from 200 reported in 2002, due to lack of data collection mechanism; since 2000, 314 casualties reported.
- In Yemen, 18 casualties recorded, down from 19 in 2002; since 2000, 75 new casualties recorded.
- In Croatia, 14 casualties recorded, down from 27 in 2002.
- In Mozambique, 14 casualties recorded, down from 47 in 2002.
- In Guinea-Bissau, 12 casualties recorded, down from 33 in 2002.
- In Nicaragua, six casualties recorded, down from 15 in 2002; since 1999, 71 new casualties recorded.

In other mine-affected countries, very limited data on landmine/UXO casualties is collected from government ministries and agencies, international agencies and NGOs, hospitals, media reports, surveys, and country campaigns of the ICBL. In some cases, available data is well below the estimates of the number of people killed or injured by landmines each year.

- In Iraq, 2,189 casualties reported; however, data does not cover the whole country or full year. In northern Iraq, 1,796 casualties reported, up from 457 in 2002. Between 1999 and the end of December 2003, at least 3,333 new mine and UXO casualties recorded in northern Iraq.
- In India, 270 casualties reported, down from 523 in 2002.
- In Vietnam, 220 casualties reported, up from 166 in 2002; true figure estimated to be considerably higher.
- In Burma (Myanmar), 192 casualties reported, up from 114 reported in 2002; true figure estimated to be considerably higher.
- In Pakistan, 138 casualties reported, up from 136 in 2002; since 2000, 460 new casualties reported.
- In Nepal, 76 new mine casualties reported in a two-month period.
- In Somalia, 75 casualties reported, up from 53 in 2002; since 2000, 686 new casualties reported.
- In Turkey, 67 casualties reported, up from 40 in 2002; since 2000, 170 new casualties reported.
- In Iran, 66 casualties reported, up from 32 in 2002; since 2001, 304 new casualties reported.
- In Uganda, 64 casualties reported, up from seven reported in 2002; since 1999, 244 new casualties reported.
- In Georgia, 50 casualties reported, down from 97 in 2002.
- In Palestine, 23 casualties reported, down from 57 in 2002.
- In Namibia, 12 casualties reported, down from 19 in 2002; since 1999, 598 casualties reported with a significant reduction in the number of new casualties since 2001.
- In Macedonia (FYR), eight casualties reported, up from four in 2002; since 1999, 90 new casualties reported.
- In Jordan, six casualties reported, down from 15 in 2002; since 2000, 46 new casualties reported.
- In the Republic of Korea, five casualties reported, down from 17 in 2002; since 1999, 47 new casualties reported.

In 2004, landmine/UXO casualties continue to be reported (with increasing frequency in some countries such as Cambodia, Guinea-Bissau, Laos, and Mozambique) in every region of the world, including:

- In Afghanistan, 423 new casualties reported to 30 June; since 1999, 7,197 new casualties recorded by ICRC.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, 28 new casualties reported to September; since 1999, 436 new casualties recorded.
- In Burundi, 46 new casualties recorded to April; since 2000, 454 new casualties reported.
- In Cambodia, casualties increased significantly in the first few months of 2004 to 671 new casualties recorded by the end of August; since 1999, 5,129 new casualties recorded.
- In Chechnya, 81 new civilian casualties recorded to September; since 1999, 2,421 new civilian casualties recorded.
- In Colombia, 421 new casualties recorded to September; since 1999, 2,174 new casualties recorded.
- In Guinea-Bissau casualties increased significantly in 2003 with 29 new casualties to July; since June 1998, 331 new casualties recorded.
- In Laos, casualties increased significantly with 117 new casualties to June; since 1999, 661 new casualties recorded.
- In Mozambique, casualties increased significantly to 24 to July; since 2000, 343 new casualties recorded.
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, casualties increased significantly to 30 to end of June; since 1999, 131 new casualties recorded.
- In Nepal, at least 132 new mine casualties reported to June.
- In Sri Lanka, 33 new casualties recorded to June; since 1999, more than 724 new casualties recorded.
- In Vietnam, 114 new casualties reported to end of April; since 2000, 752 new casualties reported from a limited number of sources.

The number of new casualties is only a small indicator of the landmine problem; more important is the number of mine survivors that need and have a right to assistance. It must be remembered that while the number of reported new landmine casualties is dropping in many mine-affected countries the number of landmine survivors continues to *increase*. The exact number of mine survivors is unknown. Through Landmine Impact Surveys and increased data collection, more information is becoming available. For example, in Afghanistan a limited survey of 75,688 persons with disabilities identified 13,624 mine survivors. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the database records 3,905 people injured since 1992, and in Cambodia the database records 41,010 people injured since 1979. Survivors identified by Landmine Impact Surveys include 2,233 survivors in Eritrea, 7,275 survivors in Ethiopia, 1,971 survivors in Thailand, and 2,344 survivors in Yemen. In northern Iraq, 9,121 mine/UXO survivors were recorded between 1991 and December 2003. In Vietnam more than 66,000 mine/UXO survivors have been recorded and more than 5,600 in Laos.

Landmine Monitor has identified more than 230,100 mine survivors recorded in 97 countries<sup>82</sup> and nine areas; some are from incidents dating back to the end of the Second World War, but the vast majority of survivors are from the mid-1970s onwards. It should be noted that this figure does not include estimates of up to 100,000 or more mine survivors in Afghanistan, or of foreign soldiers injured during the Vietnam War in the 1970s, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s, or the first Gulf War in 1990. It is unknown how many of these recorded survivors are still living, but it is clear, given the high number of casualties that likely have never been recorded, it is reasonable to assume that there are somewhere between 300,000 and 400,000 mine survivors in the world today.

In addition to the 97 countries where mine incidents took place, Landmine Monitor has identified another 24 countries with mine survivors: 20 with nationals injured abroad in mine incidents and accidents since 1999; two with nationals injured prior to 1999; and two with known survivors but no available statistics. In other words, many countries with no new reported landmine casualties nevertheless have landmine survivors that continue to require assistance. Consequently, around two-thirds of the countries in the world – 121 countries – are affected to some extent by the landmine/UXO problem and the issue of survivors.

### **Addressing the Needs of Survivors**

A landmine incident can cause various injuries to an individual including the loss of limbs, abdominal, chest and spinal injuries, blindness, and deafness, as well as less visible, psychological trauma not only to the person injured in the incident, but to the families of those killed or injured.

The Mine Ban Treaty Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration promotes a comprehensive integrated approach to victim assistance that rests on a three-tiered definition of a landmine victim. This means that a “mine victim” includes directly affected individuals, their families, and mine-affected communities. Consequently, victim assistance is viewed as a wide range of activities that benefit individuals, families and communities.

However, throughout the *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* the term “survivor assistance” is used in the country reports to describe activities aimed at the individuals directly affected by a landmine incident. The use of the term “survivor” is intended to emphasize this distinction.

The Mine Ban Treaty requires, in Article 6, Paragraph 3, that “Each State in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims....” In many mine-affected countries the assistance available to address the needs of survivors is inadequate, and it would appear that additional outside assistance is needed in providing for the care and rehabilitation of mine survivors.

Since 1999, in part because of the work of Landmine Monitor in compiling information, a great deal more is now known about facilities and programs that assist mine survivors, and some of the problems they faced. Most landmine survivors do not have access to some of the most basic needs: food security, access to water, adequate housing, roads, a way to earn an income, healthcare, and access to the lifelong rehabilitation services many require. It is understood that mine survivors and other persons with disabilities are among the most impoverished group in every society.

It is without doubt that many mine survivors have benefited from the increased attention given to the issue of victim assistance by States Parties since 1999. Several new programs for physical rehabilitation

and socio-economic reintegration have been implemented. Nevertheless, many mine survivors are still not able to access the facilities needed for their complete rehabilitation and reintegration, and many local and international NGOs report that a lack of funding, especially long-term funding, is limiting their operations and the sustainability of programs. From the research, there is a greater understanding about the extent of the problem, and the knowledge that existing programs are far from meeting the needs. For example, in Afghanistan, for every one person with a disability that receives assistance through existing programs, 100 more reportedly do not receive assistance.<sup>83</sup>

The Mine Ban Treaty sets no time frame for mine victim assistance, as it does for mine clearance and stockpile destruction. The needs of landmine survivors are long-term, in many instances lasting a lifetime. A landmine survivor will require ongoing medical and rehabilitation services, and services assisting his or her socio-economic reintegration and psychological well-being. For amputees, prostheses wear out, need repairs, and replacement. For many, the poverty brought on or exacerbated by becoming a landmine survivor leads to greater risk of illness and therefore more needs than non-disabled populations for medical care. In addition, medical problems related to amputation often resurface years after the original incident. Similarly, socio-economic reintegration is not easily achievable or sustainable. Vocational training programs and other methods to facilitate economic reintegration struggle to succeed in economies facing high levels of unemployment in the general population.

The ultimate goal of survivor assistance programs should be the complete rehabilitation of mine survivors and their reintegration into the wider community. To ensure sustainability and to avoid unnecessary segregation of survivors, assistance to landmine survivors should be viewed as a part of a country's overall public health and social services system. At the same time, within those general systems, deliberate care must be built in to ensure that landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities receive the same opportunities in life – for health care, social services, a life-sustaining income, education, and participation in the community – as every other sector of a society. Sometimes, leveling the playing field requires services or systems particular to people with disabilities. These two approaches – special services when necessary and mainstreaming whenever possible – constitute the “twin track” toward disability espoused by the ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance and its members. Providing resources to support programs that address the needs of landmine survivors is in effect assisting to build the infrastructure that will benefit all persons with disabilities in a mine-affected country.

### **Capacities of Affected States to Provide Assistance to Landmine Survivors**

The principal actors in landmine victim assistance generally agree that assistance includes the following components:<sup>84</sup>

- Pre-hospital Care (first aid and management of injuries)
- Hospital Care (medical care, surgery, pain management)
- Rehabilitation (physiotherapy, prosthetic appliances and assistive devices, psychological support)
- Social and Economic Reintegration (associations of persons with disabilities, skills and vocational training, income generating projects, sports)
- Disability Policy and Practice (education and public awareness and disability laws)

- Health and Social Welfare Surveillance and Research capacities (data collection, processing, analysis, and reporting)

A detailed analysis of efforts and capacities of mine-affected States to address the needs of landmine survivors, and persons with disabilities in general, is beyond the scope of the research undertaken for Landmine Monitor.<sup>85</sup> Landmine Monitor can, however, conclude that since 1999 through the efforts of States Parties, the ICBL, the ICRC and NGOs in the field, the Mine Ban Treaty has raised awareness of the rights and needs of mine survivors and enabled mine survivors themselves to advocate for services to meet their needs. More programs have been implemented and the survivors that have access to these services report an improved quality of life. Nevertheless, the challenge remains to ensure that programs are adequate, appropriate and sustainable and that the benefits are not limited to a fortunate few.

Based on a purely quantitative analysis of the information available in the *Landmine Monitor Report 2004*, it would appear that most countries have facilities to address some of the needs of landmine survivors. In a positive development, at least 22 mine-affected States are now taking, or have taken, steps to develop a plan of action to address the needs of mine survivors, or more generally to improve services for all persons with disabilities, although some plans have not been implemented due to a lack of resources.

Landmine Monitor has determined that in 53 of the 66 countries with new mine casualties in 2003, and in all seven areas, one or more aspects of survivor assistance are reportedly inadequate to meet the needs of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Even when services exist, they are often long distances from mine-affected areas, making them inaccessible to many survivors, are too expensive for survivors to afford, or are bureaucratically off-limits to one group or another. Assistance in the area that has been identified as the top priority for many mine survivors – socio-economic reintegration – continues to be lacking in the majority of countries.

From the research collected by Landmine Monitor since 1999, several general observations can be made:

- Most services are located in urban centers, but the majority of mine survivors are found in rural areas where the concentration of mine pollution is greatest;
- The majority of resources are directed towards medical and physical rehabilitation;
- The availability of assistance in psychosocial support and economic reintegration is limited;
- Many mine-affected countries suffer from a lack of adequately trained healthcare and rehabilitation providers;
- International organizations, NGOs, and UN agencies play a key role in the delivery of services to mine survivors;
- Local NGOs often lack the financial resources and capacity to continue programs after international organizations have withdrawn;
- On-going conflict and the consequent security concerns, in some mine-affected countries severely limit the ability of the government and international agencies to provide assistance to landmine survivors;

- The economic situation of many mine-affected countries remains an obstacle to the provision of adequate assistance to landmine survivors;
- The development of programs that address the long-term needs of landmine survivors, and other persons with disabilities, is being hampered by the practice of some donors to only fund programs for a limited period of time. A commitment to long-term funding is needed to ensure sustainability and to build local capacities to continue the programs;

The five-year review of survivor assistance activities in *Landmine Monitor Report 2004* is not exhaustive, and it is likely that information on the activities of some local and international NGOs providing services and activities undertaken by governmental agencies is not included. Landmine Monitor would welcome more input from governmental and non-governmental agencies and organizations on their survivor assistance activities for future editions of this report. Nevertheless, through the research undertaken, Landmine Monitor has attempted to provide an indication of the progress, or lack of progress, and some of the problems faced in addressing the needs of mine survivors. Following are examples of some of the key findings and developments since 1999.

#### *Emergency and Continuing Medical Care*

In 2003, at least 3,054 landmine/UXO casualties were identified in hospital records, including 110 casualties in Africa, one in Americas, 1,851 in Asia/Pacific, 341 in Europe/Central Asia, and 751 in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Afghanistan, 65 percent of the population reportedly does not have access to health facilities.
- In Angola, less than 30 percent of the population has access to healthcare, and few facilities are available for mine survivors and other persons with disabilities.
- In Burundi, in February 2002, the government introduced a “cost recovery” system for medical treatment, which reportedly excludes about 20 percent of the population from access to healthcare.
- In Chechnya, more than half the available hospitals function without running water, proper heating, and sewage systems.
- In DR Congo, in 2002, it was estimated that 37 percent of the population did not have access to any kind of healthcare.
- In Ethiopia, according to the Landmine Impact Survey, 27 percent of survivors identified between 2001 and 2003 reported receiving no care.
- In Iraq, some health facilities lack running water and constant electricity supplies, equipment has not been properly maintained, and there is a lack of well-trained and experienced healthcare workers.
- In Laos, a survey of child mine/UXO survivors found that 70 percent have long-term medical problems.
- In Rwanda, in some areas of the country the population lives more than 1.5 hours walk from the nearest health center.
- In Sudan, in Kassala, 84 percent of recorded mine/UXO casualties were transported more than 50 kilometers to the nearest health facility.

- In Uganda, a 2003 review of health facilities in eastern Uganda found that 53 percent of patients with war-related injuries had received no pre-hospital care.

#### *Physical Rehabilitation*

In 2003, Landmine Monitor identified a total of 118,154 patients or services in the area of physical rehabilitation, including at least 19,006 services for landmine/UXO survivors: 27,458 services (1,365 for survivors) in Africa; 115 services (28 for survivors) in Americas; 82,386 services (14,748 for survivors) in Asia/Pacific; 1,205 services (423 for survivors) in Europe/Central Asia; and 6,990 services (2,442 for survivors) in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Afghanistan, in 2002, it was reported that only 60 out of 330 districts had rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration facilities for the disabled, and even in those districts the needs were only partially met.
- In Angola, in 2001, the Ministry of Health implemented a five-year national program to rehabilitate persons with disabilities.
- In Cambodia, the number of physical rehabilitation centers has decreased from 15 in 1999 to eleven in 2004; the principal reason for the decrease is reduced funding, cost, quality control, and sustainability.
- In Chad, according to the Landmine Impact Survey, of 217 mine survivors identified in incidents between 1998 and 2001, none reported receiving rehabilitation assistance.
- In DR Congo, in 2002, a new three-year program was implemented to strengthen the capacity of the Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped and improve the quality of services.
- In Eritrea, according to the Landmine Impact Survey, only three percent of survivors identified in incidents between 2001 and 2003 reported receiving rehabilitation assistance.
- In Ethiopia, according to the Landmine Impact Survey, only seven percent of survivors identified in incidents between 2001 and 2003 reported receiving rehabilitation assistance.
- In Iraq, in November 2003, the UNOPS Victim Assistance Program in northern Iraq was handed over to the Coalition Provisional Authority.
- In Kosovo, in 2002, the Ministry of Health appointed an officer for physical medicine and rehabilitation to strengthen the rehabilitation sector.
- In Rwanda, in October 2002, a national plan for the rehabilitation of persons with disabilities was drafted, but the plan has not been implemented due to a lack of resources.
- In Somaliland, the Landmine Impact Survey found that of 179 mine survivors identified in incidents in 2001 and 2002, only four had received rehabilitation; 47 were amputees.
- In Vietnam, the government-sponsored Community Based Rehabilitation Program has expanded its coverage from 40 provinces in 2001 to 46 of 61 provinces by 2003.
- In Yemen, in 2000, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs reorganized its Community Based Rehabilitation Program to be more responsive to the needs of mine survivors.

### *Prosthetics/Orthotics/Assistive Devices*

Over the past five years there has been limited improvement in the area of physical rehabilitation, particularly in the production of prostheses and other assistive devices, through the training of technicians and better infrastructure at some facilities.

In 2003, ICRC-supported prosthetic/orthotic centers produced 20,837 prostheses (10,549 for landmine survivors), 14,232 orthoses (94 for mine survivors), 38,560 crutches, and 2,147 wheelchairs. Between 1999 and the end of 2003, ICRC prosthetic/orthotic centers produced 92,873 prostheses (50,197 for landmine survivors), 59,694 orthoses (162 for mine survivors), 164,645 crutches, and 6,756 wheelchairs.

Based on limited data collected by Landmine Monitor for 2003, NGOs and other agencies working in mine-affected countries also produced or distributed at least 18,532 prostheses, 5,047 orthoses, 14,046 crutches, 4,715 wheelchairs or tricycles, and 6,747 other assistive devices and components, and repaired 4,906 orthopedic devices; at least 7,890 devices were for mine survivors.

In total, Landmine Monitor identified 129,769 prostheses, orthoses, walking aids or other assistive devices produced, distributed, or repaired in 2003, including at least 18,533 for mine survivors: 33,817 orthopedic devices (2,725 for mine survivors) in Africa; 877 (249 for mine survivors) in Americas; 76,792 (11,329 for mine survivors) in Asia/Pacific; 7,903 (1,569 for mine survivors) in Europe/Central Asia; and 10,380 (2,661 for mine survivors) in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Chechnya, in January 2003, the Grozny Prosthetic/Orthotic Center started production.
- In China, in December 2003, the ICRC in cooperation with the Red Cross Society of China established a prosthetic center in Kunming.
- In Georgia, the Tbilisi Orthopedic Center had 458 amputees on its waiting list for services as at the end of December 2002.
- In Nicaragua, at the end of 2003, 490 amputees were on the waiting list for prostheses at the national orthopedic center in Managua.
- In Sudan, in June 2003, an orthopedic workshop opened in Kassala.
- In Uganda, of 1,183 amputees identified to May 2003 in northern Uganda, only 629 (54 percent) had been fitted with prostheses.
- In Yemen, in 2003, a new orthopedic center opened in Mukalla in the remote Hadramont governorate.

### *Psychosocial Support*

Landmine Monitor recorded 8,620 people that received psychosocial support, including at least 1,939 survivors: 4,506 people (574 mine/UXO survivors) in Africa; 536 (280 survivors) in Americas; 2,046 (225 survivors) in Asia/Pacific; 1,244 (839 survivors) in Europe/Central Asia; and 288 (21 survivors) in Middle East/North Africa.

- Several mine survivors participated in the Paralympic Games in Athens in September 2004.

- In Azerbaijan, in 2004, the Azerbaijan Landmine Victims Association was established; only 78 (20 percent) of 382 mine survivors interviewed in a recent survey reported receiving psychological support.
- In Chechnya, in July 2003 the first meeting of the Mine Survivors Club was organized in Gudermes.
- In Croatia, in 2001, the Croatian Mine Victims Association was established. In April 2004, reconstruction work began on a new psychosocial support center in Rovinj.
- In Lebanon, in September 2003, the first Arab summer camp for mine survivors from Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan and Syria was held.
- In Perú, in 2003, the Association of Victims and Survivors of Landmines, was created by former National Police members injured during mine clearance or mine-laying activities.
- In the Republic of Korea, in September 2003, the Association of Mine Victims was established.
- In Russia, in April 2003, the St. Petersburg Elks participated in the first World Standing Amputee Ice Hockey Championships in Helsinki; seven mine survivors are on the team.
- In Uganda, in August 2002, the Lira Landmine Survivors Association was established to support women mine survivors and other persons with disabilities.

#### *Vocational Training and Economic Reintegration*

Although many mine survivors and actors in survivor assistance regard economic integration through employment and income generation opportunities as a top priority, there is little evidence to show significant progress in this area. Numerous small programs have been implemented in several countries since 1999; however, the number of survivors benefiting from these programs appears to be small.

Landmine Monitor recorded 7,858 people assisted with vocational training and/or economic reintegration, including at least 2,304 survivors: 846 people in Africa, at least 553 survivors; 452 in Americas, at least 36 survivors; 4,450 in Asia/Pacific, at least 1,280 survivors; 1,875 in Europe/Central Asia, at least 242 survivors; and 235 in Middle East/North Africa, at least 193 mine survivors.

- In the Landmine Impact Surveys for Azerbaijan, Chad, Ethiopia, Somaliland, Thailand and Yemen, no recent mine survivors reported receiving vocational training since being injured.
- In Afghanistan, one NGO reports a three-year waiting list to join its socio-economic reintegration program.
- In Albania, in 2003, a new income generation project started in the mine-affected districts.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, 85 percent of mine survivors are reportedly concerned about the lack of employment opportunities and economic reintegration.
- In Cambodia, mine survivors elaborated a twelve-point plan that identifies their needs and those of their communities. Priorities include adequate shelter, enough food to eat, a job or the possibility to generate an income, a school for their children, and a chance for adults to learn a new skill.
- In Sri Lanka, in 2003, the UNDP Disability Assistance Project started in Jaffna to promote the economic reintegration of mine survivors and other persons with physical disabilities.
- In Vietnam, a 2003 survey found that the top priority for over 75 percent of mine survivors was assistance in socio-economic reintegration.

### *Capacity Building*

In 2003, at least 811 doctors, surgeons, nurses, first aid providers, prosthetic/orthotic technicians and physical therapists received training: 228 local healthcare providers in Africa, twelve in Americas, 336 in Asia/Pacific, 143 in Europe/Central Asia, and 92 in Middle East/North Africa. Since 1999, at least 7,026 doctors, surgeons, nurses, first aid providers, prosthetic/orthotic technicians and physical therapists received training: 4,481 local healthcare providers in Africa, 28 in Americas, 1,505 in Asia/Pacific, 520 in Europe/Central Asia, and more than 492 in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Afghanistan, in 2003, a six-month training course in prosthetics and orthotics was initiated. In 2002, a two-year physiotherapy course started in Jalalabad.
- In Cambodia, in 1999, the Cambodian School of Prosthetics and Orthotics was accredited by the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics (ISPO), and is one of only four Category II training centers in the world.
- In Eritrea, since October 2002, the UNDP Capacity Building Program in Victim Assistance is working with the government to build national capacity to provide adequate assistance to mine survivors.
- In Ethiopia, in March 2003, the ICRC started teaching Ethiopia's first prosthetics/orthotics diploma course at a new training center.
- In Kosovo, in 2002 a three-year degree course for physiotherapists was established at the University of Pristina.
- In Slovenia, since 1998, a total of 290 specialists from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, FYR Macedonia and Kosovo have completed rehabilitation training.
- In Zambia, in 2003, the ICRC started a new program to build capacity at the University Teaching Hospital in Lusaka.

### *Disability Policy and Practice*

Landmine survivor assistance, as with assistance for all persons with disabilities, is more than just a medical and rehabilitation issue; it is also a human rights issue. Until this is recognized and addressed people with a disability will continue to face significant barriers to their social and economic reintegration.

- In Afghanistan, in October 2003, the "Comprehensive National Disability Policy" was created.
- In Algeria, in 2002, new legislation was passed protecting the rights of persons with disabilities.
- In Bangladesh, in 2001, the Parliament adopted the first comprehensive disability legislation.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the "Development Strategy for BiH: PRSP (poverty reduction strategy paper) and Social Protection of People with Disabilities" includes a proposal for a law on the protection of people with disabilities, without distinction to the cause of disability.
- In Cambodia, in 2000, a draft "Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities" was prepared, but as of September 2004, the Ministry of Social Affairs had not submitted the legislation to the Council of Ministries for approval.

- In Croatia, in 2002, the Parliament adopted a new national strategy aimed at improving the quality of life of persons with disabilities, without distinction to the cause of disability.
- In the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in June 2003, the Supreme People's Assembly of DPRK adopted a new law to protect the rights of persons with disabilities.
- In DR Congo, in 2002, a social fund for military war-injured, including mine survivors, was created at the level of the Presidency.
- In Honduras, in May 2004, a new national policy on disability was approved.
- In India, in 2002, the government announced that compensation would be paid to the casualties of military-related explosions.
- In Kenya, on 31 December 2003, the new "Persons with Disabilities Act 2003" received presidential assent.
- In Lebanon, in 2000, a new law called "Access and Rights of the Disabled" was approved by Parliament; however, it has not been fully implemented due to a lack of funding.
- In Mozambique, in June 1999, Parliament enacted a new disability law but it has not been fully implemented due to a lack of resources.
- In Namibia, in 2001, the Disability Advisory Office was established within the Prime Minister's office to provide advice on issues relating to persons with disabilities.
- In Nicaragua, in 2003, it was acknowledged that the existing disability legislation had little impact on the lives of mine survivors.
- In Pakistan, the government is paying compensation to mine survivors and the families of those killed as a result of the conflict on the Pakistan-India border.
- In Sri Lanka, in August 2003, the Cabinet approved the National Disability Policy.
- In Syria, in July 2004, a new national law to protect the rights of persons with disabilities was issued by the President.
- In Uganda, a new disability policy was put in place in 2000, and in February and June 2004, a representative of the Rehabilitation and Disability Prevention Desk of the Ministry of Health participated in the meetings of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration in Geneva.
- In Vietnam, in 2001, the Ministry of Labor, War Invalids and Social Affairs established the National Coordinating Council on Disabilities.
- In Yemen, in 1999, Act 61 on the Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled was issued; in January 2002, Presidential Law Number 2 established a care and rehabilitation fund for persons with disabilities.

#### *Data Collection*

In mine-affected country reports in *Landmine Monitor Report 2004*, information is provided on the facilities that have been identified as assisting landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Since 2002, many facilities have been asked to report on how many people were assisted in the previous year, and how many were landmine survivors. Landmine Monitor was not always able to get this information and some facilities do not keep records on the cause of injury, as all persons with disabilities

are treated equally. Some facilities reported not having the capacity to record any form of data. Nevertheless, while acknowledging that the data is far from complete, it does give an indication of where additional attention may be needed in landmine survivor assistance. It is also recognized that the figures presented in the preceding sections do not represent the total number of individuals assisted, as one person may have accessed several of the services recorded.

- In Afghanistan, data collected on 75,688 persons with disabilities identified 13,624 mine survivors.
- In Cambodia, an external evaluation of the Cambodia Mine/UXO Victim Information System (CMVIS) reported that the system is “unique in the world in terms of coverage and detail,” including details on the type of injuries sustained by survivors.
- In Chechnya, in 2001, UNICEF and local partners started collecting data on civilian mine/UXO casualties.
- In Colombia, in 2001, the OAS AICMA (Comprehensive Action Against Antipersonnel Mines) program supported the implementation of the Antipersonnel Mines Observatory to record and monitor information on mine and UXO casualties and survivors.
- In DR Congo, in 2002, UNMACC started collecting data on mine/UXO casualties for entry into an IMSMA database.
- In Nicaragua, in October 2001, OAS PADCA released the first report from its database on reported mine/UXO casualties in the country since 1980.
- In Rwanda, the National Demining Office has been collecting mine casualty data using IMSMA since June 2001.
- In Sri Lanka, since 2003, the UNDP IMSMA database has become a reliable source of information on mine and UXO casualties.
- In Sudan, in May 2003, the Southern Sudan Mine Action Coordination Office mine casualty data mechanism using IMSMA became operational.
- In Tajikistan, in 2003, the Mine Action Cell started gathering data on mine casualties.

#### *Coordination and Planning*

Following the results of an UNMAS consultative process undertaken on behalf of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, coordination and planning by mine-affected States was identified as a key priority to ensure adequate assistance for mine survivors.

- In Albania, in 2003, an integrated victim assistance strategy was implemented.
- In Angola, since September 2001, the Support and Social Reintegration sub-commission of National and Sectorial Commission for Demining and Humanitarian Assistance has coordinated and monitored the activities of victim assistance providers.
- In Azerbaijan, in 2003, the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action appointed a victim assistance officer to coordinate activities of the Mine Victim Assistance Working Group and develop a long-term assistance program.

- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 2003, the Mine Action Center announced plans to establish a mine victim assistance coordination group to develop a plan of action. In June 2004, the final version of the Landmine Victim Assistance Strategy was released.
- In Cambodia, the Cambodia Mine Action Authority is responsible for the coordination and monitoring of mine victim assistance but has delegated responsibility to the Ministry of Social Affairs, Labor, Vocational Training and Youth Rehabilitation, and the Disability Action Council. In March 2004, CMAA presented a draft strategic plan for 2004-2009.
- In Chad, in 2003, a new department for victim assistance was created within the National High Commission on Demining, with the aim to improve mine victim assistance.
- In Colombia, in 2001, the government launched the Program for Mine Accident Prevention and Victim Assistance.
- In Eritrea, in April 2003, the Ministry of Labor and Human Welfare endorsed the victim assistance strategic plan for 2002-2006.
- In Guinea-Bissau, in August 2002, the National Mine Action Center organized its first meeting to elaborate a national plan of action to support mine survivors.
- In Laos, in 2003, the new National Strategic Plan included victim assistance and resources from the UNDP Trust Fund will be available for both physical rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration.
- In Lebanon, in 2001, the National Demining Office established a National Victim Assistance Committee.
- In Mozambique, the National Demining Institute's Five Year National Mine Action Plan (2002-2006) affirms its coordinating role in mine victim assistance.
- In Nicaragua, survivor assistance falls within the mandate of the National Demining Commission, which consults with the National Rehabilitation Council to find effective mechanisms to improve the social reintegration of mine survivors.
- In Slovenia, in 2003, the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance facilitated a regional study on mine victim assistance in the South-East Europe to identify gaps and promote regional cooperation.
- In Sudan, in 2003, the National Mine Action Office recruited a Victim Assistance Officer to assist in capacity building and develop a plan of action for victim assistance.
- In Thailand, in January 2004, the Public Relations Department of the Royal Thai Government established a "Public Relations Strategic Working Group for Disabled Persons" to devise a strategic plan for persons with disabilities.
- In Yemen, in 2001, the Victim Assistance Department of the National Mine Action Program was established.
- In Zimbabwe, in 2002, a Victims Assistance, Rehabilitation, Reintegration, and Resettlement Office was established as part of the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center.

### **Challenges in Providing Adequate, Appropriate and Sustainable Assistance**

In May 2004, a workshop bringing together rehabilitation experts implementing programs to assist mine survivors and other persons with disabilities in mine-affected countries was convened by Handicap

International (HI).<sup>86</sup> The aim of the workshop was to evaluate progress in the implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty in relation to victim assistance. Some of the key findings of the workshop included:

- There has been little lasting improvement in medical and surgical care.
- Developing physical rehabilitation programs takes a long time.
- Rehabilitation works best when it is comprehensive, holistic, and multi-layered.
- Few physical rehabilitation programs are sustainable as currently constituted.
- All physical rehabilitation stakeholders must coordinate resources, planning and training.
- Collaboration and coordination are essential for program sustainability.
- Psychosocial support plays a critical role in successful rehabilitation.
- Capacity building of local personnel is essential for program sustainability.
- Economic integration is the primary unmet need identified by beneficiaries in every mine-affected country.

Research undertaken by Landmine Monitor, together with the findings of the HI workshop, indicates that while some progress has been made since 1999, there is still much work to be done. Most mine-affected countries are experiencing similar problems, though to varying degrees, and there are several key challenges that need to be addressed to ensure that the growing number of mine survivors receive adequate and appropriate assistance. These include:

- Facilitating access to appropriate healthcare and rehabilitation facilities;
- Addressing the affordability of appropriate healthcare and rehabilitation;
- Improving and upgrading facilities for rehabilitation and psychosocial support;
- Creating opportunities for employment and income generation;
- Capacity building and on-going training of healthcare practitioners, including doctors, surgeons, nurses, physiotherapists and orthopedic technicians;
- Capacity building of personnel within relevant government ministries, and of local associations of persons with disabilities;
- Raising awareness of the rights of persons with disabilities;
- Establishing an effective legal and social welfare system to protect the rights of all persons with disabilities, including mine victims;
- Supporting local NGOs and agencies to ensure the participation of people with disabilities in issues that most concern them and to promote appropriate and sustainable programs;
- Collaboration and coordination of all stakeholders, including local, national and international agencies, in relation to resources, planning and training;
- Obtaining sufficient funding to support programs;
- Coordination of donor support; and
- Engaging the relevant government ministries in mine-affected countries in the planning and implementation of programs.<sup>87</sup>

### **International Developments**

The Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World in November/December 2004 marks an important milestone in global efforts to raise awareness of the rights and needs of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities, and to encourage States to match resources with needs in mine-affected communities to promote the physical rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration of survivors. The Mine Ban Treaty is the first multilateral disarmament treaty in history to call for assistance to the victims of the banned weapon. States Parties meeting in Nairobi will, in relation to mine victims, identify a number of key challenges to be addressed in the period 2005-2009 to fulfill the promise to mine survivors that the treaty implied.

The draft Nairobi Action Plan for the period 2005-2009 has identified 22 States Parties, with hundreds or thousands of mine survivors, that are deemed to face the most profound challenges in meeting their responsibility to support mine survivors: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, and Yemen. Providing assistance where necessary to these 22 States Parties will become a more focused challenge for all States Parties over the next five years. The draft Action Plan acknowledges that all States have a responsibility to assist mine survivors. As noted previously, Landmine Monitor has identified 53 States, including non-States Parties to the treaty with thousands of survivors, which also appear to need additional assistance in meeting the needs of mine survivors within their populations.

The Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration (SC-VA) has been, and will continue to be, an integral mechanism in advancing understanding and identifying needs in relation to mine victim assistance among the States Parties. The meetings of the SC-VA have been conducted in what was described as a “spirit of practical cooperation, inclusivity and collegiality.” Mine survivors, the ICBL, the ICRC, and numerous NGOs have worked closely with States Parties to advance the important work of the SC-VA.

The SC-VA has been co-chaired by Australia and Croatia since September 2003. The co-rapporteurs (who are expected to become co-chairs in December 2004) were Nicaragua and Norway. Two intersessional meetings of the SC-VA were held in February and June 2004.<sup>88</sup> Other co-chairs of the SC-VA since 1999 were México and Switzerland (1999/2000), Japan and Nicaragua (2000/2001), Canada and Honduras (2001/2002), and Colombia and France (2002/2003).

One of the early tasks undertaken by the SC-VA was to clarify the terms such as “mine victim” and “victim assistance,” and to identify the key elements of victim assistance that were fundamental to focused discussions on fulfilling the aims of the Mine Ban Treaty. Through the work of the SC-VA, States came to understand that assistance to mine survivors should not be promoted in such a manner as to exclude persons injured or disabled from other causes and must be seen in the broader context of development and underdevelopment. States also now understand that mine victim assistance is more than just a medical or rehabilitation issue – it is also a human rights issue. After the foundations were laid by previous co-chairs, Canada hosted a “Standing Committee Planning Workshop” in Ottawa in October 2001, to promote discussion on establishing a framework for the SC-VA’s future activities and identifying key issues to be addressed. As a result of the workshop, in 2002 UNMAS was invited to

undertake a consultative process to identify the priority areas for future discussions within the SC-VA on victim assistance. Five key areas were identified: emergency and continuing medical care; physical rehabilitation / prosthetics; psychological and social support; economic reintegration; and laws, public policies and national planning.

In 2004, the SC-VA continued to identify practical means to assist States Parties in meeting their obligations under the Mine Ban Treaty in relation to mine victim assistance, through an increased emphasis on hearing concrete plans of action from mine-affected States, based on the priorities established by the consultative process, for the care and rehabilitation of landmine survivors. In 2003 and 2004, a total of 32 mine-affected States Parties presented to the SC-VA their plans, progress and priorities for mine victim assistance, and their problems in meeting the needs. In 2004, presentations were made by: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Perú, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. In 2003, presentations were also made by Chad, DR Congo, Djibouti, Tajikistan, Turkey and Zambia.

Eleven States Parties reported on their policies and initiatives to support mine-affected States in providing funding and other assistance to mine victims in 2004: Canada, Denmark, Germany, Holy See, Japan, México, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, and Sweden. In 2003, presentations were also made by Australia, Austria, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, and the United Kingdom.

In February 2004, the SC-VA welcomed 14 mine survivors from Europe and the Caucasus, taking part in the *Raising the Voices* initiative. At the June meetings, eight *Raising the Voices* participants from the Middle East participated and, as has become the standard practice, made focused and substantive interventions. Since 2000, a total of 62 mine survivors from 37 countries/areas participated in the *Raising the Voices* program: Abkhazia (one), Afghanistan (two), Albania (two), Angola (two), Azerbaijan (one), Belarus (one), Bosnia and Herzegovina (two), Cambodia (two), Chad (two), Chechnya (one), Chile (one), Colombia (two), Croatia (two), Ecuador (one), El Salvador (one), Eritrea (two), Ethiopia (one), Georgia (two), India (two), Jordan (two), Laos (two), Lebanon (two), Mozambique (two), Nepal (two), Nicaragua (three), Pakistan (two), Russia (one), Rwanda (one), Senegal (one), South Africa (one), Sri Lanka (two), Sudan (one), Syria (two), Thailand (four), Uganda (one), Ukraine (one), and Yemen (two).

The ICBL's Working Group on Victim Assistance (WGVA) continued to participate actively in the SC-VA 2004 meetings. The co-chairs (Landmine Survivors Network and Ugandan landmine survivor Margaret Arach Orech) and the Landmine Monitor thematic research coordinator on victim assistance worked together on presentations to inform participants on aspects of progress and problems in the implementation of Article 6.3. In September 2003 and June 2004, representatives of the WGVA met with several NGOs working in prosthetics and orthotics to continue development of a joint strategy and specific plans to strengthen coordination, collaboration, and long-term planning in mine-affected countries.

Since the voluntary Form J of the Article 7 transparency report, developed by the SC-VA, was endorsed at the Second Meeting of States Parties in September 2000, its use has increased significantly.<sup>89</sup> As of 31 August 2004, a total of 34 States Parties had submitted the Form J with their Article 7 reports for 2003 to report on victim assistance activities or mine action funding more generally: 18 mine-affected States Parties (Albania, Angola, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia,

Cyprus, DR Congo, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Mozambique, Perú, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe), and 16 non-affected States Parties (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, México, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, and Sweden).<sup>90</sup> In addition, three mine-affected States Parties (Bangladesh, Senegal and Yemen) provided casualty and victim assistance information in Form I of their Article 7 reports.

In December 2001, the United Nations General Assembly agreed to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to consider proposals for an international convention to “promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities.”<sup>91</sup> The Ad Hoc Committee first met from 29 July to 9 August 2002 and again from 16-27 June 2003, where it agreed to establish a Working Group to prepare and present a draft text for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Working Group is comprised of 27 governmental representatives and 12 NGO representatives, particularly organizations of, and for, persons with disabilities. The Working Group met for ten days from 5-16 January 2004 to prepare the draft text, which was then discussed at the Third Session of the Ad Hoc Committee from 24 May to 4 June 2004. The Fourth Session was held from 23 August to 3 September 2004.<sup>92</sup>

In addition to governments, participants in the Ad Hoc Committee meetings included representatives from NGOs, academic institutions, legal experts, specialists in disabilities, and people with disabilities, including those representing mine survivors. In a scenario reminiscent of negotiations for the Mine Ban Treaty, the active participation of civil society, and people with disabilities themselves, has made a significant contribution to the progress achieved so far.

## MINE ACTION FUNDING

### Mine Action Donors

Tracking financial support for mine action is still difficult, despite greater transparency and better reporting mechanisms. There is much variation in what donors report on, and in what detail, and for what time period. Nevertheless, drawing from Landmine Monitor research it is possible to give an informative picture of the global funding situation.

Landmine Monitor has identified about US\$2.07 billion in donor mine action contributions from 1992-2003. Of that 12-year total, 65 percent (\$1.35 billion) was provided in the past five years (1999-2003), since the entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty, and 74 percent (\$1.54 billion) in the past six years, since the signing of the treaty.

For 2003, Landmine Monitor has identified \$339 million in mine action funding by more than 24 donors.<sup>93</sup> This is an increase of \$25 million, or 8 percent, from 2002, and an increase of \$102 million, or 43 percent, from 2001. It should be noted that the bigger totals for mine action funding for the past two years as expressed in US dollars in part reflect the increasingly favorable exchange rate for many donors.<sup>94</sup>

Even greater increases in mine action funding will be needed in the future to cope fully with the global landmine problem and to enable Mine Ban Treaty States Parties to meet their ten-year deadlines for mine clearance.

As before, Landmine Monitor has not included funds for research and development into demining technologies and equipment in these totals, and has instead listed R&D funding separately, when known. While many donors devoted some resources to mine action R&D, only a small number of donors (notably Belgium, Canada, Japan, Sweden, UK, and US) reported precise R&D funding for 2003, totaling about \$25.3 million. From 1999-2003, mine action R&D spending totaled at least \$145 million, including at least \$19.7 million in 2002. Landmine Monitor has identified at least \$240 million in mine action R&D spending since 1992.

R&D aside, these figures likely understate global donor mine action funding to a significant degree, for a number of reasons. Funding for victim assistance programs is included where possible, but for some major donors landmine victim assistance funding cannot be separated out from other non-landmine-specific programs. Also, in some cases, donors do not report the value of in-kind (as opposed to cash) contributions.

The totals also do not reflect mine action funding provided by non-governmental organizations or the private sector. Landmine Monitor has been able to collect detailed information on NGO funding in only a limited number of countries. In 2003, in six countries where information is available (Austria, Canada, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United States), NGOs and other private sources donated about \$9.5 million to mine action. According to the US State Department, in the last five years, US citizens have contributed more than \$14 million to mine action programs around the world, much of it through the Public-Private Partnership program. Since 1999, more than \$18 million has been contributed by or channeled through German NGOs for mine action. Dutch NGOs have contributed about \$4.3 million to mine action since 1999.

The totals also do not include the UN Oil for Food program funding of mine action in northern Iraq. The UN reports that the program spent \$125.5 million from 1997 to 2003, including \$27.3 million in 2002. The program ended in November 2003.

Apart from international donor funding, the mine-affected countries themselves have made significant contributions to mine action. According to the Mine Ban Treaty's Resource Mobilization Contact Group, mine-affected States Parties contributed about \$190 million in funding and in-kind resources from 1997 to 2003.<sup>95</sup> This included \$41.6 million in 2002, the last year for which complete data was available. Following are some examples of contributions by mine-affected nations, drawn from this year's Landmine Monitor country reports. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, national sources provided about \$7.5 million for mine action in 2003, up from \$5.1 million in 2002. In January 2003, Chad announced its decision to finance 50 percent of its mine action plan; it reported contributing \$1 million in 2003. Croatia reports that it provided \$23.8 million from its State budget, or 56 percent of total mine action funding for 2003. Mozambique reportedly provided \$818,000 for mine action in 2003, but allocated \$6.5 million for 2004.

#### *Contributions in 2003*

Of the twenty most significant donors, ten increased their mine action contributions in 2003, in terms of national currency, and ten provided less. Those with the largest percentage increases were: Greece (193 percent, nearly tripling its funding); Sweden (45 percent); Belgium (45 percent); European Commission (40 percent); Canada (38 percent); and the United States (26 percent).<sup>96</sup>

Those with the biggest percentage decreases in terms of national currency were: Japan (71 percent); Austria (62 percent); Italy (48 percent); Australia (43 percent); France (42 percent); and the Netherlands (24 percent).<sup>97</sup>

The United States again was the largest country donor to mine action with a total of \$80.4 million. This was a major increase of \$16.7 million and reversed two years of declining spending. By far, the biggest increase in mine action funding as expressed in US dollars came from the European Commission, which went from \$38.7 million to \$64.5 million, an increase of \$25.8 million (due in part to the favorable exchange rate). Others with notable increases in mine action funding included Canada (up \$7.4 million), Sweden (up \$5.4 million), Greece (up \$3.6 million) and Belgium (up \$2.6 million).

Japan experienced the most significant decrease in funding, falling \$36.7 million to a total of \$13 million. But, this came on the heels of Japan's highest level of spending ever in 2002, and the 2003 total was still among its highest. Mine action funding also dropped significantly for the Netherlands (down \$3.9 million), Italy (down \$2.9 million), Australia (down \$2.3 million), France (down \$1.1 million) and Austria (down \$1.1 million).

**Reported Mine Action Funding by Year**

1992-2003	\$2.07 billion
1999-2003	\$1.35 billion
2003	\$339 million
2002	\$314 million
2001	\$237 million
2000	\$243 million
1999	\$219 million
1998	\$187 million (incl. an estimated \$9 m.)
1997	\$139 million (incl. an estimated \$35 m.)
1996	\$132 million (incl. an estimated \$34 m.)
1992-95	\$258 million (incl. an estimated \$41 m.)

*Note: Does not include funding for research and development*

**Donor Mine Action Funding in 2003: \$339 million**

United States	\$80.4 million
European Comm.	\$64.5 million
Norway	\$28.6 million
Canada	\$22.5 million
Germany	\$22.1 million
United Kingdom	\$20 million
Japan	\$13 million
Sweden	\$12.7 million
Netherlands	\$12.1 million
Denmark	\$11.9 million
Switzerland	\$8.8 million
Finland	\$6.3 million
Belgium	\$6.2 million
Italy	\$5.8 million
Australia	\$5.5 million
Greece	\$5 million
France	\$2.5 million
Ireland	\$2.3 million
China	\$2 million
Spain	\$1.2 million
New Zealand	\$1.1 million
Luxembourg	\$1 million
Saudi Arabia	\$1 million
Austria	\$0.9 million
Others <sup>98</sup>	\$2 million

*Note: Does not include funding for research and development*

**Donor Mine Action Funding Reported To Date: \$2.1 billion**

USA	\$519.6 million
EC	\$304.7 million
Norway	\$184.8 million
Japan	\$135.3 million
UK	\$133.5 million
Canada	\$105 million
Germany	\$104.2 million
Sweden	\$103.5 million
Netherlands	\$95.3 million
Denmark	\$84.8 million
Australia	\$60.5 million
Switzerland	\$56.9 million
Italy	\$48.8 million
Finland	\$40.2 million
France	\$22.9 million
Belgium	\$21.8 million
Ireland	\$11.1 million
Austria	\$11 million
New Zealand	\$9 million
Greece	\$7.2 million
Spain	\$7 million
Others <sup>99</sup>	\$22.8 million

*Note: Does not include funding for research and development*

**Mine Action Donors**

Unless otherwise noted, figures are in US dollars.<sup>100</sup> Figures include victim assistance funding, where known. Figures do *not* include funds for research and development, which are identified separately.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -- \$519.6 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$80.4 million</b>
2002	\$63.7 million
2001	\$69.2 million
2000	\$82.4 million
1999	\$63.1 million
1998	\$44.9 million
1997	\$30.8 million
1996	\$29.8 million
1995	\$29.2 million
1994	\$15.9 million

1993 \$10.2 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$358.8 million.
- Figures do not include mine victim assistance funding; however, funding for war victims programs totaled an additional \$11.9 million in FY2003, and \$51.9 million for FY1999-2003.
- R&D totaled an additional \$12.6 million in FY2003, \$74.8 million for FY1999-2003, and \$120.2 million for FY1995-2003.
- In FY 2003, the US Department of Defense awarded a \$317 million contract to the US Army Corps of Engineers to secure and destroy abandoned enemy ammunition in Iraq.

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION – \$304.7 million**

**2003 \$64.5 million (€57 million)**

2002 \$38.7 million (€40.7 million)

2001 \$23.5 million (€26.1 million)

2000 \$14.3 million (€15.9 million)

1999 \$15.5 million (€17.3 million)

1998 \$21.4 million (€23.8 million)

1992-1997 \$126.8 million (€141.2 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$156.5 million.
- Figures do not include additional mine action funding by individual EU Member States.
- R&D totaled an additional €10,000 in 2003, €1.4 million in 2002, €262,000 in 2001, €16.4 million in 2000, €3.8 million in 1999, €7.6 million in 1998, and €10.1 million from 1992-1997.

**NORWAY -- \$184.8 million**

**2003 \$28.6 million (NOK 202.4 million)**

2002 \$25.4 million (NOK 202.9 million)

2001 \$20 million (NOK 176.9 million)

2000 \$19.5 million (NOK 178.6 million)

1999 \$21.5 million (NOK 185 million)

1998 \$24 million

1997 \$16.7 million (NOK 125 million)

1996 \$13.5 million (NOK 101 million)

1995 \$11.6 million (NOK 87 million)

1994 \$4.0 million (NOK 30 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$115 million.
- Expenditures on R&D are not known.

**JAPAN -- \$135.3 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$13 million (¥1,590 million)</b>
2002	\$49.7 million (¥5,537 million)
2001	\$7.5 million (¥802 million)
2000	\$12.7 million (¥1,480 million)
1999	\$16 million (¥1,904 million)
1998	\$6.3 million (¥722 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$98.9 million.
- Prior to 1998, Japan contributed approximately \$30 million to mine action.
- R&D totaled ¥720 million (\$5.9 million) in 2003, and ¥760 (\$6.2 million) from 1999 to 2003.

**UNITED KINGDOM -- \$133.5 million**

<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>\$20 million (£12.3 million)</b>
2002-2003	\$18.5 million (£12.5 million)
2001-2002	\$15.4 million (£10.7 million)
2000-2001	\$21.5 million (£15 million)
1999-2000	\$20.4 million (£13.6 million)
1998-1999	\$6.5 million (£4.6 million)
1997-1998	\$6.6 million (£4.6 million)
1996	\$6.3 million
1995	\$6.9 million
1994	\$6.3 million
1993	\$5.1 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$95.8 million.
- Figures do not include victim assistance funding.
- R&D totaled an additional £1.5 million (\$2.5 million) in 2003-2004 and £5.9 million (\$9.2 million) from 1999-2000 to 2003-2004.

**CANADA -- \$105 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$22.5 million (C\$30.8 million)</b>
2002	\$15.1 million (C\$22.3)
2001	\$15.5 million (C\$24 million)
2000	\$11.9 million (C\$17.7 million)
1999	\$15.2 million (C\$23.5 million)
1998	\$9.5 million
1997	\$3.0 million (C\$4.6 million)
1996	\$4.0 million (C\$6 million)
1995	\$1.5 million (C\$2.2 million)
1994	\$2.9 million (C\$4.4 million)
1993	\$2.2 million (C\$3.4 million)

1989 \$1.7 million (C\$2.5 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was US\$80.2 million.
- R&D totaled an additional C\$2.8 million (US\$2 million) in 2003, and US\$11.1 million from 1998-2003.
- Figures prior to 1998 only include CIDA funding.

**GERMANY -- \$104.2 million**

**2003 \$22.1 million (€19.5 million)**  
2002 \$19.4 million (€20.4 million)  
2001 \$12.3 million (DM 26.8 million, €13.7 million)  
2000 \$14.5 million (DM 27.6 million)  
1999 \$11.4 million (DM 21.7 million)  
1998 \$10.1 million  
1997 \$4.9 million  
1996 \$7.9 million  
1995 \$0.8 million  
1994 \$0.5 million  
1993 \$0.3 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$79.7 million.
- Germany devoted DM 9.75 million (\$5.1 million) to R&D from 1993-1999; no figures are available for recent years.

**SWEDEN -- \$103.5 million**

**2003 \$12.7 million (SEK 102.9 million) disbursed**  
2002 \$7.3 million (SEK 71 million) disbursed  
2001 \$9.8 million (SEK 100.9 million) disbursed  
2000 \$11.8 million (SEK 107.9 million) disbursed  
1999 \$9.8 million (SEK 83.3 million) disbursed  
1998 \$16.6 million (SEK 129.5 million) allocated  
1997 \$11.9 million allocated  
1996 \$10.4 million allocated  
1995 \$5.1 million allocated  
1994 \$2.6 million allocated  
1990-93 \$5.5 million allocated

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$51.4 million.
- Figures do not include victim assistance funding.
- Sweden has devoted considerable additional funds to R&D, totaling more than \$24 million from 1994-1999, and at least SEK14 million (\$1.73 million) in 2003. Figures for other years are not available.

**THE NETHERLANDS -- \$95.3 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$12.1 million</b>
2002	\$16 million
2001	\$13.9 million (Dfl 32 million, €15.5 million)
2000	\$14.2 million (Dfl 35.4 million)
1999	\$8.9 million (Dfl 23 million)
1998	\$9.3 million
1997	\$10.2 million
1996	\$10.7 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$65.1 million.
- Figures include some but not all victim assistance funding.
- Figures prior to 1996 are not available.
- The Netherlands spent Dfl 12.8 million (\$5 million) on the HOM 2000 research project into new demining techniques from 1997 until its termination in 2001.

**DENMARK -- \$84.8 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$11.9 million (DKK 78.6 million)</b>
2002	\$10.6 million (DKK 83.5 million)
2001	\$14.4 million (DKK 119.4 million)
2000	\$13.4 million (DKK 106.7 million)
1999	\$7 million (DKK 49.9 million)
1998	\$6.2 million (DKK 44.3 million)
1997	\$5.4 million (DKK 38.6 million)
1996	\$8 million (DKK 57 million)
1995	\$2.3 million
1994	\$2.0 million
1993	\$1.7 million
1992	\$1.9 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$57.3 million.
- Figures for 1992-1995 do not include bilateral contributions.
- Denmark has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

**AUSTRALIA -- \$60.5 million**

<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>\$5.5 million (A\$8.2 million)</b>
2002-2003	\$7.8 million (A\$14.5 million)
2001-2002	\$6.6 million (A\$12.9 million)
2000-2001	\$7.3 million (A\$12.6 million)
1999-2000	\$7.9 million (A\$12.4 million)
1998-1999	\$6.8 million (A\$11.1 million)
1997-1998	\$7.3 million (A\$9.9 million)

1996-1997 \$5.8 million (A\$7.5 million)

1995-1996 \$5.5 million (A\$7.5 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was US\$35.1 million.
- Australia has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

#### **SWITZERLAND -- \$56.9 million**

**2003 \$8.8 million**

2002 \$8.3 million

2001 \$9.8 million

2000 \$7.4 million

1999 \$5.7 million

1998 Unknown

1997 \$4.0 million

1996 \$2.6 million

1995 \$4.1 million

1994 \$3.5 million

1993 \$2.7 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$40 million.
- Funding for victim assistance is not included in these figures because it is integrated into other funding for victims of war, post-conflict reconstruction and long-term development.
- The totals include \$5.2 million for the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining in 2003, and about \$10 million from 2000-2002; some or all of these funds could be counted as R&D.

#### **ITALY -- \$48.8 million**

**2003 \$5.8 million (€5.1 million)**

2002 \$8.7 million (€9.9 million)

2001 \$5.1 million (L 11.2 billion, €5.6 million)

2000 \$1.6 million (L 4.3 billion, €1.7 million)

1999 \$5.1 million (L 13.9 billion, €4.8 million)

1998 \$12 million (L 20 billion)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$26.3 million.
- Italy contributed 18 billion lire (\$10.5 million) from 1995-1997.
- Italy has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

#### **FINLAND -- \$40.2 million**

**2003 \$6.3 million (€5.6 million)**

2002 \$4.5 million (€4.8 million)

2001 \$4.5 million (€5 million)

2000 \$4.8 million

1999	\$5.7 million
1998	\$6.6 million
1997	\$4.5 million
1996	\$1.3 million
1995	\$0.7 million
1991-94	\$1.3 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$25.8 million.

**FRANCE -- \$22.9 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$2.5 million (€2.2 million)</b>
2002	\$3.6 million (€3.8 million)
2001	\$2.7 million (€3 million)
2000	\$1.2 million
1999	\$0.9 million
1995-98	\$12 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$10.9 million.
- France has devoted considerable additional funds to R&D, but the value of R&D relevant to humanitarian mine action is not known.

**BELGIUM -- \$21.8 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$6.2 million (€5.5 million)</b>
2002	\$3.6 million (€3.8 million)
2001	\$2.1 million (€2.2 million)
2000	\$2.5 million (BEF 111 m.)
1999	\$2.3 million (BEF 93 m.)
1994-1998	\$5.1 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$16.7 million.
- R&D totaled an additional €475,000 (\$538,000) in 2003, \$5.6 million from 1999-2003, and about \$8.1 million from 1994-2003.

**IRELAND -- \$11.1 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$2.3 million (€2 million)</b>
2002	\$1.6 million (€1.7 million)
2001	\$2 million (€2.2 million)
2000	\$1.1 million
1999	\$1.5 million
1994-1998	\$2.6 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$8.5 million.

**AUSTRIA -- \$11 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$0.9 million (€0.8 million)</b>
2002	\$2 million (€1.1 million)
2001	\$0.9 million (ATS 13.7 m.)
2000	\$2 million (ATS 30 million)
1999	\$1 million (ATS 15 million)
1994-1998	\$4.2 million

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was \$6.8 million.

**NEW ZEALAND -- \$9 million**

<b>2003/04</b>	<b>\$1.1 million (NZ\$1.6 million)</b>
2002/03	\$0.8 million (NZ\$1.4 million)
2001/02	\$0.7 million (NZ\$1.7 million)
2000/01	\$1.1 million (NZ\$2.3 million)
1999/00	\$0.8 million (NZ\$1.6 million)
1998/99	\$0.5 million (NZ\$0.9 million)
1992-1998	\$4 million (NZ\$6.9 million)

- Mine action funding for the five-year review period (1999-2003) was US\$4.5 million.

**GREECE -- \$7.2 million**

<b>2003</b>	<b>\$5 million (€4.4 million)</b>
2002	\$1.4 million (€1.5 million)
2001	\$0.8 million (€0.9 million)

Other mine action contributions in 2003 included:

- China reports that it provided about \$2 million in assistance for worldwide mine clearance activities. China also reports that it donated demining equipment valued at \$3 million in 2002 to two countries, and equipment valued at \$1.3 million in 2001 to seven countries.
- Spain has not reported fully on its mine action funding in all years, including 2003. Landmine Monitor estimates Spanish mine action funding to be \$1.2 million in 2003 and \$4.7 million from 1999-2003.
- Saudi Arabia provided \$1 million for mine action in Yemen, the final contribution of a \$3 million pledge made in 2001.
- Luxembourg provided about \$983,000 for mine action, and an additional \$800,000 for projects that benefit mine victims among others. From 1999 to 2003, Luxembourg is estimated to have provided \$3.83 million in mine action funding.
- Slovenia donated \$376,250 to the International Trust Fund. Since 1998, the government has donated a total of \$3 million to the ITF.

- The Czech Republic provided \$301,757, more than its known contributions to international mine action in all previous years.
- South Korea contributed \$50,000 to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance. It has contributed a total of \$1 million to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund and \$60,000 to the ITF.
- The United Arab Emirates provided \$720,543 to Lebanon through the UN Voluntary Trust Fund. The UAE’s bilateral contribution to Lebanon is not known. In 2001, the UAE pledged up to \$50 million to redevelop South Lebanon, including an unknown sum for demining, survey and mine risk education activities. “Operation Emirates Solidarity” completed its third phase in May 2004 with the clearance of some 5 million square meters of land, and a fourth phase is under consideration.

### States and Victim Assistance

The Mine Ban Treaty obligates, in Article 6.3, that “Each State in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims....” In many mine-affected countries the assistance available to address the needs of survivors is inadequate and it would appear that additional outside assistance is needed in providing for the care and rehabilitation of mine survivors. Landmine Monitor identified 35 countries receiving resources from other States for mine victim assistance programs in 2003, with the majority of resources being provided for physical rehabilitation programs.

Precise, comprehensive and comparable figures on resources available for mine victim assistance are difficult to obtain. Some governments do not provide specific funding for victim assistance, but rather consider victim assistance as an integrated part of humanitarian mine action. In other instances, some countries, for example Sweden and the United Kingdom, do not provide specific funding for victim assistance at all with the view that landmine victims are reached through bilateral development cooperation and other contributions. However, experience has shown that unless funding is specifically targeted at facilities and programs that assist persons with disabilities, including landmine victims, it is likely that resources will be directed to other areas of public health or development concern leaving the disabled population further disadvantaged.

Based on an analysis of various sources of information available to Landmine Monitor, State donors to mine victim assistance since 1999 include:<sup>101</sup>

	<b>2003</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Australia	\$1,059,500	\$570,694	\$1,104,727	\$1,123,139	\$903,421	\$4,761,480
Austria	\$79,205	\$910,053	\$248,853	\$35,908	\$0	\$1,274,019
Belgium	\$1,021,067	\$316,510	\$675,830	\$717,990	\$746,599	\$3,477,996
Canada	\$513,766	\$2,425,619	\$4,812,009	\$1,569,815	\$2,417,702	\$11,738,911
Croatia	\$11,495	\$11,717	\$9,844	\$0	\$0	\$33,056
Czech Republic	\$108,060	\$0	\$0	\$9,650	\$48,500	\$166,210
Denmark	\$0	\$48,663	\$292,243	\$263,508	\$0	\$604,414
Finland	\$304,323	\$478,074	\$490,302	\$147,000	\$1,185,765	\$2,605,464

France	\$27,156	\$795,842	\$95,829	\$213,980	\$0	\$1,132,807
Germany	\$3,865,984	\$2,650,253	\$964,959	\$1,500,000	\$1,050,000	\$10,031,196
Hungary	\$31,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,910	\$0	\$33,910
Ireland	\$435,628	\$240,350	\$456,633	\$942,345	\$376,000	\$2,450,956
Italy	\$96,936	\$473,437	\$1,737,568	\$1,271,103	\$2,367,760	\$5,946,804
Japan	\$0	\$2,108,446	\$741,693	\$1,290,124	\$1,991,204	\$6,131,467
Luxembourg	\$854,036	\$1,444,631	\$356,788	\$73,585	\$78,983	\$2,808,023
The Netherlands	\$495,603	\$429,965	\$276,048	\$1,738,947	\$1,919,480	\$4,860,043
New Zealand	\$163,044	\$57,000	\$109,200	\$93,842	\$89,500	\$512,586
Norway	\$5,532,700	\$4,584,343	\$3,450,084	\$5,635,972	\$5,036,146	\$24,239,245
Poland	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,327	\$10,037	\$25,364
Portugal	\$68,700	\$9,500	\$56,080	\$44,166	\$107,500	\$285,946
Slovakia	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,477	\$35,477
Slovenia	\$0	\$140,143	\$165,807	\$252,706	\$8,505	\$567,161
South Africa	\$59,536	\$19,785	\$0	\$0	\$73,466	\$152,787
Spain	\$323,663	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$323,663
Sweden	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$226,677	\$226,677
Switzerland	\$0	\$46,000	\$0	\$1,478,940	\$9,970	\$1,534,910
United States of America	\$13,501,388	\$10,401,547	\$11,410,386	\$10,817,612	\$11,070,602	\$57,201,535
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$28,552,790</b>	<b>\$28,162,572</b>	<b>\$27,454,883</b>	<b>\$29,238,569</b>	<b>\$29,753,294</b>	<b>\$143,162,108</b>

While global mine action funding has increased greatly since 1999, resources for mine victim assistance have declined, even as the number of landmine survivors requiring assistance has continued to grow every year. Since 1999, \$143.2 million of victim assistance funding from State donors has been identified, with \$83.3 million (58 percent) provided by States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty. In 1999, identifiable victim assistance funding reached \$29.8 million, dropping to \$29.2 million in 2000 and to \$27.5 million in 2001. In 2002, funding rose slightly to \$28.2 million and to \$28.6 million in 2003.

In addition to resources provided by States, in 2003, for the first time since 1999, the European Commission reported funding for mine victim assistance programs: €500,000 (\$565,750) to the International Committee of the Red Cross Special Appeal for Mine Action for integrated mine action including victim assistance, promoting compliance with international humanitarian law and mine risk education in Burma; €200,000 (\$226,300) for victim assistance and mine risk education for Burmese refugees in the Thai border areas; €75,000 (\$311,163) for mine risk education and victim assistance in Laos; €200,000 (\$226,300) for victim assistance in Northern Ossetia (Russian Federation); and more than \$6.4 million for an integrated mine action program with a victim assistance component in Sri Lanka. The

total funding attributable to the victim assistance component of these programs is not known. In 1999, the EC contributed \$5.3 million through the ICRC Special Appeal for mine victim assistance in ten countries. Funding is also provided from other budget-lines, including those of the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), to support programs that assist all persons with disabilities in mine-affected countries. The total value of these contributions is not available.

Resources for victim assistance as a percentage of total mine action funding have declined significantly and steadily from 14.9 percent in 1999 to 11.5 percent in 2000, to 11.1 percent in 2001, to 8.7 percent in 2002, to a low of 8.3 percent in 2003. The average percentage of total mine action funding attributed to victim assistance for the period 1999 through 2003 was 10.5 percent.<sup>102</sup>

Although some States reported significant increases in funding in 2003 – Australia, Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, and the United States – in 10 out of 27 donor countries victim assistance funding decreased significantly from 2002. Of particular concern is the drop in funding from Canada, Italy and Japan. Canadian funding dropped by around \$2.4 million from 2001 to 2002 and again by \$1.9 million from 2002 to 2003. In the case of Italy, resources for victim assistance declined from \$2.4 million in 1999 to \$97,000 in 2003. Japan reported no funding for victim assistance in 2003 after providing \$2.1 million in 2002. Of the States Parties, Norway has provided the most resources for mine victim assistance with \$24.2 million or 17 percent of the total identified resources since 1999. It should also be noted that while the US contribution appears to be the largest, this includes the total contribution of the Leahy War Victims Fund (in excess of \$10 million each year), which supports programs for all victims of war; the percentage of funding that goes to support programs assisting landmine victims is not available.

Through the research undertaken by Landmine Monitor it is known that Sweden supports victim assistance activities in Colombia through a Swedish NGO and the United Kingdom supports activities in the northern Caucasus through UNICEF. Both States have also provided financial resources to the Comprehensive Disabled Afghans Program in Afghanistan since 1999. Iceland provided prosthetic limbs for amputees in Bosnia and Herzegovina and México provided technical support and facilitated workshops as part of a three-year victim assistance program in Central America. Israel reports sending rehabilitation specialists to mine-affected countries and has rehabilitation exchange agreements. It also supports an economic reintegration program for mine survivors in Guatemala. Although Japan reported no funding for victim assistance in 2003, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency reportedly supported an NGO providing rehabilitation and reintegration activities for mine survivors in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There are likely many other programs that assist mine survivors that are not reported in the context of mine action funding.

Equally, if not more important, are the activities of mine-affected states in providing resources for facilities and services within the public health system to address the needs of landmine victims. For example, in Croatia, the State reported allocating about \$11,495 specifically for mine victim assistance in 2003. Information on expenditure by other countries is not readily available. In addition, many if not the majority of victim assistance programs are carried out by NGOs who receive funding from various sources including governments, private donors and charitable foundations. For example, German NGOs expended approximately \$1.1 million on programs to assist war victims and persons with disabilities, including mine survivors, in 2003. Therefore, the information obtained for the *Landmine Monitor Report*

2004 cannot be taken as fully representative of the total resources available to provide assistance to mine victims and other persons with disabilities.

Included in the information provided by States are contributions to the ICRC Special Appeal for Mine Action and ICRC Special Fund for the Disabled.<sup>103</sup> Since 1999, the ICRC Special Appeal for Mine Action expended CHF 118 million (US\$76.5 million) on victim assistance, mine awareness and humanitarian diplomacy activities. Of the total expenditure, CHF 99.5 million (\$64.6 million) or 84 percent was for victim assistance activities including emergency care, continuing medical care, and physical rehabilitation in 14 mine-affected countries: CHF 18.8 million (US\$14 million) in 2003; CHF 20.3 million (\$13.1 million) in 2002; CHF 19.2 million (\$11.3 million) in 2001; CHF 16 million (\$9.4 million) in 2000; and CHF 25.2 million (\$16.8 million) in 1999.<sup>104</sup> In 2003, the ICRC received contributions from five countries (Czech Republic, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway and South Africa), three national Red Cross societies (Denmark, Japan and Norway), and six private donors. Other donors since 1999 include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and the European Commission. An additional CHF 32.3 million (US\$21.6 million) was funded out of contributions to the ICRC Emergency Appeals since 1999, including CHF 12.7 million (\$9.5 million) in 2003.

The ICRC Special Fund for the Disabled (SFD) has expended CHF 12.3 million (US\$7,985,191) on physical rehabilitation programs for persons with disabilities, including landmine survivors since 1999: \$2,235,206 in 2003; \$1,661,837 in 2002; \$1,637,535 in 2001; \$1,346,255 in 2000; and \$1,104,358 in 1999.<sup>105</sup> In 2003, three countries (Czech Republic, Norway and the United States), three national societies (Monaco, New Zealand and Norway) and two private donors contributed to the SFD. Since 1999, other donors include Australia and the Netherlands.

States also reported contributions to the Slovenia-based International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF). From 1998 through the end of 2003, of the \$111.4 million expended on mine action by the ITF only \$8,025,383 (7.2 percent) was for victim assistance programs, well below the ITF's target of 15 percent. The ITF reportedly experiences difficulties in attracting donors to support victim assistance programs. In 2003, the ITF allocated \$2,684,100 (10.8 percent of expenditure) to victim assistance programs, reversing the previous trend of reductions in absolute terms: \$936,943 (4 percent) in 2002; \$1,325,053 (5 percent) in 2001; \$1,419,814 (6 percent) in 2000; and \$1,659,473 (9 percent) in 1998/1999.<sup>106</sup> In 2003, the ITF received contributions from seven countries for mine victim assistance programs: Austria, Canada, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovenia and the United States of America. Other donors included Handicap International, Rotary Club International (Vienna) and specific fund raising events. Other countries supporting victim assistance activities through the ITF since 1999 are Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, and France. The ITF has described mine victim assistance programs as "still grossly underfunded."<sup>107</sup>

### **Major Mine Action Recipients**

Accurate, complete and comparable figures for major mine action recipients are even more difficult to obtain than those for mine action donors. According to information available to Landmine Monitor, the largest recipients have been Afghanistan (\$341 million since 1991, and \$141 million in just 2002 and 2003), Mozambique (\$192 million since 1993), Cambodia (\$190 million since 1994), Iraq (\$166 million

since 1993), Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$129 million since 1995), Angola (\$113 million since 1993), Kosovo (\$89 million since 1999), and Laos (\$54 million since 1994).

Top recipients for the five-year review period (1999-2003) were Afghanistan (\$200 million), Iraq (\$149 million), Cambodia (\$114 million), Kosovo (\$89 million), Angola (\$84 million), Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$82 million) and Mozambique (\$73 million).

In 1999, Cambodia (\$23 million) and Afghanistan (\$22 million) received the biggest shares of mine action funds, with Angola, Mozambique, and Bosnia and Herzegovina each receiving about \$12 million. Following the 1999 crisis and NATO bombing campaign, Kosovo became the favored mine action recipient, receiving some \$58 million in the latter part of 1999 and 2000. Also in 2000, the UN's Iraq Oil for Food program began providing large sums to mine action in northern Iraq, making it the third largest recipient that year after Kosovo and Cambodia. At different points in 2000, Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Cambodia experienced funding crises. In 2001, the top recipients were northern Iraq (\$30 million) and Cambodia. Lebanon (following the Israeli withdrawal) and Vietnam emerged as major funding recipients, even as some of the established programs continued to experience funding problems. In 2002, following the overthrow of the Taliban, Afghanistan's mine action funding skyrocketed to \$66 million, more than 20 percent of total global mine action funding; other top recipients were northern Iraq, Cambodia, Angola, Vietnam, Mozambique and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Eritrea (following the end of its border conflict) and Sri Lanka (after its cease-fire) became significant recipients.

In 2003, mine action funding for Afghanistan continued to rise, to \$75.2 million. Funds also poured into Iraq after the invasion and ouster of Saddam Hussein, with some \$55 million contributed in 2003. The next top recipients were Angola (\$21.3 million), Cambodia (\$17 million), Sri Lanka (\$15.8 million), Mozambique (\$15.3 million) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$10.4 million). Other notable recipients in 2003 included Sudan (\$9.5 million), Eritrea (\$6.9 million), Lebanon (\$6.6 million), Azerbaijan (\$5.5 million), Nicaragua (\$5.3 million), Laos (\$5.3 million), and Vietnam (\$4.3 million).<sup>108</sup>

The biggest increase in mine action funding in 2003 was predictably seen in Iraq (up \$24.4 million). Other large increases occurred in Sri Lanka (up \$9.8 million), Afghanistan (up \$9.2 million), and Sudan (up \$4.4 million).

An unusually large number of mine-affected countries experienced a decline in donor contributions to mine action in 2003. Mine action funding fell most severely in 2003 for Vietnam (down \$13.4 million) and Cambodia (down \$10.4 million). Decreases in funding were also seen for Bosnia and Herzegovina (down \$5.4 million), Eritrea (down \$4.2 million), Somaliland (down \$3.5 million), Laos (down \$2.7 million), and Ethiopia (down \$2.7 million).

### **Afghanistan**

Since the ouster of the Taliban in late 2001, mine action funding for Afghanistan has exceeded that for any country previously. After dropping sharply to \$14 million in 2001, mine action funding totaled \$66 million in 2002 and \$75.2 million in 2003. Contributions in 2003 were received from 13 countries, the EC, eight organizations and private donors. Funding for Afghanistan amounted to \$200 million from 1999-2003 and \$341 million from 1991-2003.

### **Mozambique**

According to information provided to Landmine Monitor, in 2003, 11 donor governments and the EC provided about \$15.3 million for mine action in Mozambique. The National Demining Institute said it received approximately \$18.2 million. NDI reported contributions totaling \$16.9 million in 2002, while Landmine Monitor recorded \$13.5 million from 16 donors. Landmine Monitor estimates that funding for Mozambique totaled \$73 million from 1999-2003 and \$192 million from 1993-2003.

### **Cambodia**

In 2003, 15 donor governments and the EC provided approximately \$17 million in mine action funding for Cambodia, a decrease of more than \$10 million from 2002. Donations for mine action in Cambodia are estimated to have exceeded \$190 million from 1994 through 2003, including \$114 million for 1999 through 2003.

### **Iraq**

Fifteen major donors provided about \$55 million to mine action throughout Iraq in 2003. Funding for mine action in northern Iraq (Iraqi Kurdistan) alone in 2002 totaled about \$30.6 million. Prior to the occupation of Iraq by the Coalition Provisional Authority in 2003, mine action only took place in northern Iraq. The Iraq Mine Action Program, under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, was funded entirely through the UN Oil for Food Program, which closed in November 2003. Two key mine action NGOs, Mines Advisory Group and Norwegian People's Aid, received funds apart from the UN program. It is estimated that funding for mine action in Iraq has totaled \$166 million, including \$111 million for northern Iraq from 1993 to 2002, plus \$55 million for the entire country in 2003. Funding for the review period, 1999-2003, amounted to an estimated \$149 million.

### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

In 2003, 11 governments, the EC, and NATO provided about \$10.4 million for mine action in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a decrease of \$5.4 million from the previous year. Landmine Monitor estimates mine action funding totaled \$129 million from 1995-2003, including \$82 million from 1999 to 2003.

### **Angola**

In 2003, 17 countries and the EC reported contributions to mine action in Angola totaling approximately \$21.3 million, roughly the same as in 2002, when 15 donors reported contributions totaling approximately \$21.2 million. The EC is also providing \$11.3 million to fund an emergency mine action program for sustainable return and resettlement of Angolan refugees. Mine action funding for Angola totaled an estimated \$113 million from 1993-2003, including \$84 million from 1999-2003.

### **Kosovo**

Landmine Monitor estimates mine action donations in 2003 for Kosovo totaled \$2.2 million. In 2002, mine action funding totaled \$1.4 million. In December 2001, the UN declared Kosovo was mine-free. A Praxis/UNMAS evaluation estimated funding from mid-1999 to 2001 at \$85 million.

### **Laos**

Ten donor governments and the EC contributed about \$5.3 million to mine action in Laos in 2003, which was \$2.7 million less than in 2002. Landmine Monitor estimates that mine action funding for Laos totaled more than \$54 million from 1994 to 2003, including \$36 million from 1999-2003.

### **Eritrea**

Since the end of its border conflict with Ethiopia in June 2000, and its accession to the Mine Ban Treaty in August 2001, Eritrea has received significant amounts of mine action assistance. Eight donors provided about \$6.9 million for mine action in Eritrea in 2003, down from \$11.1 million from 11 donors in 2002, and \$8.4 million in 2001. Total mine action funding for Eritrea from 1994 to 2003 is estimated at approximately \$39 million, including at least \$27 million from 1999-2003.

### **Vietnam**

In 2003, three donors reported providing a total of \$4.3 million for mine action in Vietnam, a huge decrease from the 2002 level of \$17.7 million, which included a \$12 million grant from Japan. According to reports from contributing countries, more than \$35 million has been provided or pledged in recent years.

### **Croatia**

Croatia has paid for most of its mine action costs from the State budget and other domestic sources. Croatia reports that it has provided \$116 million to mine action since 1999. In 2003, CROMAC recorded foreign donations totaling \$5.5 million, although donor reports indicate contributions of about \$3.6 million from ten countries and the EC. Landmine Monitor estimates international contributions to mine action in Croatia to be at least \$33.4 million from 1994 to 2003, including at least \$26.7 million from 1999-2003.

### **Lebanon**

Mine action funding and activities in Lebanon increased greatly after the Israeli withdrawal from South Lebanon in 2000. Landmine Monitor has identified \$6.6 million in mine action funding from seven major donors in 2003, compared to \$6.9 million from eight donors in 2002, \$12.6 million from 13 donors in 2001, and nearly \$6 million in 2000. In 2001, the United Arab Emirates pledged up to \$50 million to redevelop South Lebanon, including funds for mine action. The UAE has not reported how much has been spent on mine action, other than \$2.5 million through the UN Voluntary Trust Fund in 2002 and 2003. Thus, the \$29.6 million in identified donor funding for mine action in Lebanon since 2000 is likely far from a complete total.

### **Sri Lanka**

Since the cease-fire took effect in February 2002, significant amounts of mine action funding have been provided to Sri Lanka. Thirteen donors contributed about \$15.8 million in 2003, compared to about \$6 million from 11 donors in 2002. Mine action projects were mostly suspended in 2000 and 2001.

### **Other Mine Action Recipients**

- **Sudan:** In 2003, eight donor governments and the EC provided about \$9.5 million for mine action in Sudan. This compares to \$5.1 million in 2002 and \$2.2 million in 2001. There was little international funding prior to 2001.
- **Nicaragua:** In 2003, Nicaragua received about \$5.3 million in mine action funding from eleven countries and the EC. In 2002, eight donors reported providing about \$5.9 million.
- **Azerbaijan:** Azerbaijan reports receiving approximately \$5.3 million in mine action funding in 2003, and \$4.2 million in 2002. Landmine Monitor recorded mine action funding totaling \$5.5 million in 2001 and \$2.4 million in previous years.
- **DR Congo:** Landmine Monitor has identified about \$3.8 million in funding for mine action in the DRC in 2003.
- **Yemen:** In 2003, international donors contributed at least \$3.6 million to the Yemen Mine Action Program, down from \$5.6 million in 2002 and \$4 million in 2001. International donors contributed approximately \$18.6 million from 1999 to 2003.
- **Albania:** Landmine Monitor estimates that approximately \$3.6 million was provided for mine action in Albania in 2003, up from \$2.8 million in 2002. Mine action funding totaled \$2.2 million in 2001 and \$1.8 million in 2000.
- **Ethiopia:** In 2003, Landmine Monitor received reports that five donors provided about \$2.5 million for mine action in Ethiopia, compared to about \$5.2 million in 2002.
- **Serbia and Montenegro:** In 2003, the ITF allocated nearly \$2.4 million for mine action in Serbia and Montenegro, excluding the UN-administered province of Kosovo, a very large increase from about \$299,000 in 2002 and \$31,000 in 2001, when ITF support began.
- **Somaliland:** Landmine Monitor recorded \$2.1 million for mine action in Somaliland in 2003, compared to \$5.6 million in 2002, \$4.4 million in 2001, \$4.5 million in 2000, \$6.6 million in 1999 and \$546,000 in 1998.
- **Thailand:** International donations to mine action in Thailand in 2003 totaled about \$1.2 million.
- **Abkhazia (Georgia):** Donations for mine action in Abkhazia in 2003 totaled an estimated \$1.4 million.
- **Chad:** Three donors reported providing about \$1.2 million in mine action funding to Chad in 2003, compared to \$1.3 million in 2002, \$1.9 million in 2001, \$8 million in 2000, and \$4.9 million in 1999.
- **Jordan:** Three donors reported providing \$1.1 million to mine action in Jordan in 2003, compared to \$1.1 million in 2002 and \$1.6 million in 2001. In August 2004, Jordan reported that since 1996, it has received \$9.6 million in mine action assistance.
- **Guinea-Bissau:** In 2003, four donors provided an estimated \$1.2 million for mine action in Guinea-Bissau.
- **OAS Member States:** The OAS mine action program, Comprehensive Action against Antipersonnel Mines (or AICMA by its Spanish acronym), has conducted mine action activities in Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru. It received contributions totaling \$8.2

million in 2003 and the first quarter of 2004. Funding for totaled \$3.95 million in 2002, and \$4.7 million in 2001. Contributions from 1992 to 2002 totaled \$31.3 million.

Funding for mine action in each of the following countries totaled less than \$1 million in 2003: Armenia, Benin, Burma, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Djibouti, Ecuador, Estonia, Georgia, Guatemala, FYR Macedonia, Mauritania, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Congo, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Uganda, and Ukraine.

## **MINE BAN TREATY STATES PARTIES, SIGNATORIES, AND NON-SIGNATORIES**

### **1997 CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION (1997 MINE BAN TREATY)**

Under Article 15, the treaty was open for signature from 3 December 1997 until its entry into force, which was 1 March 1999. On the following list, the first date is signature; the second date is ratification. Now that the treaty has entered into force, states may no longer sign rather they may become bound without signature through a one step procedure known as accession. According to Article 16 (2), the treaty is open for accession by any State that has not signed. Accession is indicated below with (a).

As of 1 October 2004, 152 signatories/accessions and 143 ratifications/accessions (a).

#### **States Parties**

Afghanistan 11 Sep 02 (a)  
Albania 8 Sep 98; 29 Feb 00  
Algeria 3 Dec 97; 9 Oct 01  
Andorra 3 Dec 97; 29 Jun 98  
Angola 4 Dec 97; 5 Jul 02  
Antigua and Barbuda 3 Dec 97; 3 May 99  
Argentina 4 Dec 97; 14 Sep 99  
Australia 3 Dec 97; 14 Jan 99  
Austria 3 Dec 97; 29 Jun 98  
Bahamas 3 Dec 97; 31 Jul 98  
Bangladesh 7 May 98; 6 Sep 00  
Barbados 3 Dec 97; 26 Jan 99  
Belarus 3 Sep 03 (a)  
Belgium 3 Dec 97; 4 Sep 98  
Belize 27 Feb 98; 23 Apr 98  
Benin 3 Dec 97; 25 Sep 98  
Bolivia 3 Dec 97; 9 Jun 98  
Bosnia and Herzegovina 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 98  
Botswana 3 Dec 97; 1 Mar 00  
Brazil 3 Dec 97; 30 Apr 99  
Bulgaria 3 Dec 97; 4 Sep 98  
Burkina Faso 3 Dec 97; 16 Sep 98  
Burundi 3 Dec 97; 22 Oct 03  
Cambodia 3 Dec 97; 28 Jul 99  
Cameroon 3 Dec 97; 19 Sep 02  
Canada 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97

Cape Verde 4 Dec 97; 14 May 01  
Central African Republic 8 Nov 02 (a)  
Chad 6 Jul 98; 6 May 99  
Chile 3 Dec 97; 10 Sep 01  
Colombia 3 Dec 97; 6 Sep 00  
Comoros 19 Sep 02 (a)  
Congo (Brazzaville) 4 May 01 (a)  
Congo, Democratic Rep. Of 2 May 02 (a)  
Costa Rica 3 Dec 97; 17 Mar 99  
Cote d Ivoire 3 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00  
Croatia 4 Dec 97; 20 May 98  
Cyprus 4 Dec 97; 17 Jan 03  
Czech Republic 3 Dec 97; 26 Oct 99  
Denmark 4 Dec 97; 8 Jun 98  
Djibouti 3 Dec 97; 18 May 98  
Dominica 3 Dec 97; 26 Mar 99  
Dominican Republic 3 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00  
Ecuador 4 Dec 97; 29 Apr 99  
El Salvador 4 Dec 97; 27 Jan 99  
Equatorial Guinea 16 Sep 98 (a)  
Eritrea 27 Aug 01 (a)  
Estonia 12 May 04 (a)  
Fiji 3 Dec 97; 10 Jun 98  
France 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98  
Gabon 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 00  
Gambia 4 Dec 97; 23 Sep 02  
Germany 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98  
Ghana 4 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00  
Greece 3 Dec 97; 25 Sep 03  
Grenada 3 Dec 97; 19 Aug 98  
Guatemala 3 Dec 97; 26 Mar 99  
Guinea 4 Dec 97; 8 Oct 98  
Guinea-Bissau 3 Dec 97; 22 May 01  
Guyana 4 Dec 97; 5 Aug 03  
Holy See 4 Dec 97; 17 Feb 98  
Honduras 3 Dec 97; 24 Sep 98  
Hungary 3 Dec 97; 6 Apr 98  
Iceland 4 Dec 97; 5 May 99  
Ireland 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97  
Italy 3 Dec 97; 23 Apr 99  
Jamaica 3 Dec 97; 17 Jul 98

Japan 3 Dec 97; 30 Sep 98  
Jordan 11 Aug 98; 13 Nov 98  
Kenya 5 Dec 97; 23 Jan 01  
Kiribati 7 Sep 00 (a)  
Lesotho 4 Dec 97; 2 Dec 98  
Liberia 23 Dec 99 (a)  
Liechtenstein 3 Dec 97; 5 Oct 99  
Lithuania 26 Feb 99; 12 May 03  
Luxembourg 4 Dec 97; 14 Jun 99  
Macedonia FYR 9 Sep 98 (a)  
Madagascar 4 Dec 97; 16 Sep 99  
Malawi 4 Dec 97; 13 Aug 98  
Malaysia 3 Dec 97; 22 Apr 99  
Maldives 1 Oct 98; 7 Sep 00  
Mali 3 Dec 97; 2 Jun 98  
Malta 4 Dec 97; 7 May 01  
Mauritania 3 Dec 97; 21 Jul 00  
Mauritius 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97  
Mexico 3 Dec 97; 9 Jun 98  
Moldova 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 00  
Monaco 4 Dec 97; 17 Nov 98  
Mozambique 3 Dec 97; 25 Aug 98  
Namibia 3 Dec 97; 21 Sep 98  
Nauru 7 Aug 00 (a)  
Netherlands 3 Dec 97; 12 Apr 99  
New Zealand 3 Dec 97; 27 Jan 99  
Nicaragua 4 Dec 97; 30 Nov 98  
Niger 4 Dec 97; 23 Mar 99  
Nigeria 27 Sep 01 (a)  
Niue 3 Dec 97; 15 Apr 98  
Norway 3 Dec 97; 9 Jul 98  
Panama 4 Dec 97; 7 Oct 98  
Papua New Guinea 28 Jun 04 (a)  
Paraguay 3 Dec 97; 13 Nov 98  
Peru 3 Dec 97; 17 Jun 98  
Philippines 3 Dec 97; 15 Feb 00  
Portugal 3 Dec 97; 19 Feb 99  
Qatar 4 Dec 97; 13 Oct 98  
Romania 3 Dec 97; 30 Nov 00  
Rwanda 3 Dec 97; 8 Jun 00  
Saint Kitts and Nevis 3 Dec 97; 2 Dec 98

Saint Lucia 3 Dec 97; 13 Apr 99  
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 3 Dec 97; 1 Aug 01  
Samoa 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98  
San Marino 3 Dec 97; 18 Mar 98  
Sao Tome e Principe 30 Apr 98; 31 Mar 03  
Senegal 3 Dec 97; 24 Sep 98  
Serbia and Montenegro 18 Sep 03 (a)  
Seychelles 4 Dec 97; 2 Jun 00  
Sierra Leone 29 Jul 98; 25 Apr 01  
Slovak Republic 3 Dec 97; 25 Feb 99  
Slovenia 3 Dec 97; 27 Oct 98  
Solomon Islands 4 Dec 97; 26 Jan 99  
South Africa 3 Dec 97; 26 Jun 98  
Spain 3 Dec 97; 19 Jan 99  
Sudan 4 Dec 97; 13 Oct 03  
Suriname 4 Dec 97; 23 May 02  
Swaziland 4 Dec 97; 22 Dec 98  
Sweden 4 Dec 97; 30 Nov 98  
Switzerland 3 Dec 97; 24 Mar 98  
Tajikistan 12 Oct 99 (a)  
Tanzania 3 Dec 97; 13 Nov 00  
Thailand 3 Dec 97; 27 Nov 98  
Timor-Leste 7 May 03 (a)  
Togo 4 Dec 97; 9 Mar 00  
Trinidad and Tobago 4 Dec 97; 27 Apr 98  
Tunisia 4 Dec 97; 9 Jul 99  
Turkey 25 Sep 03 (a)  
Turkmenistan 3 Dec 97; 19 Jan 98  
Uganda 3 Dec 97; 25 Feb 99  
United Kingdom 3 Dec 97; 31 Jul 98  
Uruguay 3 Dec 97; 7 Jun 01  
Venezuela 3 Dec 97; 14 Apr 99  
Yemen 4 Dec 97; 1 Sep 98  
Zambia 12 Dec 97; 23 Feb 01  
Zimbabwe 3 Dec 97; 18 Jun 98

**Signatories**

Brunei Darussalem 4 Dec 97  
Cook Islands 3 Dec 97  
Ethiopia 3 Dec 97  
Haiti 3 Dec 97  
Indonesia 4 Dec 97  
Marshall Islands 4 Dec 97  
Poland 4 Dec 97  
Ukraine 24 Feb 99  
Vanuatu 4 Dec 97 Non-Signatories

**Non-Signatories**

Armenia  
Azerbaijan  
Bahrain  
Bhutan  
Burma  
China  
Cuba  
Egypt  
Finland  
Georgia  
India  
Iran  
Iraq  
Israel  
Kazakhstan  
Korea, North  
Korea, South  
Kuwait  
Kyrgyzstan  
Lao PDR  
Latvia  
Lebanon  
Libya  
Micronesia  
Mongolia  
Morocco  
Nepal  
Oman  
Pakistan

Palau  
Russian Federation  
Saudi Arabia  
Singapore  
Somalia  
Sri Lanka  
Syria  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
United Arab Emirates  
United States  
Uzbekistan  
Vietnam

## KEY DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 1999

### States Parties

#### *Afghanistan*

Afghanistan acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 11 September 2002 and the treaty entered into force on 1 March 2003. Since the war and dramatic political and military changes in late 2001 and early 2002, mine action activities have expanded. From 1989 through December 2003, about 298 million square meters of mined land and 538 million square meters of battle areas were cleared. Approximately 288,830 antipersonnel mines, 18,421 antivehicle mines, and 4,366,890 UXO and cluster bomblets were destroyed. During the past five years, from 1999 to 2003, a total of about 132 million square meters of mined land was cleared, as well as 373 million square meters of battlefield areas. From 1999 to 2003, two NGOs surveyed 136 million square meters of mined land and 383 million square meters of battle areas. The Afghan government reports that mine risk education has been provided to 10.6 million people since 1990.

MAPA experienced a severe shortage of funds in 2000 and had to lay-off mine action teams; another funding shortfall prior to 11 September 2001 had threatened to again curtail mine action operations. Mine action operations were virtually brought to a halt following 11 September 2001. The mine action infrastructure suffered greatly during the subsequent military conflict, and military operations created additional threats to the population, especially unexploded US cluster bomblets and ammunition scattered from storage depots hit by air strikes. By March 2002, mine action had returned to earlier levels. Mine action funding has increased from \$14 million in 2001, to \$66 million in 2002, to \$75 million in 2003.

The Northern Alliance used landmines throughout the period since 1999. The Taliban, which had declared a ban on mines in 1998, began using them again in 2001, and continued up to the present. Coalition forces are not known to have used mines.

The estimated number of new mine casualties has declined from 150 to 300 people a month in 2000 to 100 people a month in 2004. Since 1999, mine/UXO casualties have been reported in 33 of the 34 provinces in Afghanistan. As of July 2004, UNMACA had collected data on 13,874 mine/UXO casualties since 1988, but stressed that this was not a comprehensive figure. The ICRC recorded 7,197 new mine/UXO casualties between 1999 and June 2004. In 2002, the Transitional Islamic Government of Afghanistan approved the establishment of a National Disability Commission. Since 1999, the ICRC opened two new orthopedic centers; and several local and international NGOs have opened or expanded programs that assist mine survivors and other persons with disabilities.

#### *Albania*

Albania ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 29 February 2000, and became a State Party on 1 August 2000. Specific legislation to implement the treaty has yet to be adopted. Albania's stockpile of 1,683,860 antipersonnel mines was destroyed by 4 April 2002, well in advance of the treaty deadline of 1 August 2004. Albania has opted not to retain any antipersonnel mines for training purposes. The northeast of the country was heavily contaminated with landmines and unexploded ordnance from the Kosovo crisis in 1999. The Albanian Mine Action Committee and the Albanian Mine Action Executive were formed in October 1999, and strengthened in subsequent years with assistance from UNDP. A national mine action strategy was produced in June 2002 with the goal of freeing Albania from the effect of mines and UXO

by 2005. A new mine action plan was announced in June 2004, which postponed the deadline for clearance of medium and high priority areas from December 2005 to December 2006, and clearance of low impact areas from December 2006 to December 2008. From 2000 to 2003, some \$10.4 million was donated to mine action in Albania. The amount of financial assistance has been steadily increasing each year. From 2000 to 2003, a total of 10.1 million square meters of land was cleared or reduced through survey. From 1999 to July 2004, the AMAE database records 269 mine/UXO casualties in northeast Albania.

#### *Algeria*

Algeria ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 9 October 2001 and it entered into force on 1 April 2002. Algeria issued a presidential decree in May 2002 to establish an interministerial committee to oversee implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, but it still did not exist as of mid-2004. Algeria submitted its initial Article 7 report, due September 2002, on 1 May 2003, for the first time declaring a stockpile of 165,080 antipersonnel mines. Algeria intends to retain 15,030 mines, one of the highest totals for any State Party. Algeria has served as co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance since September 2003. Algeria has accused “terrorists” of continuing to use improvised mines.

#### *Andorra*

Andorra became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. It has submitted only one Article 7 transparency report. Andorra declares that it has never possessed antipersonnel mines and is not mine-affected.

#### *Angola*

Angola signed the Mine Ban Treaty on 4 December 1997, but continued to use landmines until the peace agreement signed with UNITA forces in April 2002. Angola ratified the treaty on 5 July 2002, and it entered into force on 1 January 2003. In 2001, the government created the Inter-Sectoral Commission on Demining and Humanitarian Assistance (CNIDAH) to be responsible for policy-making, coordination of mine action and victim assistance, and the design of a new National Mine Action Plan. Trouble-plagued INAROOE, the national demining institution, was restructured in 2003, and renamed the National Institute for Demining (INAD). A Landmine Impact Survey started in December 2002 was ongoing as of September 2004. Landmine Monitor estimates that more than 20 million square meters of land were cleared from 1999-2003. Up to 20 different agencies have conducted mine risk education in Angola since 1999. From 1999 to 2003, 2.35 million people reportedly took part in MRE activities. From 1999 to 2003, there were at least 2,912 new mine/UXO casualties reported in Angola. In 2001, the Ministry of Health launched the National Program for Physical and Sensorial Rehabilitation 2001-2005.

#### *Antigua and Barbuda*

Antigua and Barbuda became a State Party on 1 November 1999.

### *Argentina*

Argentina ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 21 July 1999 and it entered into force on 1 March 2000. Argentina has not enacted domestic implementation legislation. Argentina completed destruction of its stockpile of more than 90,000 antipersonnel mines on 4 December 2003. Argentina reported in July 2002 that it would retain 13,025 mines; the number was decreased to 1,000 in 2002 with the decision to make 12,025 of them inert “exercise mines.” In 2004 the number was adjusted again to 1,772 mines retained. Argentina co-hosted a regional seminar on stockpile destruction in November 2000. In 2000, a Working Group composed of representatives of the Ministry of Defense and the armed forces was created to oversee Mine Ban Treaty implementation, and an Office for Humanitarian Demining was established.

### *Australia*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Australia on 1 July 1999. Australia has spent A\$96.6 million (US\$60 million) on mine action over the past nine years, and is poised to exceed its ten-year commitment of A\$100 million next year. Australia destroyed its stockpile of 128,161 antipersonnel mines in five days in September/October 1999, and another 6,460 previously unrecorded mines in October/November 2000. In May 2001, Australia reported that it had decided to reduce the number of antipersonnel mines retained for training purposes from a total of 10,000 to 7,845; by the end of 2003, Australia had consumed 380 of those mines.

Australia has been a very active participant in the Mine Ban Treaty intersessional work program. Australia served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2000 to September 2002, and of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance from September 2002 to December 2004. Australia’s Ambassador was President of the Review Conference of the CCW in 2001. Since 2000, the Australian government and the Australian Network of the ICBL have had a collaborative program to encourage universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty in the Southeast Asia region. The last two Australian landmine casualties occurred in 2002 in Afghanistan.

### *Austria*

Austria became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. It completed stockpile destruction and adopted national legislation prohibiting antipersonnel mines prior to entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty. Since 1999, Austria has continuously played a key role in the Mine Ban Treaty intersessional work program and in promoting universalization and full implementation of the treaty. It developed the reporting format for Article 7 reports. It served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from September 2001 to September 2003. In September 2003, Ambassador Petritsch of Austria was designated as the President of the First Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty. Austria decided not to retain any antipersonnel mines for training and development. From 1999 to 2003, Austria provided about \$6.67 million in mine action funding.

### *Bahamas*

The Bahamas became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

### *Bangladesh*

Bangladesh became the first South Asian country to ratify the Mine Ban Treaty on 6 September 2000, and it entered into force on 1 March 2001. Bangladesh established a National Committee on implementation of the treaty in August 2001. In its first Article 7 report, submitted one year late in August 2002, Bangladesh for the first time reported a stockpile of 204,227 antipersonnel mines. It plans to keep 15,000 mines for training, the fourth highest total of all States Parties. Bangladesh became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction in September 2003. Bangladesh soldiers have been engaged in mine clearance in Kuwait and with the UN Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia. In 2001, the Parliament adopted Bangladesh's first comprehensive disability legislation. Since 1993, 64 people have been killed and 131 injured in reported landmine incidents. No new mine casualties have been reported since 2001.

### *Barbados*

Barbados became a State Party on 1 July 1999.

### *Belarus*

Belarus acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 3 September 2003 and the treaty entered into force on 1 March 2004. Even as a non-signatory, Belarus attended every annual Meeting of States Parties and intersessional meeting since September 2000. It has participated in numerous regional landmine meetings, and hosted landmine workshops in Minsk in March 2000 and December 2003. In January 2003, Belarus extended its export moratorium (in place since 1995) for five years. On 28 July 2003, Belarus completed the domestic steps necessary to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty with the approval of Presidential Decree 330. Belarus has destroyed some 300,000 antipersonnel mines since 1992. On 7 July 2004, Belarus and NAMSA signed a Memorandum of Understanding on stockpile destruction. In 2000, the UN Mine Action Service conducted an assessment of mine and UXO contamination in Belarus. From 1999-2003, Belarus cleared 4,732 mines and 46,227 UXO.

### *Belgium*

Belgium was the first country to adopt a national prohibition on antipersonnel mines in 1995, and it became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. National implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty in Belgium was achieved by amending the 1995 legislation in 1999. Stockpile destruction was completed in September 1997, before entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty; an estimated 440,000 antipersonnel mines were destroyed. From 1999 to 2003, Belgium provided an estimated \$17 million in mine action funding, plus another \$5.6 million for research projects. This includes about \$3.29 million in funding for victim assistance.

Belgium has played a leadership role in the Mine Ban Treaty work program and in promoting universalization and full implementation of the treaty. Belgium served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from May 1999 to September 2001. It served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance from September 2001 to September 2003. Belgian Ambassador Jean Lint served as President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002 and chair of the Coordinating Committee until

September 2003; he carried out extensive preparations for the first Review Conference in 2004. Belgium initiated and has coordinated the Article 7 Contact Group. In 2001–2002, Belgium chaired the donors' Mine Action Support Group. No mine or UXO casualties have been reported in Belgium since 2000, when one person was killed and five others were injured by UXO.

#### *Belize*

Belize became a State Party on 1 March 1999. Belize did not submit required annual Article 7 reports from 2000–2003. Belize has formally declared that it is not mine-affected and that it has no stocks of antipersonnel mines. Belize's national implementation legislation was published in the National Gazette on 10 January 2004.

#### *Benin*

Benin became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. In 2002, it created a national commission to oversee implementation of the treaty. It has not adopted national legal measures to implement the treaty. On 25 April 2002, it opened a regional demining training center, built with the assistance of France, for ECOWAS member states. In 2003, the center carried out five demining training courses for 80 military from 16 West African countries.

#### *Bolivia*

Bolivia became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. Bolivia submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in November 1999, but has not issued any of the required annual updated reports. Bolivia has not enacted any legal implementation measures, as required by Article 9. In March 2001, Bolivia provided detailed information to Landmine Monitor on Chilean minefields near its border. In 2003, there were numerous incidents involving the use of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs).

#### *Bosnia And Herzegovina*

Bosnia and Herzegovina became a State Party on 1 March 1999. National legislation to implement the treaty has been delayed by political changes. BiH announced completion of destruction of its stockpile of 460,727 antipersonnel mines in November 1999. However, in 2003 SFOR found several hundred thousand antipersonnel mines among old munitions at military storage sites. Occasional use of antipersonnel mines has occurred in criminal or terrorist activities, and illegal stores of mines and other weaponry continue to be discovered. From 1998, when "Operation Harvest" began, through February 2004, 32,907 antipersonnel mines and large quantities of other munitions have been collected and destroyed by the SFOR.

BHMAC reported that from 1996, when official mine clearance started, through 2003, 45 square kilometers of land were cleared, including 32 square kilometers since 1999. From 1998 to 2003, general survey was conducted on 365 square kilometers of land. A national Landmine Impact Survey was carried out from October 2002 to December 2003. The mine incident rate has fallen from an average of 52 casualties per month in 1996, to eight per month in 1999, to 4.5 per month in 2003, to three per month in the first half of 2004. Since 1999, 435 new mine/UXO casualties were recorded.

### *Botswana*

Botswana ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 2000 and became a State Party on 1 September 2000. It has not adopted national legal measures to implement the treaty. Botswana submitted an initial Article 7 report on 28 September 2001, but has not provided required annual updates since then.

### *Brazil*

Brazil ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 30 April 1999 and it entered into force on 1 October 1999. On 31 October 2001, Brazil enacted national implementation legislation, Law 10.300. Brazil completed destruction of its stockpiled mines in January 2003, ahead of the October 2003 deadline. It is retaining 16,545 antipersonnel mines for training, the highest number of any State Party. Brazil has made important interpretive statements on antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes and antihandling devices, joint military operations with non-States Parties, and foreign stockpiling and transit of antipersonnel mines. Brazil has participated in international humanitarian mine action efforts on a bilateral and multilateral basis; 60 percent of military officers serving with the MARMINCA demining program in Central America between 1994 and 2003 were Brazilian.

### *Bulgaria*

Bulgaria became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. Sanctions for violations of the treaty were included in the penal code. Bulgaria completed destruction of a stockpile of 885,872 antipersonnel mines in December 2000, far in advance of the treaty deadline. Production ceased in 1998 and in April 2002, production facilities were reported to have been permanently decommissioned. Bulgaria originally intended to retain 10,446 antipersonnel mines, but later reduced this to 4,000. Bulgaria reported having one type of antivehicle mine capable of having an antihandling device and in February 2003, stated that production had been discontinued and that existing stocks were being destroyed. Bulgaria reported that there were 72 minefields on its territory, which had been laid during the Cold War. Clearance of all antipersonnel mines in mined areas was completed by 31 October 1999.

### *Burkina Faso*

Burkina Faso was the fortieth country to ratify the Mine Ban Treaty, triggering its entry into force on 1 March 1999. The country adopted national implementation legislation in 2001, including penal sanctions. In January 2004, Burkina Faso organized a regional Mine Ban Treaty meeting as part of a series of events leading up to the 2004 Nairobi Summit.

### *Burundi*

Burundi ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 22 October 2003 and the treaty entered into force for Burundi on 1 April 2004. There have been credible, though not confirmed, allegations of antipersonnel landmine use by government forces throughout the period. The government has strongly denied the charges. CNDD-FDD rebel forces have acknowledged using mines until December 2002. On 2 December 2002, the transitional government of Burundi and the CNDD-FDD signed a cease-fire agreement that prohibits all laying of mines by either party. It also contains obligations for marking and mapping of minefields, as well as mine clearance, but it did not appear that either side had begun this

process by mid-2004. Burundi has declared a stockpile of 1,200 antipersonnel mines for training purposes only, but states that CNDD-FDD stocks will now have to be considered.

### *Cambodia*

Cambodia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 28 July 1999 and it entered into force on 1 January 2000. Treaty implementation legislation took effect 28 May 1999; the new law created the National Demining Regulatory Authority to coordinate activities related to the mine problem. In September 2000, a new coordinating body, the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority, was established. Although Cambodia declared in 1999 that it had destroyed all of its 71,991 stockpiled antipersonnel mines, thousands of stockpiled mines are newly discovered and destroyed each year.

Cambodia served as co-chair of the Standing Committee of Experts on Technologies for Mine Clearance from May 1999 to September 2001, and as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies from September 2002 to December 2004. Cambodia hosted a regional seminar “Building a Co-operative Future for Mine Action in South East Asia” in March 2003.

The Cambodia Landmine Impact Survey was completed in April 2002 and revealed that nearly half of all villages are either known or suspected to be contaminated by mines or UXO. Nearly 252 million square meters of land were cleared from 1992 to 2003, and more than 146 million square meters from 1999 to 2003. The Land Use Planning Unit was established in May 1999. The Cambodian Mine Action Center faced a funding crisis that resulted in the lay-off of most CMAC employees and the temporary closure of the bulk of demining operations in October 2000. Between 1999 and 2002, about 2.1 million people attended Mine Risk Education sessions.

Since 1999, more than 28,000 prostheses were produced and fitted—the majority for mine survivors. New programs to address the socio-economic reintegration of mine survivors and their families have been implemented. However, the number of physical rehabilitation centers declined from 15 in 1999 to eleven in 2004. Between 1999 and August 2004, 5,128 new mine/UXO casualties have been recorded in Cambodia. The mine/UXO casualty rate declined from an average of 12 new casualties a day in 1996, to three a day in 1999, to two a day from 2000 through 2003. However, in the first eight months of 2004 the rate increased again to an average of almost three casualties a day.

### *Cameroon*

Cameroon ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 19 September 2002 and became a State Party on 1 March 2003. Before becoming a State Party, Cameroon submitted a voluntary Article 7 report on 14 March 2001. Cameroon destroyed 9,187 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in April 2003.

### *Canada*

Canada was the first government to sign and ratify the Mine Ban Treaty. Since the Mine Ban Treaty was opened for signature in Ottawa on 3 December 1997, Canada has played a critical leadership role in promoting universalization and effective implementation of the treaty. It has been key to the development and execution of Mine Ban Treaty structures and processes. Canada served as the first co-chair of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from May 1999 to September

2000, as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration from September 2000 to September 2002, and as co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction since September 2003. It has devoted more time and resources to bringing additional countries on board the treaty than any other State Party, including by establishing and coordinating the Universalization Contact Group. It has sponsored regional meetings to promote the Mine Ban Treaty in Afghanistan, Armenia, Croatia, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, and elsewhere. Canada has also taken the lead in facilitating discussions regarding compliance matters. It has provided assistance for stockpile destruction in numerous countries. Canada has championed the government-NGO partnership that has characterized the Ottawa Process and Mine Ban Treaty work program. Canada provided about C\$134 million (US\$90.7 million) to mine action from 1999-2003. In November 2002, the Canadian Landmine Fund was renewed with a five-year funding commitment.

#### *Cape Verde*

Cape Verde ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 14 May 2001 and it entered into force on 1 November 2001. Cape Verde has not submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due by 30 April 2002.

#### *Central African Republic*

The Central African Republic acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 8 November 2002 and became a State Party on 1 May 2003. Antivehicle landmines were reportedly used in October 2002 by opposition forces during an attempted military coup. Those opposition forces subsequently seized power in March 2003. The new government denies use of mines and has reaffirmed its adherence to the Mine Ban Treaty.

#### *Chad*

Chad became a State Party on 1 November 1999. It has no domestic implementation legislation in place. Chad destroyed its stockpile of 4,490 mines between October 2002 and January 2003, and retained none for training purposes. It destroyed another 207 newly discovered stockpiled mines in August 2003. A Landmine Impact Survey was conducted in 1999-2001. The High Committee for National Demining was created in 1998 and restructured in 2003. In June 2002, Chad developed a "National Strategic Plan to Fight Mines and UXO: 2002-2015." According to the HCND, from September 2000 to March 2004, 1,069,402 square meters of mined land and 1,890,681 square meters of battle areas were cleared, destroying 4,902 antipersonnel mines, 3,753 antivehicle mines, and 59,423 pieces of UXO. Until 2004, mine risk education was only conducted occasionally with clearance activities. Chad has no systematic casualty data collection system and has no concrete survivor assistance programs.

#### *Chile*

Chile ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 10 September 2001, becoming a State Party on 1 March 2002. Chile completed destruction of its stockpile of 299,219 antipersonnel mines in August 2003, more than two and a half years before its deadline. It revised downward the number of antipersonnel mines retained for training from 28,647 to 6,245 mines. The National Demining Commission, officially constituted on 19 August 2002, issued a National Demining Plan on 10 January 2003. Humanitarian demining

commenced in August 2004. Landmine Monitor fieldwork has produced new information on mined areas and revealed problems with inadequate fencing and warning signs in some areas. Since 1999, there have been at least 13 new mine/UXO casualties in Chile.

### *Colombia*

Colombia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 6 September 2000, becoming a State Party on 1 March 2001. National implementation legislation, Law 759, came into effect on 25 July 2002. In November 1999, Colombia's antipersonnel mine production facilities were destroyed. Colombia began destroying its stockpile of 20,312 landmines in June 2003. Colombia served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socioeconomic Reintegration from September 2001 to September 2003. On 8 October 2001, the government established a commission (CINAMA) to coordinate mine action and oversee implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. The government's Antipersonnel Mine Observatory became operational in 2001. A National Mine Action Plan was approved on 27 February 2003. In March 2003, Colombia and the Organization of American States signed an Agreement on Cooperation and Technical Assistance for mine action. There is no systematic humanitarian demining underway, but mine risk education activities have expanded. Guerrilla groups, most notably the FARC, have used antipersonnel mines throughout the period; the government reports significant increases in use in 2003 and 2004. The number of mine-affected municipalities increased from 125 in 1999 to 422 in 2003. Between 1999 and 2003, the Observatory registered 1,753 new mine casualties. The number of reported new casualties has increased significantly since 1999, with 235 percent more casualties reported in 2002 than 2001.

### *Comoros*

Comoros acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 19 September 2002, and became a State Party on 1 March 2003. It reports that it is not mine-affected, and that it has never produced, transferred, or used antipersonnel mines, and has no stockpile of the weapon, including for training.

### *Democratic Republic Of Congo*

There was widespread use of antipersonnel mines until 2001. DRC government forces and rebel RCD forces have acknowledged past use of antipersonnel mines, and Landmine Monitor has cited credible allegations of use of antipersonnel mines in the DRC by the forces of the governments of Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, as well as at least seven rebel groups. Smaller-scale use has continued by rebel groups in 2002, 2003 and 2004. Landmine Monitor has not received any allegations of mine use by government forces in the past three years.

The DRC acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 2 May 2002. A National Commission to Fight Antipersonnel Mines was created on 6 May 2002. A domestic implementation law has been drafted. As of mid-2004, there was no stockpile destruction plan, no national mine action plan, and no mine risk education plan.

The UN Mine Action Coordination Center was established in February 2002. It has registered 366 dangerous areas. In 2002 and 2003, Handicap International reported destroying 1,660 antipersonnel mines and 119 antivehicle mines from rebel stockpiles. HI conducted a series of landmine impact surveys in

various parts of the country in 2002 and 2003. Between 1999 and 2003, about 106,000 people attended mine risk education sessions. In 2002, UNMACC began collecting data on mine/UXO casualties for entry into an IMSMA database. UNMACC has recorded 780 new mine/UXO casualties since 1999. In 2002, HI started a three-year project to strengthen the capacity of the Rehabilitation Center for the Physically Handicapped (CRHP) and improve the quality of treatment.

#### *Republic Of Congo*

The Republic of Congo acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 4 May 2001 and became a State Party on 1 November 2001. Implementation legislation was reportedly drafted in 2002, but is still not in place. In September 2003, the Republic of Congo destroyed its stockpile of 5,136 antipersonnel mines, retaining 372 for training purposes. It hosted a workshop on implementation of the treaty and mine action in Brazzaville in May 2003.

#### *Costa Rica*

Costa Rica ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 17 March 1999 and it entered into force on 1 September 1999. Costa Rica was declared mine-free on 10 December 2002, nearly seven years prior to its treaty deadline. Costa Rican deminers destroyed a total of 341 landmines and UXO and cleared 131,903 square meters of land between 1996 and December 2002, according to the IADB. National implementation legislation, "Prohibition of Antipersonnel Mines," took effect on 17 April 2002. Costa Rica submitted its initial Article 7 report in September 2001, more than one and a half years late, and has not submitted annual updates in 2003 or 2004. The initial report confirmed that Costa Rica has no stockpile of antipersonnel mines.

#### *Côte D'ivoire*

Côte d'Ivoire ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 30 June 2000, and became a State Party on 1 December 2000. It submitted its initial Article 7 report three years late on 27 May 2004. It has not enacted national legal measures to implement the treaty. In August 2001, Côte d'Ivoire hosted a national seminar on the Mine Ban Treaty and the ECOWAS moratorium on small arms.

#### *Croatia*

Croatia became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty in March 1999. Croatia has played an active role in the global effort to ban antipersonnel mines for many years, hosting regional landmine conferences in Zagreb in June 1999 and Dubrovnik in October 2002. Croatia completed destruction of its stockpile of almost 200,000 antipersonnel mines in October 2002, well in advance of the treaty deadline of 1 March 2003. Stockpile destruction has included 20,000 mines collected from civilians under the "Farewell to Arms" program. Initially, Croatia announced that it would retain 17,500 antipersonnel mines, but in December 2000 reduced this to approximately 7,000. Croatia served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2000 to September 2002. It has served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration from September 2002 until December 2004. National legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty, in preparation since late 2000, has still not been adopted, although penal sanctions for

violations already exist in Croatian law. Antipersonnel mines have occasionally been used in criminal activities in Croatia. Croatia became a party to CCW Amended Protocol II in October 2002.

Since 1999, approximately 444 square kilometers of mine-affected and mine-suspected land has been released to the community through survey reduction (about 70 percent) and clearance (about 30 percent). Since 1999, approximately \$160 million has been expended on mine action by CROMAC. CROMAC recorded 160 new mine/UXO casualties between 1999 and July 2004. In October 2001, the Croatian Mine Victims Association was established.

### *Cyprus*

Cyprus ratified the Mine Ban Treaty in January 2003 and became a State Party on 1 July 2003. In 2002, the National Guard completed the clearance of two minefields outside the buffer zone, in the area of Pyla, totaling 36,000 square meters. It was reported in 2003 that in the last two years, the National Guard had destroyed 11,000 mines of various types in minefields. In June 2002, the UN Mine Action Service carried out an assessment of the mine situation in Cyprus.

### *Czech Republic*

The Czech Republic ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 26 October 1999 and became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 April 2000. National implementation legislation entered into force on 3 December 1999 and the criminal code was amended to provide penal sanctions for treaty violations. Destruction of the stockpile of 324,412 mines was completed on 15 June 2001, far in advance of the treaty deadline of 1 April 2004. Clearance of the former military area at Ralsko was completed in March 2004, and of the Mlada area in June 2000. In May 2003 and May 2001, Czech PD-Mi-PK antivehicle mines in tripwire-activation mode were offered for sale at an international arms fair, in possible violation of the Mine Ban Treaty. The Czech Republic stockpiles antivehicle mines with tilt rod fuzes, which the ICBL believes are prohibited by the Mine Ban Treaty.

### *Denmark*

Denmark became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. No additional legal or administrative measures were deemed necessary for national implementation of the treaty beyond ratification. Stockpile destruction of 266,517 mines was completed in December 1999, well in advance of the treaty deadline of 1 March 2003. At the end of 2003, Denmark retained 2,058 antipersonnel mines for training purposes, less than half the amount originally planned. From 1999 to 2003, Denmark provided more than DKK338 million (about \$57 million) in mine action funding. Mine action funding dropped 34 percent from 2001 to 2003.

### *Djibouti*

Djibouti became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It declared itself "mine-safe" on 29 January 2004, after a total of 40,081 square meters of land had been cleared. The Djibouti Mine Action Center, a unit of the Djiboutian military, was inaugurated in February 2001. Djibouti submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in January 2003, nearly three and one-half years late. Djibouti destroyed its stockpile of 1,118 antipersonnel mines on 2 March 2003, one day after its treaty-mandated deadline, keeping 2,996

mines for training purposes. In March 2004, Djibouti stated that it has drafted domestic implementation legislation. Djibouti has been active regionally, and hosted landmine meetings in November 2000 and February 2004, but has not attended any of the Meetings of States Parties, and few of the intersessional meetings.

#### *Dominica*

Dominica became a State Party on 1 September 1999.

#### *Dominican Republic*

The Dominican Republic became a State Party on 1 December 2000.

#### *Ecuador*

Ecuador ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 29 April 1999 and became a State Party on 1 October 1999. Ecuador has not yet enacted national implementation legislation. It completed the destruction of its stockpile of 258,844 antipersonnel mines in January 2002, far in advance of the 1 October 2003 deadline. The number of mines retained for training purposes has been revised downwards from 16,000 to 4,000, and then to 2,000. In September 1999, Ecuador established a National Demining Center. In 2001, Ecuador and the Organization of American States signed a Framework Agreement for an Integrated Mine Action Program in Ecuador. A National Mine Clearance Plan for 2003-2004 was approved on 17 December 2002. Impact surveys and technical studies have been carried out since 2002 in a number of provinces. At the end of 2003, a total of 83,790 square meters of land had been cleared, destroying 4,342 antipersonnel mines and 59 antivehicle mines. Ecuador's reporting on mined areas laid from 1995-1998 indicates that the country used antipersonnel mines after signing the Mine Ban Treaty in 1997.

#### *El Salvador*

El Salvador ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 27 January 1999 and the treaty entered into force on 1 July 1999. El Salvador has not enacted national legislative measures to implement the treaty. El Salvador submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due on 27 December 1999, on 31 August 2001. On 20 February 2003, El Salvador completed destruction of its stockpiled antipersonnel mines, ahead of its treaty-mandated deadline of 1 July 2003. In November 2001, an interagency committee on the Mine Ban Treaty was established, with responsibility for liaising with national and international organizations on demining and mine survivor rehabilitation. Although El Salvador has declared itself mine-free, during field research in September 2002, the International Demining Group identified 33 sites suspected of being affected by unexploded ordnance.

#### *Equatorial Guinea*

Equatorial Guinea became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It has not enacted national implementation measures. It has not submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due on 28 August 1999. It has not officially informed States Parties if it has complied with its obligation to have destroyed any stockpiled mines by 1 March 2003.

### *Eritrea*

Eritrea acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 27 August 2001 and it entered into force on 1 February 2002. It has not enacted implementing legislation. Eritrea submitted its initial Article 7 report in September 2003 and declared it has no stockpiled landmines. During the 1998–2000 border conflict, Eritrean forces laid an estimated 240,000 mines, and Ethiopian forces laid an estimated 150,000 to 200,000 mines.

The United Nations Mission on Eritrea and Ethiopia Mine Action Coordination Center was established in August 2000, following the cessation of hostilities. It supported the development of the Eritrean Mine Action Program, as the coordinating body to oversee mine action, and the creation of a national demining NGO. Mine clearance and mine risk education activities increased greatly. In July 2002, the government unexpectedly re-structured mine action in Eritrea, replacing EMAP with the Eritrean Demining Authority, creating Eritrean Demining Operations as the national demining implementing agency, and expelling most international mine action groups. This resulted in a temporary cessation of mine action activities.

A national Landmine Impact Survey began in May 2002, and fieldwork was completed in June 2004. United Nations demining support for the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission began in late 2002. The EDO began demining operations in December 2003. From 2001 to 28 September 2004, UNMEE MACC coordinated the clearance of 47 million square meters of land and 3,946 kilometers of roads, including the destruction of 7,225 mines and 54,620 pieces of unexploded ordnance in the TSZ and adjacent areas.

In April 2003, the Ministry of Labor and Human Welfare endorsed the victim assistance strategic plan for 2002–2006. As of 28 September 2004, UNMEE MAC had recorded 257 mine incidents resulting in 402 casualties (111 people killed and 291 injured) since 2000.

### *Estonia*

Estonia acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 12 May 2004. Estonia has stated on several occasions that it has not produced or exported antipersonnel mines and that it does not possess significant quantities in stockpiles. Export and transit of antipersonnel mines have been banned since 1999. The Estonian Rescue Board estimates that hundreds of thousands of landmines and items of UXO remain in Estonia from the World Wars I and II. From 1999 to 2003, a total of 10,494 items of unexploded ordnance have been found and destroyed in Estonia. Mine/UXO risk education is a compulsory part of the school curriculum. Estonian EOD teams were in Afghanistan from July 2002 to December 2003. From 1999 to 2003, 77 mine and UXO casualties were reported in Estonia.

### *Fiji*

Fiji became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

### *France*

France became a State Party on 1 March 1999. National implementing legislation, which includes penal sanctions, was previously enacted on 8 July 1998. France completed destruction of its stockpile of 1.4 million antipersonnel mines on 20 December 1999. In January 1999, France created the position of Ambassador for Mine Action, and CNEMA, the National Commission for the Elimination of

Antipersonnel Mines, became operational in June 1999. France has played a prominent role in promoting universalization and implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, with a special focus on compliance issues. It has been actively involved in the intersessional process. From May 1999 to September 2000, it was co-chair of the Standing Committee on Technologies for Mine Clearance. It served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration from September 2001 to September 2003. It has promoted multilingualism in the intersessional process. France has been prominent among the States Parties opposed to the effort to reach a common understanding on Article 2 and antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes. From 1999 to 2002, France provided about \$10.9 million in mine action funding, excluding expenditures on research and development. This total included about \$650,000 in funding for mine victim assistance.

#### *Gabon*

Gabon ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 8 September 2000 and became a State Party on 1 March 2001. Gabon reported that it destroyed its stockpile of 1,082 antipersonnel mines before the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for the country. Gabon submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report more than one year late in September 2002, and has not provided required annual updates in 2003 and 2004.

#### *The Gambia*

The Gambia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 September 2002 and the treaty entered into force for the country on 1 March 2003. Although the Gambia submitted a voluntary Article 7 report in August 2002, it has not submitted its initial transparency report since becoming a State Party, due 27 August 2003.

#### *Germany*

Germany became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. Prior to that, Germany completed destruction of its stockpile of 1.7 million antipersonnel mines by December 1997, and enacted national legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty in July 1998. Germany served as co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Mine Action Technologies from May 1999 to September 2000, as co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education, and Related Technologies from September 2000 to September 2001, and co-chair of that committee from September 2001 to September 2002. Germany has been prominent among the States Parties opposed to the effort to reach a common understanding on Article 2 and antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes; yet, in June 2003 Germany stated that tripwires, breakwires and tilt rods cannot be recommended as methods of detonation for antivehicle mines. The US has more than 112,000 antipersonnel mines stockpiled in Germany, which Germany has declared are not under its jurisdiction or control. From 1999 to 2003, Germany provided governmental funding for mine action of approximately \$80 million, including nearly \$10 million in support for victim assistance.

### *Ghana*

Ghana ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 30 June 2000 and became a State Party on 1 December 2000. It submitted its initial Article 7 report more than one year late in July 2002, and declared that it is not mine-affected and has no stockpile of mines, even for training.

### *Greece*

Greece ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 25 September 2003, the same day as Turkey in accordance with an April 2001 agreement between the two countries. From 2000–2002, Greece cleared 3.7 million square meters of mined land. Greece completed clearance of its border with Bulgaria in December 2001. Greece intends to maintain defensive minefields on the border with Turkey, so it is removing antipersonnel mines from the existing mixed minefields, and replacing them with antivehicle mines. In 1999–2003, Greece provided more than \$7.3 million in mine action funding. Since 1999, at least 67 foreign nationals have been killed or injured by landmines in Greece. In 2003, 12 new landmine casualties (ten killed and two injured) were reported.

### *Grenada*

Grenada became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

### *Guatemala*

Guatemala ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 26 March 1999 and it entered into force on 1 September 1999. A domestic ban had already been enacted in 1997, and Guatemala declared it never stockpiled antipersonnel mines. Guatemala submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due by 27 February 2000, on 2 March 2001. Guatemala served as co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2002 to September 2003 and as co-chair since then. Clearance operations were reported completed in the departments of Quetzaltenango, Retalhuleu and Totonicapán in October 2003, in the San Marcos department in December 2002, in El Quiché department in June 2001, and in Ixcán in January 2000. Between 1998 and March 2004, a total of 4,011 mines and UXO were cleared and destroyed. From 2000–2003, mine risk education was provided to more than 300,800 people.

### *Guinea*

Guinea became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 April 1999. Guinea failed to meet its stockpile destruction deadline of 1 April 2003, destroying its 3,174 antipersonnel mines from September–November 2003. Guinea submitted its initial Article 7 report nearly five years late.

### *Guinea-Bissau*

Guinea-Bissau ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 22 May 2001 and it entered into force on 1 November 2001. From June 2000 to July 2004, some 720,000 square meters of land were cleared of 2,527 antipersonnel mines, 60 antivehicle mines and 28,000 UXO. Mine risk education has been provided to some 24,000 people outside the capital and 55,000 in Bissau. The National Mine Action Coordination Center (CAAMI) was established in March 2001, and the National Commission for Humanitarian Demining in September 2001. A National Mine Action Plan 2001/2004 (PAAMI) was developed. The

Education Program to Prevent Accidents involving Mines (PEPAM) was established in November 2000 to provide mine risk education and victim assistance. The NGO HUMAID began mine clearance in June 2000 and a second NGO, LUTCAM, began demining in February 2003. Guinea-Bissau destroyed 4,711 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in February 1998, and another 1,000 in September 2002, leaving nearly 4,000 to be destroyed before November 2005. A countrywide survey on mine/UXO casualties was launched in 2002, and has identified 665 mine/UXO survivors as of July 2004.

#### *Guyana*

Guyana ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 5 August 2003 and it entered into force on 1 February 2004. Guyana attended its first Meeting of States Parties in September 2003 and its first intersessional meetings in June 2004.

#### *Holy See*

The Holy See became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999.

#### *Honduras*

Honduras became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. National implementation legislation took effect on 29 June 2000. On 2 November 2000, Honduras destroyed its stockpile of 7,441 antipersonnel mines, except for 826 mines retained for training purposes. Honduras served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration from September 2000 to September 2002. Honduras completed mine clearance throughout the country in June 2004. Honduras reported that a total of approximately 447,000 square meters of affected land had been cleared since 1995. An estimated 65,000 Honduran families have benefited from the mine clearance program, which has returned some 1,500 square kilometers to agricultural productivity.

#### *Hungary*

Hungary became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. Previously, national legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force on 7 March 1998. In June 1999, Hungary completed destruction of its antipersonnel mine stockpile. Hungary has withdrawn from service its 400,000 UKA-63 antivehicle mines, which have tilt-rod fuzes allowing them to function like an antipersonnel mine. By the end of 2003, 40,000 had been destroyed. Hungary served as co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from May 1999 to September 2000.

#### *Iceland*

Iceland ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 5 May 1999 and became a State Party on 1 November 1999. National implementation legislation was enacted on 7 May 2001. Iceland has never produced, stockpiled or used antipersonnel mines, and is not mine-affected. Iceland has provided funding and other assistance for mine survivors in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

*Ireland*

Ireland became a State Party in March 1999. Ireland has taken national measures to implement the treaty, but has not adopted penal sanctions for treaty violations in military operations. From 1999 to 2003, Ireland provided about \$8.5 million in mine action funding; this included about \$2.1 million in funding for mine victim assistance.

*Italy*

Italy became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 October 1999. Parliament had already approved a national law banning antipersonnel mines in October 1997. Italy possessed a stockpile of 7.1 million antipersonnel mines, substantially larger than any other EU member. The destruction program began in February 1999 and was completed in November 2002. Italy served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2002 to December 2004. Italian funding of mine action from 1999–2003 totaled about €27.1 million (\$26.3 million); of this, victim assistance projects received about \$4.5 million. Italy established a Trust Fund for Humanitarian Demining in 2001.

*Jamaica*

Jamaica became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

*Japan*

Japan became a State Party on 1 March 1999. Japan exceeded its five-year mine action funding pledge, contributing ¥10.48 billion (US\$92.6 million) from 1998–2002. In February 2003, Japan completed destruction of 985,089 stockpiled antipersonnel mines. It decided to retain 15,000 antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes, one of the highest number of mines retained by any State Party. Between 1999 and the end of 2003, Japan consumed 6,641 of these mines. Japan served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance from May 1999 to September 2001, and of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance from September 2002 to December 2004. Japan has been prominent among the States Parties opposed to the efforts to reach common understandings on Articles 1, 2, and 3.

*Jordan*

Jordan became a State Party on 1 May 1999. Jordan began destruction of its stockpile of 92,342 antipersonnel mines in September 1999 and concluded in April 2003. A National Demining and Rehabilitation Committee was established by royal decree in 2000. Between 1993 and June 2004, demining operations cleared 11.81 million square meters of land, destroying 59,461 antipersonnel mines and 42,099 antivehicle mines from 183 minefields. Deminers from the Royal Engineering Corps deployed to Afghanistan in December 2002. Since 1999, there have been at least 57 new mine/UXO casualties in Jordan. As of June 2004, there had been at least 529 mine casualties in Jordan. The Landmine Survivors Network started a program in Jordan in April 1999.

*Kenya*

Kenya ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 January 2001 and the treaty entered into force on 1 July 2001. Kenya submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report on 27 December 2001. Kenya served as

co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies from September 2001 to September 2003. Kenya completed destruction of its stockpile of antipersonnel mines in August 2003, well in advance of its deadline. It has drafted national implementation legislation. Kenya has been active regionally on the landmine issue. In response to demands from the local population, the Kenyan military in 2002 began some risk education in areas contaminated with unexploded ordnance. The British Army and Kenyan military carried out joint UXO clearance operations in 2001 and 2002. Kenya will host the First Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty in November/December 2004.

#### *Kiribati*

Kiribati acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 7 September 2000 and became a State Party on 1 March 2001.

#### *Lesotho*

Lesotho became a State Party on 1 June 1999. It has declared that it is not mine-affected and has no stock of antipersonnel mines. It has not submitted required annual updated Article 7 reports, including in 2004.

#### *Liberia*

Liberia acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 December 1999 and it entered into force on 1 June 2000. Liberia has not adopted national measures to implement the treaty, as required by Article 9, nor has it submitted annual transparency reports, as required by Article 7. Liberia's deadline under Article 4 for destruction of all stockpiled mines was 1 June 2004, but Liberia has not formally notified States Parties of its compliance with this requirement. It appears that antipersonnel mines were not used in Liberia's second civil war (1999-August 2003). No systematic humanitarian mine clearance or mine risk education has been carried out in Liberia. Landmine Monitor has identified no reports of landmine casualties in Liberia since 2000.

#### *Liechtenstein*

Liechtenstein ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 5 October 1999 and became a State Party to on 1 April 2000. National implementation legislation was passed by Parliament on 9 September 1999. Liechtenstein declares that it has never produced, stockpiled or used antipersonnel mines, and is not mine-affected. Liechtenstein has reported that its contributions to mine action from 1996-2001 totaled more than \$250,000.

#### *Lithuania*

Lithuania ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 12 May 2003 and became a State Party on 1 November 2003. It completed stockpile destruction in June 2004, after initially indicating it would retain all of its stocks for training purposes. In 2002, Lithuania voluntarily submitted an Article 7 transparency report. Since 1992, 181,000 items of UXO have been destroyed. Planned clearance of UXO-contaminated areas started in 2002, and on average, 250,000 square meters have been checked and cleared each year.

### *Luxembourg*

Luxembourg ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 14 June 1999 and became a State Party on 1 December 1999. National legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force on 1 December 1999. Prior to ratification, Luxembourg destroyed its stockpile of 9,600 antipersonnel mines from April 1996 to August 1997. From 1999 to 2003, Luxembourg provided more than \$3.8 million in mine action funding, including more than \$750,000 in funding for mine victim assistance. Another \$2.2 million has been donated to Handicap International Luxembourg for projects that include assistance to mine victims.

### *Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic Of)*

FYR Macedonia became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999. The government has stated that actions in violation of the treaty are covered by existing criminal law. Stockpile destruction was completed on 20 February 2003, just before the treaty deadline. A total of 38,921 antipersonnel mines were destroyed. FYR Macedonia has decided to retain 4,000 mines, instead of the 50 it originally declared. Ethnic Albanian insurgents used mines in the 2001 conflict in the region bordering Kosovo. Article 7 reports submitted by FYR Macedonia have provided no data on the location of mined areas or on mine clearance programs. The United Nations established a Mine Action Office in September 2001. The UN originally planned to complete mine/UXO clearance in all affected areas in 2002, but clearance operations continued in 2004. From September 2001 through December 2003, approximately 6.7 million square meters of suspected mine/UXO-affected land in northwest FYR Macedonia were cleared. From January 2001 to December 2002, 42 mine/UXO casualties were recorded in the UNMAO database, of whom 15 were killed. The majority of reported incidents are attributed to antivehicle mines.

### *Madagascar*

Madagascar ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 16 September 1999 and became a State Party on 1 March 2000. It submitted its initial Article 7 report, due by 28 August 2000, on 20 June 2001, and has not provided required annual updates since. It declared that it does not have a stockpile of antipersonnel mines.

### *Malawi*

Malawi became a State Party on 1 March 1999. Malawi has not enacted legal measures to implement the treaty, but stated in 2004 that national legislation is under consideration. Malawi submitted its initial Article 7 Report, due on 28 August 1999, on 9 April 2003. It stated that Malawi has no stockpile of live antipersonnel mines, even for training purposes. It acknowledged suspected mined areas along the border with Mozambique. Malawi states it has the capacity but not the resources to conduct mine clearance. Limited mine risk education has been carried out in affected parts of the country. From 1986 to 2003, landmines killed at least 41 people and injured around 1,000 others.

### *Malaysia*

Malaysia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 22 April 1999 and the treaty entered into force on 1 October 1999. Malaysia's domestic mine ban legislation, the Anti-Personnel Mines Convention Implementation Act (Act 603), took effect on 25 June 2000. Malaysia destroyed its stockpile of 94,721

antipersonnel mines from 15-23 January 2001, and has chosen not to retain any mines for training purposes. Malaysia has been very active in promoting universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, especially in Southeast Asia. It served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from May 1999 to September 2001. Malaysia hosted a regional seminar on stockpile destruction in August 2001. In 2004, Malaysia is serving as one of the “Friends of the President” for the President-designate of the First Review Conference. The Malaysian Armed Forces have conducted a number of surveys since 2001 and found no mines in formerly affected areas on the Thai border.

#### *Maldives*

Maldives ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 7 September 2000 and became a State Party on 1 March 2001. Maldives has not reported the adoption of any national implementation measures.

#### *Mali*

Mali became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It destroyed its stockpiled antipersonnel mines in 1998, even before the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force. Mali adopted national implementation measures in 2000. Mali hosted an Africa-wide regional conference on the Mine Ban Treaty in Bamako in February 2001. An inter-ministerial commission was created in June 2002 to take responsibility for the mine issue.

#### *Malta*

Malta ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 7 May 2001 and became a State Party on 1 November 2001. Malta has declared that it has never produced, stockpiled or used antipersonnel mines, and is not mine-affected. Legislation to implement the treaty in Malta was enacted on 27 April 2001. Malta joined CCW Amended Protocol II on 24 September 2004.

#### *Mauritania*

Mauritania ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 21 July 2001 and became a State Party on 1 January 2001. Domestic implementation legislation was drafted in 2001, but has not been enacted. In 2001-2002, Mauritania destroyed 16,168 stockpiled mines. Instead of keeping its remaining 5,728 mines for training, Mauritania decided to destroy all but 728. The National Humanitarian Demining Office has been operational since April 2000, but was officially created in June 2002. A National Commission in charge of the mine issue and implementation of the treaty was created in July 2002. The Mines Advisory Group carried out an assessment mission in December 2001, and UNMAS in 2002. HAMAP-Deminers conducted a survey in Nouadhibou in February-March 2003. Minefield and battle area clearance reportedly freed 1.41 million square meters of land in 1999-2000. At least ten people were killed and nine injured in reported landmine incidents since 1999. In 1999, the Federation of the Specific National Associations of Disabled People was established to represent persons with disabilities.

### *Mauritius*

Mauritius became a State Party in March 1999. It enacted domestic implementation legislation in April 2001. It submitted its initial Article 7 report in May 2002, nearly three years late. It destroyed its stockpile of 93 antipersonnel mines in November 2003.

### *México*

México became a State Party on 1 March 1999. México has played an important role in the development of the Mine Ban Treaty work program, and in promoting full and effective implementation of the treaty. México served as the first co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance from May 1999 to September 2000. It has served as co-rapporteur, then co-chair of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention since September 2002. It hosted, with Canada, the region's first seminar on antipersonnel landmines in January 1999 in México City. México, along with Canada and the Pan American Health Organization, implemented the tripartite Victim Assistance in Central America program between 1999 and 2003.

### *Moldova*

Moldova ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 8 September 2000 and it entered into force on 1 March 2001. In November 2002, Moldova completed the destruction of its stockpile of 12,892 antipersonnel mines, far ahead of the March 2005 deadline. Moldova has declared that, for the purposes of the Mine Ban Treaty, it is not mine-affected. It reports that it completed destruction of all antipersonnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control in August 2000. Between May and August 2000, 850,000 square meters of land were cleared. This followed humanitarian demining training from the US in 1999 and 2000. However, Moldova is still affected by mines and unexploded ordnance left over from World War II and from the Transdnister conflict of 1992.

### *Monaco*

Monaco became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 May 1999. Monaco has declared that it has never produced, stockpiled or used antipersonnel mines, and is not mine-affected. National legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty was passed on 30 August 1999.

### *Mozambique*

Mozambique ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 25 August 1998 and the treaty entered into force on 1 March 1999. Mozambique hosted the First Meeting of States Parties in May 1999. It served as co-chair of the first Standing Committee of Experts on Mine Clearance in 1999 and 2000. The National Demining Institute (IND) was established in 1999 to coordinate all mine action in Mozambique, succeeding a troubled National Demining Commission. In November 2001, the IND produced its first Five Year National Mine Action Plan for 2002-2006, which sets the goal of a "mine-impact free" Mozambique within ten years.

A national Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was carried out from March 2000 to August 2001. The survey identified 1,374 suspected mined areas in all ten provinces, covering an estimated 558 square kilometers, in 791 communities with a combined population of nearly 1.5 million. In April 2003, the IND

reported it had re-evaluated information from the Landmine Impact Survey and decided to reduce its estimate of mined areas by 38 percent, to 346 million square meters. In 2003, HALO Trust reported that it re-surveyed 433 of the suspected mined areas covered by the LIS in the four northern provinces and found that the LIS overestimated the landmine impact for much of northern Mozambique, but that it has failed to identify many mined areas.

According to the IND, between 1997 and 2003, a total of 35.6 million square meters of land was cleared, destroying 29,158 antipersonnel mines, 68 antivehicle mines, and 4,514 UXO. Mozambique completed destruction of its stockpile of 37,818 antipersonnel mines on 28 February 2003. It is retaining 1,470 mines for training purposes, instead of zero as it previously reported. Since 1999, 254 new landmine casualties were reported, dropping to a low of 14 in 2003, but increasing significantly to 24 in the first seven months of 2004.

#### *Namibia*

Namibia became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It has not enacted domestic implementation legislation, but reported in 2004 that it plans to do so. Namibia submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report nearly five years late, in July 2004. Namibia's treaty-mandated deadline for stockpile destruction was 1 March 1999; it did not inform States Parties that it had met this obligation (in 1998) until 2004. Angolan UNITA rebels and Angolan government troops used landmines inside Namibia, prior to the peace accords of 2002. Allegations of use by Namibian forces were not substantiated. The ICBL expressed concerns that Namibia could have been "assisting" Angolan government troops with mine use during their joint military operations, which is a treaty violation, but Namibia denied such actions.

Upon completion of its work in Namibia in February 2001, the US commercial demining firm RONCO declared Namibia free of mines, except the area of conflict on the Angola border in the Kavango Region. The US reported that ten known minefields, 410 electric pylons and more than one million square meters of land had been cleared, and more than 5,000 mines and 1,300 UXO destroyed. The ICRC and partners initiated a new mine risk education project in Namibia in 2002. Since 1999, there has been a significant decrease in the number of reported mine/UXO casualties from 140 mine/UXO casualties in 2000, to 50 casualties in 2001, 19 in 2002, and 12 in 2003.

#### *Nauru*

Nauru became a State Party on 12 February 2001. It submitted its initial transparency report on 23 July 2004, confirming that it possesses no stockpiles and is not mine-affected.

#### *The Netherlands*

The Netherlands became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 October 1999. As of April 2004, amendments to national legislation to implement the Mine Ban Treaty still were not finalized. Destruction of the stockpile of nearly 265,000 antipersonnel mines, which started in 1996, was completed by the end of 2002, well in advance of the treaty deadline. The Netherlands has played a leadership role in promoting universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. It served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance from May 1999 to September 2001, as chair of the Mine Action Support Group in 2000-2001, and as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing

Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from September 2002 to December 2004. Ambassador Sanders of the Netherlands coordinated work in the CCW that resulted in agreement in November 2003 on a new protocol on explosive remnants of war. Since 1999, the Netherlands has contributed mine action funding totaling about \$65 million, including about \$5.8 million in funding for mine victim assistance.

#### *New Zealand*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for New Zealand on 1 July 1999. New Zealand has been a highly active participant in the Mine Ban Treaty intersessional work program. It has also carried out significant international advocacy in support of the Mine Ban Treaty, particularly in promoting universalization in the Pacific region. New Zealand has taken a strong position that there is no need to retain antipersonnel mines for training purposes. New Zealand provided NZ\$8 million to mine action from 1999 to 2003, with both financial and in-kind contributions.

#### *Nicaragua*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Nicaragua on 1 May 1999. National implementation legislation was signed into law on 7 December 1999. Nicaragua destroyed its stockpile of 133,435 antipersonnel mines between April 1999 and August 2002, finishing well in advance of its treaty-mandated deadline of May 2003. Nicaragua hosted and was President of the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty in September 2001 and served as Chair of the Coordinating Committee in 2001-2002. Nicaragua served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration from May 1999 to September 2001. It assumed the role of co-rapporteur of that committee again in September 2003.

Nicaragua completed clearance of its border with Costa Rica in September 2002. In March 2003, Nicaragua reported the completion of mine clearance in the departments of Boaco, Chinandega, Chontales and Región Autónoma del Atlántico Sur. From 1990 to May 2004, a total of 3,800,928 square meters of land was cleared, destroying 107,556 mines and 555,339 UXO. Nicaragua has concluded mine clearance operations in fifty-eight municipalities, benefiting 1,979,675 inhabitants. In June 2004, Nicaragua reported that donors have contributed more than \$30 million to the national demining plan, as well as significant in-kind support. The OAS reports that from 2001 to June 2004, 91,293 people received mine risk education in Nicaragua. As of June 2004, the OAS had registered 753 landmine/UXO casualties in the country since 1980, of which 73 people were killed and 680 injured.

#### *Niger*

Niger ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 March 1999 and became a State Party on 1 September 1999. Niger has not enacted national legal implementation measures. Niger submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in September 2002, more than two and one-half years late. In April 2003, Niger reported that it had destroyed a stock of 48 antipersonnel mines; it previously indicated it had no stockpile.

### *Nigeria*

Nigeria acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 27 September 2001 and it entered into force on 1 March 2002. It has been more active regionally and internationally on the issue since that time. Nigeria submitted its initial Article 7 report almost two years late, on 22 June 2004. It has not yet adopted any legal national implementation measures. After initially indicating it had no antipersonnel mines, even for training purposes, Nigeria declared a stock of 3,364 mines, all of which will be retained. A massive explosion at an ammunition transit depot in Lagos in January 2002 created a significant UXO problem.

### *Niue*

Niue became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

### *Norway*

Norway hosted the Mine Ban Treaty negotiating conference in 1997 and became a State Party on 1 March 1999. National legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty had already entered into force on 22 May 1998. Norway has played a crucial leadership role in developing the Mine Ban Treaty structures and processes, and in promoting full implementation of the treaty. Norway took the lead in the conception and establishment of the intersessional work program in 1999, and the creation of the Coordinating Committee in 2000. Norway served as President of the Second Meeting of States Parties in September 2000 and presided over the intersessional program throughout the subsequent year. Norway served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from September 2000 to September 2002. Norway was instrumental in setting up the Implementation Support Unit in 2001. At Norway's initiative, a contact group on resource mobilization was established at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002; Norway continues to chair the group. Norway became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance in September 2003.

Norway destroyed its stockpiled antipersonnel mines in 1996, except for Claymore-type mines, which were modified by December 1999 to ensure command-detonation only. Norway finds no need to retain any mines for training and development. Norway reported that US antipersonnel mines stored in Norway were transported out in 2002.

From 1999 to 2003, Norway allocated about \$115 million to mine action funding. Landmine Monitor estimates that Norway allocated nearly \$19 million to victim assistance in 1999–2003. In 2002, Norway's five-year commitment of \$120 million to mine action activities came to an end, but officials have given assurances that the same level of support would be upheld in the future.

### *Panamá*

Panamá became a State Party on 1 April 1999. Panamá has formally declared that it has never produced or exported antipersonnel mines, that it holds no stockpile, and that it is not mine-affected. Systematic clearance of the unexploded ordnance problem resulting from US military exercises and weapons testing conducted in Canal Zone military ranges until 1997 has not yet begun. According to UNICEF Panamá, over 1,700 children have received UXO risk education.

### *Papua New Guinea*

Papua New Guinea acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 28 June 2004. It apparently possesses a small stockpile of Claymore-type mines for training purposes.

### *Paraguay*

Paraguay became a State Party on 1 May 1999. It submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report more than two and a-half years late, and has not provided required annual updates in 2003 or 2004. It has declared that it is not mine-affected and has no stockpiles of antipersonnel mines.

### *Perú*

Perú became a State Party on 1 March 1999. An inter-ministerial Working Group on Antipersonnel Mines was formalized in September 1999 to oversee implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. No specific implementation legislation has been enacted. In December 2001, Perú completed destruction of its 338,356 stockpiled antipersonnel mines, far in advance of its March 2003 deadline. It has reduced the number of mines initially retained for training from 9,526 to 4,024. Perú has played a leadership role in the Mine Ban Treaty intersessional work program. Perú served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance from May 1999 to September 2001, and as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from September 2001 to September 2003.

In May 2001, Perú and the Organization of American States signed an agreement to support integrated mine action in the country. On 13 December 2002, Perú officially created the Peruvian Center for Mine Action, “Contraminas,” responsible for mine action planning and policy-making. Perú reported that humanitarian clearance in the departments of Piura and Tumbes was completed in December 2003. In 2002, the Army completed mine clearance of the Zarumilla Canal, its source at La Palma, and the area leading to the international bridge at Aguas Verdes. Since 1999, there have been at least 55 mine/UXO casualties in Perú. In early 2003, the Association of Victims and Survivors of Landmines (AVISCAM) was created.

### *Philippines*

The Philippines ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 15 February 2000 and it entered into force on 1 August 2000. Three landmine ban bills were tabled in the House from 2000-2003, but none were acted on. Three rebel groups have used antipersonnel mines or improvised explosive devices: New People’s Army, Moro Islamic Liberation Front, and Abu Sayyaf Group. Use by the MILF violated its written commitments to a mine ban in March 2000 and April 2002. Three rebel groups (MILF, the Revolutionary Workers Party of the Philippines/Revolutionary Proletarian Army-Alex Boncayao Brigade, and the Revolutionary Workers Party of Mindanao/Revolutionary People’s Army) have signed the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment banning antipersonnel mines.

### *Portugal*

Portugal became a State Party on 1 August 1999. In February 2002, Portugal stated that domestic implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, including penal sanctions, is already accomplished by existing legislation. Stockpile destruction started in February 2002 after a number of delays. Destruction of 271,967 antipersonnel mines was completed in March 2003. The total stockpile number was revised twice in Portugal's Article 7 reports, downward in 2002 and upward in 2003. Portugal reported in 2002 that it would retain 1,115 mines instead of the 3,523 mines it originally planned to keep. Portugal has provided few details on its mine action funding over the last five years.

### *Qatar*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Qatar on 1 April 1999. Qatar has taken no national legal measures to implement the treaty. Qatar submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due by 27 September 1999, on 3 August 2002. It confirmed that Qatar is not mine-affected, has never used, produced or exported antipersonnel mines, and has no stockpile of live mines. Qatar has not formally stated if any US mines stored in the country fall under Qatar's jurisdiction or control.

### *Romania*

Romania ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 30 November 2000 and became a State Party on 1 May 2001. Implementing legislation was published on 4 December 2002; penal sanctions for treaty violations are said to be covered by the existing criminal law. Romania served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2001 to September 2003. Romania completed destruction of more than one million stockpiled mines on 25 March 2004.

### *Rwanda*

Rwanda became a State Party on 1 December 2000. It has not yet enacted domestic implementation legislation, although a government committee was created in July 2002 to draft such legislation. Rwanda submitted its first Article 7 transparency report, due by 30 May 2001, on 4 September 2001, indicating that it has no stockpile of antipersonnel mines. There were serious and credible allegations of Rwandan use of antipersonnel mines in the fighting in the Democratic Republic of Congo, especially in the June 2000 battle for Kisangani. Rwanda denies any use. There have also been allegations that Rwanda has supplied antipersonnel mines and other types of assistance to RCD-Goma and UPC rebel forces in the DRC, who have admitted ongoing mine use.

An NDO assessment carried out from October 2002 to January 2003 determined that since 1995, 46 percent of Rwanda's mined areas had been cleared. According to the NDO, from 1995 through 2003, a total 477,576 square meters of land was cleared. Mine risk education was carried out between 1995 and 2001, but there have been no MRE activities since, due largely to a lack of funding. From 1990 to June 2004, 659 mine/UXO casualties were recorded, including 275 people killed and 384 injured.

### *Saint Kitts and Nevis*

Saint Kitts and Nevis became a State Party on 1 June 1999.

*Saint Lucia*

Saint Lucia became a State Party on 1 October 1999.

*Saint Vincent and the Grenadines*

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines became a State Party on 1 February 2002.

*Samoa*

Samoa became a State Party on 1 March 1999.

*San Marino*

San Marino became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 1999.

*São Tomé E Príncipe*

São Tomé e Príncipe became a State Party on 1 September 2003, having ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 31 March 2003. It has not submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, which was due on 28 February 2004.

*Senegal*

Senegal became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It has stated that the existing penal code provides sanctions for violations of the Mine Ban Treaty, but also indicated in June 2004 that new implementation legislation will be prepared. Senegal reported that it has no stockpile of antipersonnel mines, even for training purposes. In August 1999, a National Commission was created to oversee implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. In 1999 and 2000, there were allegations that MFDC rebels were using antipersonnel mines in Casamance Province. Systematic mine clearance operations by the Army began in 2003. From the beginning of Handicap International's mine risk education program in 1999 until July 2003, a total of 19,821 village mine risk education sessions took place, in 899 out of 1,272 villages. Handicap International maintains a database of mine and UXO casualties in Casamance, recording 651 mine/UXO casualties since 1996.

*Serbia And Montenegro (Formerly Federal Republic Of Yugoslavia)*

Serbia and Montenegro became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 March 2004. In the conflict in Kosovo in 1999, Yugoslav forces reportedly laid at least 620 minefields and an estimated 50,000 mines; the KLA also used mines. Following the change of regime, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia announced its intention to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty, and on 20 June 2003, the Parliament passed legislation to accede. The delay was due in part to the constitutional restructuring of the country from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia into the new state of Serbia and Montenegro. The Mine Action Center for Serbia and Montenegro, formed in March 2002, has estimated that 39 million square meters of Serbia and Montenegro may be contaminated by mines, cluster submunitions and UXO. In January 2003, the Ministry of Defense disclosed that Serbia and Montenegro holds a stockpile of just over 1.3 million antipersonnel mines; Yugoslav military authorities also claimed that no antipersonnel mines have been produced, imported or exported since 1992. Since 2000, there have been mine incidents

each year in southern Serbia, but it has been unclear if these represent new use by irregular anti-Serb forces.

#### *Seychelles*

Seychelles ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 2 June 2000, becoming a State Party on 1 December 2000. It submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, due May 2001, on 14 April 2003. National implementation legislation was approved in March 2004.

#### *Sierra Leone*

Sierra Leone ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 25 April 2001 and became a State Party on 1 October 2001. Sierra Leone destroyed its stockpile of 959 antipersonnel mines in February 2003. It submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report on 9 February 2004, nearly two years late. Sierra Leone has not reported the enactment of any national implementation measures, as required by Article 9. An UNMAS mission in 2000 concluded that there was only a small landmine problem in Sierra Leone, and that UXO presented a greater threat.

#### *Slovakia*

Slovakia became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 August 1999. The government believes that existing penal codes provide sanctions for any violations of the treaty. Slovakia served as co-rapporteur then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from May 1999 to September 2001. Slovakia started destruction of its stockpile of 187,060 antipersonnel mines in August 1999, and completed in 2000, well in advance of the treaty deadline. At the end of 2003, Slovakia retained 1,481 antipersonnel mines, a significant decrease from the 7,000 it originally intended to retain. In March 2000, Slovakia reported the voluntary destruction of its stocks of the PT-Mi-K antivehicle mine with an anti-lift firing mechanism. It is also destroying its antivehicle mines with tilt rods, and has banned antivehicle mines with tripwires and the Ro-3 antihandling device. Slovakia ratified CCW Amended Protocol II in November 1999.

#### *Slovenia*

Slovenia became a State Party on 1 April 1999. National implementation was achieved by administrative measures in December 1998 and April 1999, with penal sanctions provided by the existing penal code. Slovenia completed destruction of its stockpile of nearly 170,000 antipersonnel mines on 25 March 2003. Slovenia initially announced it would retain 7,000 antipersonnel mines, but later reduced this to 3,000. Slovenia has acknowledged possessing mines with tilt rods; the ICBL believes these are banned. In 1998, Slovenia set up the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance to support mine action in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and later extended it to other mine-affected countries in South East Europe. The government has donated \$3 million to the ITF. The ITF had raised more than \$127 million from various sources and spent \$111 million by end 2003, including \$8 million to support victim assistance. Slovenia hosted the Third Regional Conference on Landmines in June 2000. Slovenia ratified Amended Protocol II of CCW in December 2002.

### *Solomon Islands*

The Solomon Islands became a State Party on 1 July 1999. It submitted its initial transparency measures report on 11 February 2004.

### *South Africa*

South Africa ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 26 June 1998 and the treaty entered into force on 1 March 1999. South Africa has played a leading role in the intersessional work program of the Mine Ban Treaty and in promoting universalization and full implementation of the treaty, especially in Africa. South Africa served as co-chair of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention from May 1999 to September 2000, and as co-rapporteur of the same committee since September 2003. South Africa completed destruction of its stockpile of mines in October 1997. National implementation legislation was promulgated in December 2003. South African firms have been involved in mine clearance operations around the world, and in developing demining technology and equipment.

### *Spain*

Spain became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 July 1999. Legislation prohibiting antipersonnel mines was passed earlier in October 1998. Spain's completed destruction of its stockpile of some 850,000 antipersonnel mines on 3 October 2000. Spain initially intended to retain 10,000 mines, but announced in May 2000 that this would be reduced to 4,000. In February 2000, the Ministry of Defense said that US antipersonnel mines stockpiled in Rota had been withdrawn. From 1999 to 2003, Spain contributed approximately \$4.7 million to mine action. In September 2001, the International Demining Training Center was established, and it has expanded its activities since then.

### *Sudan*

Sudan ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 13 October 2003 and the treaty entered into force on 1 April 2004. Every year since 1999 Landmine Monitor has reported serious allegations about use of antipersonnel mines by government forces, the SPLM/A and other rebel groups. The government has consistently denied any use, while SPLM/A has acknowledged some use. In October 2001, the SPLM/A signed the Geneva Call "Deed of Commitment" banning antipersonnel mines. Cease-fire agreements signed in January and October 2002 prohibit the use of landmines. Sudan ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 13 October 2003. The Nuba Mountains cease-fire agreement has been considered a model of cross-line mine action in Sudan. The Sudan Landmine Information and Response Initiative was formed in 2001. The UN established a National Mine Action Center in Khartoum in September 2002 and a Southern Sudan Mine Action Coordination Office in Rumbek in February 2003. Mine clearance and mine risk education activities expanded in 2002 and 2003, in the wake of the cease-fire agreements. A number of surveys and assessments have been carried out in both government and rebel areas. According to donor information, funding for mine action in Sudan has increased from a few hundred thousand dollars in 1999 and 2000, to \$2.2 million in 2001, \$5.1 million in 2002, and \$9.5 million in 2003. In April 2003, the NMAO recruited a Victim Assistance Associate to develop a plan of action for victim assistance. NMAO has received incident reports on more than 2,667 mine/UXO casualties.

### *Suriname*

Suriname ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 May 2002 and the treaty entered into force on 1 November 2002. On 9 May 2002 a seminar on implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty was held in Paramaribo. In March 2003, the Minister of Defense established an inter-ministerial Commission on Antipersonnel Mines. Suriname destroyed 146 antipersonnel mines on 25 February 2004 and intends to retain the remaining 150 antipersonnel mines for training purposes.

### *Swaziland*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Swaziland on 1 June 1999. Swaziland has not provided any annual updated Article 7 reports. Clearance of Swaziland's small minefield has not begun.

### *Sweden*

Sweden became a State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty on 1 May 1999 and domestic legislation to implement the treaty entered into force on the same day. Sweden began destruction of its stockpile of 3,365,000 antipersonnel mines in 1996, and completed it in December 2001, well in advance of its deadline of 1 May 2003. Sweden reconstructed its Claymore-type antipersonnel mines to prevent victim-activation. Sweden has retained the second largest number of mines for training and development purposes (15,706 at the end of 2003); in 2002 it was discovered that the Bofors company held 3,069 more mines than previously known. In September 2003, Sweden became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies. In March 2004, Sweden appointed an ambassador for mines and small arms/light weapons.

From 1999 to 2003, Sweden donated SEK 466 million (about \$48 million) to mine action in at least 17 countries and regions. It has also provided considerable technical expertise to mine action programs, particularly through SRSA and SWEDEC. Sweden announced a new strategy on mine action in May 2002, with an emphasis on integrating mine action into long-term development assistance. Sweden has invested significantly in research and development on mine detection and clearance technologies.

### *Switzerland*

Switzerland became a State Party on 1 March 1999, after playing a leading role in supporting a ban on antipersonnel mines. Switzerland's 1996 law banning antipersonnel mines has served as implementation legislation, and has been amended several times to conform with the treaty. Switzerland completed destruction of its stockpile of 3.85 million antipersonnel mines in the weeks following entry into force of the treaty. Switzerland has been very active in the Mine Ban Treaty work program. Switzerland served as co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance from May 1999 to September 2000. It served as co-rapporteur and then co-chair of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction from September 2001 to September 2003. The Second and Fourth Meetings of States Parties were held in Geneva in September of 2000 and 2002. Switzerland set up the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining in December 1997; the GICHD has hosted the intersessional meetings and housed the Mine Ban Treaty's Implementation Support Unit since it began operations in January 2002. From 1999 to 2003, Switzerland provided about \$41 million to mine action.

### *Tajikistan*

Tajikistan acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 12 October 1999 and the treaty entered into force on 1 April 2000. Until September 2002, there were serious concerns about Tajikistan's commitment to the Mine Ban Treaty and its failure to take steps to implement the treaty. Since that time, it has engaged extensively in the treaty processes and has striven to meet all of its obligations. It destroyed its stockpile of antipersonnel mines by the treaty-mandated deadline, has submitted required transparency reports, and has begun to clear mined areas. However, in 2002 and 2003, Tajikistan was the only State Party to abstain from voting on the UN General Assembly resolutions promoting the Mine Ban Treaty. During 1999-2001, Russian Border Forces laid antipersonnel mines inside Tajikistan along the Afghan border, and Uzbekistan laid antipersonnel mines on its border with Tajikistan, including some inside Tajik territory.

### *Tanzania*

Tanzania ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 13 November 2000 and became a State Party on 1 May 2001. It completed destruction of its stockpile of 22,841 antipersonnel mines in July 2004. Its initial Article 7 report, due by 28 October 2001, was submitted on 5 February 2003. Numerous landmine survivors from Burundi and DR Congo arrived in refugee camps in Tanzania from 1999-2002.

### *Thailand*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Thailand on 1 May 1999. A nationwide Landmine Impact Survey was conducted from May 2000 to May 2001 that identified 531 mine-affected communities in 27 provinces. The Thailand Mine Action Center was established in January 1999. Three military Humanitarian Mine Action Units were created in 1999 and 2000, and a fourth in 2002; a civilian demining team was also created in 2002. Humanitarian demining operations began in 2000 and a total of 1,162,236 square meters of land had been cleared at the end of 2003. More than 370,000 people received mine risk education from 2000 to 2003. Thailand completed destruction of its 337,725 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in April 2003. Thailand hosted and served as President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in September 2003, and also hosted regional landmine conferences in 2001 and 2002. Thailand served as co-chair of the Standing Committee of the General Status and Operation of the Convention from September 2001 to September 2002 and as co-rapporteur the previous year.

### *Timor-Leste*

Timor-Leste acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 7 May 2003 and the treaty entered into force on 1 November 2003. Timor-Leste submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in June 2004, confirming that it is mine-free and that it possesses no stocks of antipersonnel mines.

### *Togo*

Togo ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 9 March 2000, becoming a State Party on 1 September 2000. Togo submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in April 2003, more than two years late. It declared a stockpile of 436 antipersonnel mines, all of which are retained for training purposes.

*Trinidad and Tobago*

Trinidad and Tobago became a State Party on 1 March 1999. It was the first Caribbean state to adopt domestic implementation legislation in June 2000.

*Tunisia*

Tunisia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 9 July 1999 and it entered into force on 1 January 2000. Tunisia submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report in July 2000, providing details on its stockpile of antipersonnel mines and five mined areas for the first time. In January 2002, the government hosted a regional seminar on the Mine Ban Treaty in North Africa. MAG and UNMAS conducted assessment missions in December 2002 and January 2003 to examine Tunisia's mine clearance needs. In June 2003, an inter-ministerial committee to coordinate implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty was established. Tunisia completed destruction of its stockpile of 18,259 antipersonnel mines in September 2003.

*Turkey*

Turkey acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty on 25 September 2003, on the same day Greece ratified. Turkey claims that existing domestic legislation gives effect to the treaty obligations. Previously, production of antipersonnel mines ceased in January 1996. A 1996 export moratorium was renewed in 1999 and made permanent in March 2002. Use of antipersonnel mines was banned in 1998. Turkey first stated its intention to accede in the near future in May 1999, and participated in Mine Ban Treaty meetings regularly ever since. Agreements to demine borders with Bulgaria and Georgia were made in 1999 and 2001. Turkey completed clearance of its border with Bulgaria in mid-2002. By the end of 2003, 14,487 antipersonnel mines had been removed in eastern and southeastern areas, and an area of 48,120 square meters was cleared on the border with Armenia. The government accused PKK of using mines in 1999-2002, and 2004. PKK stated its intention to ban antipersonnel mines in January 2002. The Turkish government has claimed that between 1993 and 2003, landmines caused 2,905 casualties. Since 2000, at least 260 new mine casualties were reported, including 72 people killed and 188 injured.

*Turkmenistan*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Turkmenistan on 1 March 1999. Turkmenistan did not attend any annual or intersessional Mine Ban Treaty meetings of States Parties until June 2004. Turkmenistan submitted its initial Article 7 transparency measures report in November 2001, more than two years late and without all the required information, did not submit annual updates in 2002 or 2003, and provided another incomplete report in February 2004. Turkmenistan has not passed any national legislation or other implementation measures as required by Article 9. After first asking for an extension of its stockpile destruction deadline, Turkmenistan announced it completed destruction of its antipersonnel mine stockpile in February 2003, in advance of its 1 March 2003 deadline. However, it stated it would retain 69,200 mines for training. The ICBL criticized this as a possible violation of Articles 3 and 4 of the Mine Ban Treaty. Turkmenistan subsequently decided to destroy all of its mines, by the end of 2004.

### *Uganda*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Uganda on 1 August 1999. Uganda submitted its initial Article 7 report, due in January 2000, in May 2002. Uganda does not have implementing legislation in place, although reportedly it has been drafted and revised. Uganda completed its stockpile destruction of 6,383 antipersonnel landmines in July 2003. There were serious and credible allegations indicating a strong possibility of Ugandan use of antipersonnel mines in the Democratic Republic of Congo, particularly in the June 2000 battle for Kisangani. Uganda has denied any use, and reportedly carried out a joint investigation, but it has not made the findings public. It appears that Lord's Resistance Army rebels have used landmines throughout most of the period. Uganda invited foreign military attaches to inspect an alleged mine production facility, and they concluded no production existed. There is no organized mine clearance underway in Uganda, but mine risk education is being carried out in the northern districts of Gulu, Kitgum and Pader, and in Kasese district in western Uganda. Assessments of the mine situation in Uganda have been carried out by the Mines Advisory Group (in May 2001 and February/March 2003), Mines Awareness Trust (in January 2003), and a United Nations interagency team (in March/April 2004). It is estimated that since 1998, 425 people have been killed by mines. In northern Uganda, the government has identified 385 people with amputations as a result of mine or UXO incidents between 1999 and 2003. More than ten local associations have been established to support the socio-economic reintegration of mine survivors. In 2000, a disability policy was put in place.

### *United Kingdom*

The UK became a State Party on 1 March 1999. National legislation implementing the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force the same day. From 1999 to 2003, the UK provided about \$107 million for mine action in at least 24 countries and regions. The UK has been actively engaged in the intersessional work program, and served as co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in 1999–2000. It has actively promoted universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. The UK completed destruction of its stockpile of more than 2 million antipersonnel mines on 19 October 1999, well in advance of the treaty deadline of 1 March 2003. At one point the UK retained close to 5,000 antipersonnel mines for training purposes, but in 2003 decided the number was excessive to the need and destroyed 3,116 mines. Since entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty, there have been allegations of attempted transfers of antipersonnel mines in the UK by Pakistani, Romanian, and UK companies. The UK has stated that tripwires, breakwires and tilt rods are not acceptable methods of detonating antivehicle mines, but has not made the legal determination that such mines are prohibited by the Mine Ban Treaty. The UK has confirmed that transit of foreign antipersonnel mines through UK territory is prohibited by the treaty and domestic law.

### *Uruguay*

Uruguay ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 7 June 2001 and the treaty entered into force on 1 December 2001. Uruguay started stockpile destruction in 2000, and completed it on 23 September 2004. In 2002 and 2003, Army deminers took part in the UN peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

### *Venezuela*

Venezuela ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 14 April 1999 and the treaty entered into force on 1 October 1999. Venezuela's initial Article 7 report, due 29 March 2000, was submitted in September 2002. Venezuela reported that it completed destruction of its stockpile of 47,189 antipersonnel mines on 24 September 2003. Venezuela has revealed that it laid antipersonnel mines in May 1998, five months after signing the Mine Ban Treaty.

### *Yemen*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Yemen on 1 March 1999. A nationwide Landmine Impact Survey, completed in July 2000, identified 594 mine-affected villages in 19 of the country's 20 governorates. By April 2004, at least 6,688,575 square meters of land, including 213 minefields, had been demined, accounting for 74 percent of the total area marked in Yemen for clearance; 11 of the 14 high-impacted and 67 medium to low-impacted communities had been cleared. From 1999-2003, mine risk education activities reached 341,980 people in 198 villages. Yemen completed destruction of its antipersonnel mine stockpile in April 2002. The Victim Assistance Department of the Yemen Mine Action Program was established in 2001. In January 2002, Presidential Law Number 2 established a care and rehabilitation fund for persons with disabilities.

### *Zambia*

Zambia ratified the Mine Ban Treaty on 23 February 2001 and became a State Party on 1 August 2001. Domestic implementation legislation was enacted on 18 November 2003. UNMAS carried out an assessment mission in May-June 2000, and the US State Department conducted an assessment mission in October 2000. The Zambian Mine Action Center was established in August 2001, and training was provided for management, survey, mine risk education, and clearance teams. In November 2002, a Level One Survey was carried out jointly by ZMAC and its Namibian counterpart, to help establish the scale of the landmine problem in Western province. Mine clearance operations began in May 2002. In 2002, 721 kilometers of road along Lake Kariba were cleared to open up the area for a \$50 million World Bank development project. The Angolan government and UNITA forces both appeared to have laid antipersonnel mines inside Zambia in 1999 and 2000.

### *Zimbabwe*

The Mine Ban Treaty entered into force for Zimbabwe in March 1999. In January 2001, Zimbabwe enacted *The Anti-Personnel Mines (Prohibition) Act, 2000*. In November 2000, Zimbabwe destroyed its stockpile of 4,092 antipersonnel mines, retaining 700 mines for training purposes. Zimbabwe served as co-rapporteur, then co-chair, of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention from May 1999 to September 2001. Zimbabwe strongly denied allegations of use of antipersonnel mines by its forces deployed in the DR Congo, and rejected concerns about possible "assistance" to other forces using mines.

Major mine clearance operations started in March 1999. Zimbabwe reports that by the end of 2003, 221,020 antipersonnel landmines had been cleared from three of Zimbabwe's seven identified contaminated areas. In 2002, a National Authority on Mine Action was established to formulate a

national mine action plan, and the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center was formed to coordinate all mine action in the country. Mine risk education has been carried out in the country since 1998. Between 1999 and 2002, 31 mine/UXO casualties were reported; another 26 were reported in 2003.

## **Signatories**

### *Brunei Darussalam*

Brunei has shown new interest in the Mine Ban Treaty since 2003, attending several meetings including the Fifth Meeting of States Parties. As of August 2004, the ratification process has reportedly progressed and is in its final stage.

### *Ethiopia*

Ethiopia signed the Mine Ban Treaty on 3 December 1997, but it has not yet ratified the treaty. During the 1998-2000 border conflict, Ethiopian forces laid an estimated 150,000 to 200,000 mines, and Eritrean forces laid an estimated 240,000 mines. Although Ethiopia had denied using mines, in April 2002 it gave the UN detailed maps of mines its forces laid in Eritrea during the conflict. The United Nations Mission on Eritrea and Ethiopia Mine Action Coordination Center was established in August 2000, following the cessation of hostilities. The government created the Ethiopian Mine Action Office in February 2001. A national Landmine Impact Survey was carried out from April 2002 to March 2004. EMOA started humanitarian demining operations in mid-2002. By February 2004, EMAO reported having cleared 4.6 million square meters of land. From 2000 to 2003, more than 1.3 million people received some form of mine risk education. Since 2000, ICRC-supported orthopedic centers have produced 6,455 prostheses, including 2,971 for mine survivors. The Landmine Impact Survey recorded 16,616 landmine/UXO casualties, including 1,295 “recent” deaths or injuries.

### *Haiti*

In January 2004, a Ministry of Foreign Affairs official told the ICBL that the national parliament passed ratification legislation on 12 January 2004.

### *Indonesia*

Indonesia has repeatedly stated its commitment to the Mine Ban Treaty and has moved toward ratification, albeit slowly, since 2002. In May 2002, Indonesia revealed that it has a stockpile of 16,000 antipersonnel mines. Since 2001, there have been a small number of incidents involving homemade mines and booby-traps in Aceh and Ambon.

### *Poland*

Poland has been a signatory to the Mine Ban Treaty since 4 December 1997. From signature until 2004, Poland repeatedly cited several pre-conditions to its ratification. However, in 2004, the Prime Minister’s Office and the Defense Ministry indicated that ratification could now go forward. Poland has been a regular participant in the Mine Ban Treaty work program. In March 2003, Poland submitted a voluntary Article 7 report, declaring stockpiles of about one million antipersonnel mines, and noting that

Poland banned export of antipersonnel mines in 1998 and stopped production long before that. It submitted a second report in May 2004. In 2000, Poland established an inter-agency working group to develop a plan and timeline for ratification. Poland and Canada co-sponsored a landmine seminar in Warsaw in June 2001. From 1999-2003, Poland cleared 16,972 mines and 256,704 UXO, nearly all left from World War II. During those years, more than 700 Polish deminers engaged in international operations in Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Kosovo, Lebanon, Syria and Yemen.

#### *Ukraine*

The government of Ukraine has been working with donors and others in the mine action community to address the linked issues of destruction of 6 million stockpiled PFM mines and the process of ratification of the Mine Ban Treaty. In 2002, the European Commission launched a project to prepare for the destruction of the PFM mines. The first phase assessing the condition of the mines concluded in mid-2003. Between July 2002 and May 2003, Ukraine cooperated with NATO's Maintenance and Supply Agency to complete the destruction of 405,000 stockpiled PMN mines. Ukraine ratified CCW Amended Protocol II on 12 September 1999. From 1992 to the end of 2003, Ukrainian demining teams destroyed more than 450,000 mines and UXO. Since 2000, Ukrainian deminers have participated in international operations in Lebanon, Sierra Leone, Kosovo, and Iraq. From 2000 to mid-May 2004, 73 new mine/UXO casualties were reported.

### **Non-Signatories**

#### *Armenia*

The National Center for Humanitarian Mine Action was officially opened in March 2002. The US trained and equipped 178 Armenian deminers and other personnel in 2001 and 2002. The first survey activities began in October 2002 in the Tavush region, and the first demining operations got underway in May 2003 in Syunik province. Armenia has voted in favor of every annual UN General Assembly resolution calling for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. An international seminar on banning antipersonnel landmines was held in Yerevan in October 2002.

#### *Azerbaijan*

In 2000, the civilian Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action developed a National Mine Action Plan, initiated a National Mine Database, purchased equipment and trained deminers. Demining operations started in July 2000. A limited Level One Survey was completed in the Fizuli region in 2000. Two national demining NGOs were established in 2000. With UNDP assistance, an Azeri National Strategic Plan for mine action was adopted in October 2001. A national Landmine Impact Survey was initiated in September 2002 and completed in June 2003. At least 153,000 people attended mine risk education sessions held between 1999 and 2002. The LIS identified a total of 1,215 mine/UXO casualties. From 1999 to July 2004, ANAMA recorded 172 new mine/UXO casualties.

### *Bahrain*

Bahrain has voted in favor of every pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996. Bahrain has not revealed if it has a stockpile of antipersonnel mines. The status of US landmines stockpiled in Bahrain is not known following combat operations in Iraq.

### *Bhutan*

In September 2004, Bhutan's Foreign Minister stated that Bhutan would accede to the Mine Ban Treaty in 2005. Bhutan attended the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in September 2003, its first participation in a Mine Ban Treaty meeting. Bhutan for the first time officially stated that it has never produced, acquired, or stockpiled antipersonnel mines. In December 2003, during a Bhutanese military offensive to oust Indian rebels from their bases in Bhutan, there were reports of use of landmines by the rebels.

### *Burma (Myanmar)*

Government forces and armed ethnic groups have used antipersonnel mines regularly and extensively throughout the period. In 1999, Landmine Monitor identified ten rebel groups using landmines; the number grew to 15 by 2004. Myanmar remains one of the few countries still producing antipersonnel mines. There has been no humanitarian mine clearance carried out. Government forces have been accused each year of using "human minesweepers," forcing civilians to walk in front of troops to blow up mines. There is no systematic collection of information about mine casualties, but there is evidence that Myanmar is among the countries with the highest number of casualties each year. The ICRC resumed its joint physical rehabilitation programs with the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Defense, and with the Myanmar Red Cross in June 1999. In 2002, a new physical rehabilitation and prosthetic center was opened at Hpa-an in Karen State.

### *China*

China announced completion of clearance of its border with Vietnam in September 1999, but resumed clearance in Yunnan and Guangxi provinces following the signing of a new border agreement with Vietnam. China is modifying or destroying antipersonnel mines that do not meet CCW Amended Protocol II requirements. China reported that since 1997, it has ceased the production of non-detectable antipersonnel mines and those without self-destruct mechanisms. China has reported providing more than \$6 million in international mine action assistance from 2001-2003. China has been increasingly active in international mine action and in Mine Ban Treaty-related activities. Landmine Monitor has identified 4,207 mine survivors in Yunnan province and Guangxi province.

### *Cuba*

Cuba is one of the small number of countries that has abstained from the vote on every annual pro-ban United Nations General Assembly resolution since 1996. Cuba is one of only 15 countries in the world still producing antipersonnel mines. It has stated that it does not export antipersonnel mines, but has declined to institute a formal moratorium. The United States removed its landmines from around Guantánamo Naval Base from 1996-1999; Cuban minefields remain.

### *Egypt*

In 2002, the government recast its approach to the landmine problem to focus on development aspects. In 2003, Egypt adopted a national plan to develop the north coast and clear mines. The United States trained Egyptian Army deminers and provided equipment and other assistance between 2000 and 2003. In February 2000, Egypt told a UN assessment mission that it does not produce or export antipersonnel mines. An Arab Regional Seminar on Landmines was held in Cairo in April 2000. Since 1999, at least 87 new landmine/UXO casualties were reported in Egypt.

### *Finland*

Finland has put back adherence to the Mine Ban Treaty until 2012. The goal of joining the treaty by 2006 was first stated in December 1997, reiterated in December 1999 and December 2000, and confirmed by a governmental report approved by Parliament in December 2001. The Ministry of Defense will not reveal any details of Finland's stockpile of antipersonnel mines. Finland claims that all mines are in storage and none are deployed in minefields. Finland carried out destruction of some non-detectable mines, and adapted others, in accordance with CCW Amended Protocol II. From 1999 to 2003, Finland provided more than \$25 million in mine action funding.

### *Georgia*

It appears that Georgian Armed Forces have used antipersonnel mines each year from 2001-2004, despite repeatedly government denials. In addition, private armed groups from Georgia have infiltrated into Abkhazia and laid antipersonnel mines. In 2002 NATO agreed to provide assistance for clearance of UXO around military sites, but in mid-2004, the project had not yet started. The US transferred demining equipment to Georgia in 2001 and 2002 and trained Georgian demining instructors. Georgia has frequently expressed its support for the goals of the Mine Ban Treaty, and has voted in favor of every annual UN General Assembly resolution calling for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. The ICBL Georgian Committee recorded 266 landmine/UXO/IED casualties between 2001 and April 2004.

### *India*

India laid large numbers of mines along its border with Pakistan between December 2001 and July 2002, in one of the biggest mine-laying operations anywhere in the world in years. There have been numerous reports of civilian casualties, raising concerns about the effectiveness of the measures taken to protect civilians. The Indian Army started major mine clearance operations in October 2002 and reported that as of 30 September 2003, over 90 percent of the mines had been recovered. Previously, India said it cleared 8,000 mines planted by intruders during the 1999 conflict in the Kargil area of Kashmir.

India has for the first time designed a remotely-delivered antipersonnel mine system for trial evaluation and prototype production. It has also designed for production a detectable version of its hand-laid, non-metallic M14 mine. India is making its large existing stockpile of M14 antipersonnel mines detectable. India has had an export moratorium in place since 1996.

India ratified CCW Amended Protocol II on 2 September 1999. An Indian Ambassador chaired the key Main Committee One during the Second CCW Review Conference in 2001 and subsequently chaired

the Group of Governmental Experts considering the issues of explosive remnants of war and antivehicle mines.

The Indian Institute for Peace, Disarmament & Environmental Protection started collecting data on civilian landmine casualties in the border districts of Rajasthan, Punjab and Jammu in December 2002; it has collected data on more than 700 civilians killed or injured by landmines with some injuries dating back to the 1965 India-Pakistan war.

### *Iran*

The UN Development Programme signed an agreement with Iran in July 2002 to implement a national mine action program. A National Committee for Demining was established. The Army carries out extensive mine clearance, but official statistics are not available. Despite an export moratorium announced in 1997, and government statements that production has ceased, antipersonnel mines of Iranian origin with date stamps indicating new production have been found in Afghanistan. The first known conference on the landmine problem in Iran was held in Tehran in February 2000, organized by the non-governmental High Center of Research and Informatics. There is renewed interest in the landmine issue, with increased attention by the government and the formation of NGOs to deal with the problem.

### *Iraq*

The government of Saddam Hussein did not in any way engage in the global effort to eradicate antipersonnel mines. An Iraqi diplomat confirmed that Iraq continued to produce mines until 2003. The extensive mine and UXO problem in Iraq was exacerbated by the conflict in 2003 in which Iraqi forces used mines, US and UK forces used cluster munitions in populated areas, and hundreds of thousands of tons of ammunition were abandoned by Iraqi forces. The long-established mine action programs in Kurdish-controlled northern Iraq were for the most part suspended in early 2003, but subsequently resumed and expanded into new areas. Mine action programs were initiated for the first time in central and southern Iraq after the main fighting ceased.

In northern Iraq, from 1997 to 2003, the UN Mine Action Program cleared more than 12.2 million square meters of land, destroying more than 79,000 UXO, 2,500 cluster bomblets, 11,000 antipersonnel mines and 560 antivehicle mines. In addition, the NGOs MAG and NPA cleared more than 3.7 million square meters of land, destroying more than 54,959 mines and 4,500 cluster bomblets. The Mine Action Program completed a Landmine Impact Survey in northern Iraq in 2002. In northern Iraq, as of the end of 2003, 13,672 mine/UXO casualties (4,551 killed and 9,121 injured) have been recorded in four northern governorates. Between 1999 and the end of December 2003, at least 3,333 mine and UXO casualties were recorded in northern Iraq. ICRC-supported centers fitted more than 11,956 prostheses (6,230 for mine survivors) since 1999. The construction of new rehabilitation and vocational training centers in Diana and Dohuk were completed in 2002/2003.

### *Israel*

Israel has ceased the production of antipersonnel mines and has renewed an export moratorium until 2005. The last confirmed use of antipersonnel mines by the IDF was in 2000 in south Lebanon. Israel

first reported destroying obsolete antipersonnel mines in 2002. Israel joined CCW Amended Protocol II in October 2000 and has submitted three national annual reports.

#### *Kazakhstan*

An ICBL delegation visited Kazakhstan in April 2004. Kazakhstan participated in the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in Thailand in September 2003, and in regional seminars on landmines in Kyrgyzstan in November 2003 and Tajikistan in April 2004. The Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs estimated that it could cost \$3 million to destroy its antipersonnel mine stockpile. In September 2003, Kazakhstan deployed 25 troops to Iraq to assist in demining.

#### *Democratic People's Republic Of Korea*

In 2002, North Korea conducted mine clearance inside the DMZ for the first time as part of two inter-Korean transportation projects to link railways and roads. The ICRC and Handicap International have launched programs specifically for persons with disabilities. North Korea has made no public statements on landmines and has been absent from every vote on the pro-Mine Ban Treaty UNGA resolutions. Landmine Monitor assumes that North Korea continues to produce antipersonnel mines. In June 2003, the Supreme People's Assembly adopted a new law to protect the rights of persons with disabilities.

#### *Republic Of Korea*

In April 1999, the ROK began clearance around military bases in the rear area of the DMZ and had completed clearance at 17 sites by the end of 2003. In 2002 and 2003, the ROK conducted mine clearance inside and below the DMZ for the first time as part of two inter-Korean transportation projects to link railways and roads. The ROK has stated that it has not produced antipersonnel mines of any type since 2000, and that it has enforced an indefinite extension of its 1997 moratorium on the export of antipersonnel mines. The ROK revealed that it has a stockpile of about 2 million antipersonnel mines. Between 1999 and 2002, at least 46 new mine casualties were recorded. The ROK has contributed a total of \$1 million to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund.

#### *Kuwait*

More landmines, and even greater numbers of cluster bomblets and other explosive remnants of war, are found in Kuwait each year and clearance operations are ongoing. In 2002, Ministry of Defense sources told Landmine Monitor that Kuwait does not use landmines. Officials also stated that the 45,845 antipersonnel mines Kuwait removed from the ground and stored for a period were destroyed by 2002, but Kuwait will not confirm if it has a stockpile of mines. Following the movement of weaponry associated with the invasion of Iraq, the status of the US antipersonnel mine stockpiles in Kuwait is not known.

#### *Kyrgyzstan*

Kyrgyzstan used landmines in 1999 and 2000 to prevent infiltration across its border with Tajikistan. Mine risk education programs have begun in border areas of Kyrgyzstan adjacent to minefields replaced by Uzbekistan. In June 2001, the Kyrgyz government issued a decree regarding mine clearance and mine

risk education. Since 1999, at least ten landmine casualties occurred in the Batken region near the Uzbek border.

#### *Lao People's Democratic Republic*

From 1996 to 2003, UXO Lao cleared 43.96 million square meters of land, benefiting an estimated 1.5 million people, including 33.36 million square meters since 1999. The Australian commercial company Milsearch reports clearing 26 million square meters from 1993-2003. More than 600,000 pieces of UXO and mines have been cleared, including more than 400,000 since 1999. Since 1996, more than 1.14 million people have received UXO and mine risk education in Laos, including more than 900,000 since 1999. During a funding crisis in mid-2002, UXO Lao reduced its staff by more than half, but regained capacity in 2003 and 2004. There have been more than 11,000 UXO/mine casualties since 1973, including at least 544 since 1999.

#### *Latvia*

Latvia has declared that it intends to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty by November 2004. It has voluntarily submitted two Article 7 transparency reports. Latvia has voted for every annual pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996. Latvia reports that mines and unexploded ordnance from World Wars I and II and the Soviet occupation are still found "in considerable quantity." More than 24,000 UXO, including mines, have been found and destroyed since 1999. Latvia became a party to CCW Amended Protocol II in August 2002.

#### *Lebanon*

Israel withdrew its forces from South Lebanon in May 2000, leaving behind a significant mine and UXO problem. In May 2001, the United Arab Emirates announced a contribution of up to \$50 million to redevelop South Lebanon, including an unknown sum for demining, survey and mine risk education activities; "Operation Emirates Solidarity" began in October 2001 and was completed in June 2004 with clearance of nearly 5 million square meters of land. Between 1999 and 2003, 1,555,644 people received mine risk education. A nationwide Landmine Impact Survey was conducted from March 2002 to August 2003. The Mine Action Coordination Center for South Lebanon was established in early 2002. In 2001, the National Demining Office established a National Mine Victim Assistance Committee. Between 2000 and June 2004, landmines and UXO caused 291 casualties. Casualties have steadily declined from 119 in 2000, to 93 in 2001, 49 in 2002, and 26 in 2003.

#### *Libya*

Libya has abstained from voting on every annual pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1998, but it has participated in most Mine Ban Treaty meetings. There is no national budget or coordination body for mine action in Libya, but reportedly some mine clearance is carried out every year by the civil defense authority and the Army. In 2002, Italy initially allocated €2.5 million to Libya for mine clearance operations, but Italy reports the money was reallocated when Libya did not meet the deadline to provide information on how the money would be used.

### *Mongolia*

Mongolia has voted in favor of every pro-Mine Ban Treaty UN General Assembly resolution since 1998. Mongolia has increasingly participated in Mine Ban Treaty meetings. In January 2002, the President of Mongolia expressed support for a mine ban and said that a process to assess accession to the Mine Ban Treaty had been initiated; it was still underway in 2004. Mongolian defense officials have acknowledged that Mongolia has a large operational stockpile of antipersonnel mines.

### *Morocco*

Morocco has stated that it is complying with the Mine Ban Treaty “de facto.” In February 2001, Moroccan officials for the first time claimed that Morocco no longer uses or stockpiles antipersonnel mines. Morocco and the Polisario have periodically traded accusations of new mine use. Both parties have conducted mine clearance and explosive ordnance disposal along the berms of Western Sahara. In April 2004, the UN reported that since 1997 MINURSO has facilitated the discovery and marking of 1,123 mines and UXO, and has participated in 750 disposal operations. Morocco ratified CCW Amended Protocol II on 19 March 2002.

### *Nepal*

Government forces and Maoist rebels have used antipersonnel landmines and improvised explosive devices in the internal conflict, which began in 1996. The Maoists have used mines/IEDs much more extensively than security forces. The use of mines and IEDs increased every year from 1999 to 2002, until the cease-fire which lasted from January to August 2003. There were no confirmed instances of new mine use during the cease-fire, but in the wake of renewed fighting since then, both sides are again laying mines or IEDs in significant numbers. All 75 districts are now affected, compared to four in 1999. The government did not officially acknowledge using mines until 2002. The Army has also acknowledged that Nepal produces antipersonnel mines, a previously unknown fact.

Nepal has voted in support of every pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996, and has participated in many Mine Ban Treaty meetings. Some of Nepal’s most senior officials have expressed support for a ban. Nepalese leaders have since 1999 regularly stated that Nepal is carefully studying accession to the Mine Ban Treaty.

There have been no formal surveys or assessments of the mine situation of Nepal. There are no humanitarian demining programs in Nepal. Mine risk education activities were initiated in 2003 and 2004. Handicap International started a program to support persons with disabilities in 2001. Nepal has taken special measures to aid victims of the conflict and acknowledges that assistance to landmine survivors is an obligation of the state. Since 2000, the number of landmine casualties is increasing although no comprehensive statistics are available.

### *Oman*

Oman has voted in favor of every pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996. The United States provided mine action assistance from 2000-2002. In February 2001, Oman revealed for the first time that it has a limited stockpile of antipersonnel mines for training purposes. The status of US landmines stockpiled in Oman is not known following combat operations in Iraq.

### *Pakistan*

During the escalation of tensions with India that began in December 2001, Pakistani forces engaged in a massive mine-laying operation, which continued until mid-2002. Reports of civilian casualties in Pakistan following the mine-laying call into question the effectiveness of the measures taken to protect civilians. Pakistan stated in November 2003 that it had cleared 99 percent of the mines it laid in the operation. Pakistan-backed militants, and allegedly Pakistan Army troops, made extensive use of antipersonnel mines in the conflict in the Kargil area of Kashmir in mid-1999. There were allegations of Pakistani-manufactured mines being supplied to the militants. There were reports of attempts by state-owned Pakistan Ordnance Factories to sell antipersonnel mines to British journalists posing as representatives of private companies in both November 1999 and April 2002. Pakistan's 1997 moratorium on export of antipersonnel mines became a legally binding ban in February 1999. Pakistan ratified CCW Amended Protocol II on 9 March 1999, exercising the nine-year deferral period. Pakistan is modifying its stockpile of low-metal content mines to make them detectable. Pakistan is producing both new detectable hand-emplaced antipersonnel mines and new remotely-delivered mines.

From August to December 2000, the Community Motivation & Development Organization carried out the first assessment mission in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas and collected data on landmine casualties in the Bajaur Agency. It launched the first mine awareness program in August 2000. By the end of 2003, it had provided mine risk education to 97,664 people. Handicap International provided mine risk education in Afghan refugee camps in Baluchistan Province from October 2001 to January 2003, and the Italian NGO Intersos from January 2001 to June 2002. Several NGOs have implemented programs to assist mine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Landmine incidents in border areas with India and Afghanistan continue to be reported. From 2000 to 2003, Landmine Monitor has reported at least 428 new landmine/UXO casualties.

### *Russian Federation*

Russia has used antipersonnel mines in Chechnya, Dagestan, Tajikistan, and on the Russia-Georgia border since 1999. CCW Amended Protocol II was submitted to the State Duma for ratification in May 2000, but has not been approved. Still, Russia maintains it is complying with letter of the law. Russia stated that it stopped production of blast mines in 1997. Russia's five-year moratorium on transfer of non-detectable and non-self-destructing mines expired in 2002, but officials have stated that it is still being observed. In 2003, Russia surprisingly reported that it had destroyed more than 16.8 million antipersonnel mines from 1996 through 2002. New information in 2004 indicates Russia's antipersonnel mine stockpile may number 22-25 million, rather than the previously estimated 50 million. Russia has been increasingly involved in international demining operations.

### *Saudi Arabia*

Saudi Arabia has participated in almost every annual Meeting of States Parties, as well as all the intersessional meetings since December 2000. Saudi Arabia claims that it has never produced, exported or used antipersonnel mines, but in 2002, Saudi officials indicated for the first time that the country stockpiles antipersonnel mines. They also confirmed that the United States stockpiles mines in Saudi

Arabia, but stated that the US cannot use them on Saudi territory. In May 2001, Saudi Arabia announced it would provide \$3 million for mine action in Yemen.

### *Singapore*

Singapore remains one of the fifteen mine producers globally. While stating the need for antipersonnel mines for “legitimate security concerns,” Singapore has voted in favor of every pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996, and has attended all but one of the annual Mine Ban Treaty States Parties meetings. Singapore has maintained an indefinite moratorium on the export of all types of antipersonnel mines since February 1998. An NGO Campaign to Ban Landmines was launched in Singapore in June 2001.

### *Somalia*

Continuous conflict, including use of landmines by different factions, has prevented any meaningful mine action throughout most of the period, outside of Somaliland. The United Nations Mine Action Program, which had in 2000 and 2001 taken exploratory steps to set up mine action offices in Mogadishu, Baidoa and Garowe, was forced to abandon its efforts in 2002 due to insecurity in all of those areas. The Puntland Mine Action Center was established in August 2004 and a Landmine Impact Survey began the same month. In November 2002, 16 Somali factions (including Puntland and two representatives of the TNG) signed the Geneva Call “Deed of Commitment” to ban landmines and cooperate on mine action. Since 1999, ICRC-assisted hospitals treated more than 519 mine/UXO casualties. Since 2001, there have been at least 539 new mine/UXO casualties in Somalia.

### *Sri Lanka*

Following a UNDP assessment, the UN Mine Action Project began in July 1999, but had to be suspended in April 2000 due to the conflict. Increased fighting in 2000 and 2001 resulted in increased use of antipersonnel mines by both sides, increased military and civilian mine casualties, and the termination of UN mine action programs. Fighting stopped in December 2001, and a formal cease-fire agreement came into force in February 2002. There have been no confirmed reports of new use of mines by either government or LTTE forces since December 2001.

The cease-fire enabled a significant expansion of mine action activities in 2002: the government established a National Steering Committee on Mine Action; UNICEF and NGOs increased mine risk education activities; and, seven mine action operators cleared a combined total of more than 16.3 million square meters of land. In 2003, more than 2.1 million square meters of land were cleared, and another 629,948 square meters from January to March 2004. Mine risk education activities expanded, reaching over 200,000 people. From 1999-2003, more than 18.7 million square meters of land were cleared, and at least 300,000 people received mine risk education. In early 2004, the government set the goal to make Sri Lanka mine-free by the end of 2006.

Since 1999, at least 724 new landmine/UXO casualties have been recorded; however, UNDP believes the real number is higher. In April 2002, a five-year Disability Support Program started with the aim of improving the quality of life of persons with disabilities. In February 2003, UNDP announced the start of its “Disability Assistance Project.”

Sri Lanka has voted in favor of every pro-ban UN General Assembly Resolution and in October 2002, the government announced its willingness to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty contingent upon reaching an agreement with the LTTE prohibiting use of landmines.

#### *Syria*

In cooperation with Syrian authorities, UN peacekeeping forces in the Golan Heights initiated a program to identify and mark all mined areas in their area of operations in 2000. A mine awareness component is included in the Ministry of Health's "Safe Gardens Project," initiated in August 2000. In February 2001, the Syrian Army started landmine clearance in Lebanon, and had demined more than 955,000 square meters of land by the end of 2003. Since 1999, at least 12 new mine casualties have been reported in Syria. Although it was previously believed that Syria had not produced mines, Jordan has declared possession of Syrian-made mines.

#### *United Arab Emirates*

The UAE has voted in favor of every pro-ban UN General Assembly resolution since 1996. The UAE has stated that it has not produced or exported antipersonnel mines, and in December 2003, for the first time stated that it has no stockpile of mines. In May 2001, the UAE announced a contribution of up to \$50 million to redevelop South Lebanon, including an unknown sum for demining, survey and mine risk education activities; "Operation Emirates Solidarity" commenced in October 2001 and as of June 2004, deminers had cleared nearly 5 million square meters of land.

#### *United States Of America*

The Bush Administration announced the results of a two-and-one-half year policy review on 27 February 2004, abandoning the objective of joining the Mine Ban Treaty eventually and declaring its intent to retain antipersonnel mines indefinitely. The US apparently did not use antipersonnel mines in Yugoslavia (Kosovo) in 1999, or in Afghanistan since October 2001, or in Iraq since March 2003. It reserved the right to use antipersonnel mines during each of these conflicts, and deployed mines to the region at least in the cases of Kosovo and Iraq. Landmine Monitor has identified 74 mine casualties among US military personnel between 2001 and 2003.

US mine action funding totaled \$421.4 million between fiscal years 1999 and 2003, the largest total for any government. In addition, the State Department reports that in the last five years several hundred thousand US citizens have contributed more than \$14 million to mine action programs around the world. The Department of Defense spent over \$250 million from 1999-2003 to identify and field alternatives for landmines. The RADAM program, which would have combined existing antipersonnel and antivehicle mines into a new "mixed system," was cancelled in 2002. The Pentagon reported in May 2002 that it "will not be able to meet" the 2006 target date to develop and field alternatives to antipersonnel mines.

Congress has extended the 1992 legislative moratorium on export of antipersonnel mines several times, most recently until 23 October 2008. US antipersonnel mines stockpiled in Italy, Norway, and Spain were removed to comply with their Mine Ban Treaty obligations. The US cleared its protective minefields at the Guantanamo Bay naval base in Cuba in 1999, and now claims not to maintain minefields anywhere in the world. However, protective minefields from the Soviet era are incorporated

into the perimeter defense at locations US forces occupy in Afghanistan. The US ratified CCW Amended Protocol II in May 1999.

#### *Uzbekistan*

Uzbekistan used antipersonnel mines on its borders with Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, beginning with the Afghan border in 1998, then the Kyrgyz border in November 1999, and the Tajik border from August 2000-May 2001. Both Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan contend that Uzbekistan laid mines inside their borders. Uzbekistan declared demining by Kyrgyzstan in disputed border areas illegal. Kyrgyzstan claimed in February 2004 that Uzbekistan had replanted mines in areas that the Kyrgyz deminers had cleared in the first half of 2003. In June 2004, Uzbekistan declared it would demine its borders with Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Since 2000, incidents involving mines laid by Uzbekistan have caused at least 65 Uzbek casualties and numerous others involving Tajik and Kyrgyz citizens.

#### *Vietnam*

A National Landmine Impact Survey began in February 2004 after more than three years of negotiations. Mine/UXO survey, clearance, risk education, and survivor assistance activities by non-governmental organizations have expanded throughout the period, including into new areas of the country. The government has carried out extensive clearance, especially related to construction of the new Ho Chi Minh Highway. Vietnam states that from 1975 to 2002, the Army cleared 1,200 million square meters of land, destroying 4 million landmines and 8 million UXO. Since 1998, seven NGOs have combined to clear 12 million square meters of heavily-affected land. The government-sponsored Community Based Rehabilitation program expanded from 40 to 46 of 61 provinces by 2003. In 2001, the government established a National Coordinating Council on Disabilities. Donors have provided an estimated \$35 million for mine action in Vietnam. Vietnam confirmed continuing production of antipersonnel mines. Officials have stated that Vietnam does not and will never export landmines. Between 1975 and 2000, Vietnam recorded 104,701 mine/UXO casualties (38,849 people killed and 65,852 injured). Estimates of the current mine/UXO casualty rate range between 1,200 and 2,992 people killed or injured each year.

#### **Other**

##### *Abkhazia*

In 2001, Abkhazian authorities for the first time acknowledged that Abkhazian soldiers were using antipersonnel mines. Abkhazia maintains that both Abkhazian and Georgian forces used landmines in the Kodor Valley in October 2001 and in mid-2002. Throughout the period, private armed groups from Georgia have infiltrated into Abkhazia and laid antipersonnel mines. The Abkhazian Mine Action Center was established January 1999. HALO Trust conducted a nationwide survey of the mine problem in 1999, and determined that about 18 million square meters of land was dangerous or suspect. Between 18 December 1997 and 28 July 2004, HALO cleared a total of 4,555,216 square meters of land, and destroyed 4,816 antipersonnel mines, 521 antivehicle mines, and 4,338 UXO. The most important elements of Abkhazia's infrastructure have been demined. Systematic mine risk education programs have

been underway since early 1999. By the end of 2003, 61,955 people had received MRE. The Gagra Orthopedic Center identified 244 landmine amputees between 1995 and 2003.

#### *Chechnya*

Renewed conflict in 1999 was accompanied by extensive use of antipersonnel mines by Russian and Chechen forces. In December 1999, mine clearance operations by HALO Trust were suspended. Because of the ongoing security situation, there has been no humanitarian mine clearance since that time. Mine risk education activities also ground to a halt, but resumed in 2000. Since then, UNICEF and the ICRC have expanded their mine risk education and survivor assistance programs in Chechnya and neighboring Ingushetia, where the majority of Chechen Internally Displaced Persons reside. From 1999 to 2003, about 543,000 people took part in mine risk education sessions in Chechnya and IDP camps in the region, including 263,000 in 2003 alone. In 2001, UNICEF started data collection on civilian mine and UXO casualties in Chechnya. UNICEF has recorded 2,340 new civilian landmine and UXO casualties occurring between 1999 and the end of 2003.

#### *European Union*

All members of the European Union are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, with the exception of Poland (which is a signatory), Latvia and Finland. The EU has vigorously promoted universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. In the five years since 1999, the EU and its Member States have contributed more than €710 million to mine action.

#### *Kosovo*

The 1999 NATO bombing campaign and internal conflict left widespread contamination in Kosovo. The Mine Action Coordination Center (MACC) was set up by the UN in June 1999. It closed in December 2001, having declared Kosovo generally free of the impact of mines and UXO. It passed responsibility for clearance to the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC). During MACC operations from June 1999 to December 2001, 32 million square meters of land were cleared, with the destruction of 19,457 antipersonnel mines, 5,515 antivehicle mines, 15,940 cluster bomblets and 13,896 other items of UXO. Mines have been used on occasion, mainly in attacks against the remaining Serbian minority in Kosovo, with the last incident in May 2003. Weapons caches, including mines, continued to be uncovered by KFOR. From June 1999 through July 2004, 502 civilians were killed or injured by mines, cluster bomblets and UXO.

#### *Nagorno-Karabakh*

In January 2000, the HALO Trust resumed mine clearance operations which it had previously undertaken in 1995-96. From 2000 to 2003, HALO cleared 2,691,097 square meters of affected land manually, cleared 45,414,190 square meters by battle area clearance, surveyed 7,767,500 square meters, and destroyed 2,167 antipersonnel mines, 977 antivehicle mines and 8,710 items of UXO. Since 1999, 131 new mine/UXO casualties were reported in Nagorno-Karabakh.

### *Palestine*

A National Mine Action Committee was created in August 2002. NMAC has designed a national mine action plan and coordinated mine risk education. Mine risk education activities have grown significantly since 2001. In 2002, a UNICEF assessment of the landmine and UXO situation concluded that most affected areas are not properly fenced or marked, including Israeli military training zones. There were allegations of Israeli use of antipersonnel mines in 2000 and 2001. Armed Palestinian groups have used improvised explosive devices, and allegedly landmines as well.

### *Somaliland*

The House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for a unilateral ban on landmines in 1999 and the President endorsed the resolution. A comprehensive Landmine Impact Survey began in Somaliland in May 2002 and was completed in March 2003. It identified 357 mine-affected communities and another 772 suspected hazard areas. Mine clearance and mine survey activities expanded significantly in Somaliland in 1999 and 2000. Three NGOs have been clearing mines since 1999 and 2000. According to their information, from 1999 through 2003, they cleared a total of 2.9 million square meters of mined land and about 92 million square meters of battle area, destroying 47,613 antipersonnel mines, 1,213 antivehicle mines, and 59,168 UXO. Mine action coordination in Somaliland was seriously disrupted in 2002. As of November 2002, some 7,517 stockpiled mines had been destroyed. Officials indicated in early 2003 that there were plans for the destruction of all stockpiles, but no further destruction has been reported. Since 2001, there have been at least 349 new mine/UXO casualties in Somaliland.

### *Taiwan*

Since 1999, officials on many occasions have expressed Taiwan's support for a comprehensive ban on antipersonnel mines. In March 2001, a Ministry of National Defense spokesman stated that Taiwan no longer uses, produces, or transfers antipersonnel mines. In 2002, Taiwan sent 42,175 stockpiled antipersonnel mines to Germany for destruction. But, Taiwan has not formally taken any steps domestically to restrict or ban antipersonnel mines, and the military continues to believe some existing minefields are necessary. Six minefields on Kinmen Island and eleven on Matsu Island were cleared from 1998 to April 2001. In 2002, an area of 66,362 square meters on Kinmen was cleared, and another 114,300 square meters in 2004.

### *Western Sahara*

Polisario states that it has not used antipersonnel mines since the 1991 cease-fire, and has no stockpile of mines. Between April 1998 and May 2000, Norwegian People's Aid conducted a mine risk education program for Saharawi refugees in Algeria. In April 2004, the UN reported that since 1997 MINURSO has facilitated the discovery and marking of 1,123 mines and UXO, and has participated in 750 disposal operations.

18 September 1997

**CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND  
TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION**

**Preamble**

The States Parties,

Determined to put an end to the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, that kill or maim hundreds of people every week, mostly innocent and defenceless civilians and especially children, obstruct economic development and reconstruction, inhibit the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons, and have other severe consequences for years after emplacement,

Believing it necessary to do their utmost to contribute in an efficient and coordinated manner to face the challenge of removing anti-personnel mines placed throughout the world, and to assure their destruction,

Wishing to do their utmost in providing assistance for the care and rehabilitation, including the social and economic reintegration of mine victims,

Recognizing that a total ban of anti-personnel mines would also be an important confidence-building measure,

Welcoming the adoption of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, annexed to 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 calling for the early ratification of this Protocol by all States which have not yet done so,

Welcoming also United Nations General Assembly Resolution 51/45 S of 10 December 1996 urging all States to pursue vigorously an effective, legally-binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines,

Welcoming furthermore the measures taken over the past years, both unilaterally and multilaterally, aiming at prohibiting, restricting or suspending the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines,

Stressing the role of public conscience in furthering the principles of humanity as evidenced by the call for a total ban of anti-personnel mines and recognizing the efforts to that end undertaken by the

International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and numerous other non-governmental organizations around the world,

Recalling the Ottawa Declaration of 5 October 1996 and the Brussels Declaration of 27 June 1997 urging the international community to negotiate an international and legally binding agreement prohibiting the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines,

Emphasizing the desirability of attracting the adherence of all States to this Convention, and determined to work strenuously towards the promotion of its universalization in all relevant fora including, inter alia, the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament, regional organizations, and groupings, and review conferences 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,

Basing themselves on the principle of international humanitarian law that the right of the parties to an armed conflict to choose methods or means of warfare is not unlimited, on the principle that prohibits the employment in armed conflicts of weapons, projectiles and materials and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering and on the principle that a distinction must be made between civilians and combatants,

Have agreed as follows:

### **Article 1**

#### *General obligations*

1. Each State Party undertakes never under any circumstances:
  - a. To use anti-personnel mines;
  - b. To develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain or transfer to anyone, directly or indirectly, anti-personnel mines;
  - c. To assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention.
2. Each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

### **Article 2**

#### *Definitions*

1. "Anti-personnel mine" means a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons. Mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are

- equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.
2. "Mine" means a munition designed to be placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area and to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person or a vehicle.
  3. "Anti-handling device" means a device intended to protect a mine and which is part of, linked to, attached to or placed under the mine and which activates when an attempt is made to tamper with or otherwise intentionally disturb the mine.
  4. "Transfer" involves, in addition to the physical movement of anti-personnel mines into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the mines, but does not involve the transfer of territory containing emplaced anti-personnel mines.
  5. "Mined area" means an area which is dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines.

### **Article 3**

#### *Exceptions*

1. Notwithstanding the general obligations under Article 1, the retention or transfer of a number of anti-personnel mines for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques is permitted. The amount of such mines shall not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for the above-mentioned purposes.
2. The transfer of anti-personnel mines for the purpose of destruction is permitted.

### **Article 4**

#### *Destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines*

Except as provided for in Article 3, each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines it owns or possesses, or that are under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than four years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.

## **Article 5**

### *Destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas*

1. Each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.
2. Each State Party shall make every effort to identify all areas under its jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced and shall ensure as soon as possible that all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means, to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians, until all anti-personnel mines contained therein have been destroyed. The marking shall at least be to the standards set out in the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, annexed to 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.
3. If a State Party believes that it will be unable to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines referred to in paragraph 1 within that time period, it may submit a request to a Meeting of the States Parties or a Review Conference for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of such anti-personnel mines, for a period of up to ten years.
4. Each request shall contain:
  - a) The duration of the proposed extension;
  - b) A detailed explanation of the reasons for the proposed extension, including:
    - i. The preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programs;
    - ii. The financial and technical means available to the State Party for the destruction of all the anti-personnel mines; and
    - iii. Circumstances which impede the ability of the State Party to destroy all the anti-personnel mines in mined areas;
  - c) The humanitarian, social, economic, and environmental implications of the extension; and
  - d) Any other information relevant to the request for the proposed extension.
5. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Review Conference shall, taking into consideration the factors contained in paragraph 4, assess the request and decide by a majority of votes of States Parties present and voting whether to grant the request for an extension period.
6. Such an extension may be renewed upon the submission of a new request in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of this Article. In requesting a further extension period a State Party shall

submit relevant additional information on what has been undertaken in the previous extension period pursuant to this Article.

## **Article 6**

### *International cooperation and assistance*

1. In fulfilling its obligations under this Convention each State Party has the right to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible.
2. Each State Party undertakes to facilitate and shall have the right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of this Convention. The States Parties shall not impose undue restrictions on the provision of mine clearance equipment and related technological information for humanitarian purposes.
3. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims and for mine awareness programs. Such assistance may be provided, inter alia, through the United Nations system, international, regional or national organizations or institutions, the International Committee of the Red Cross, national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies and their International Federation, non-governmental organizations, or on a bilateral basis.
4. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for mine clearance and related activities. Such assistance may be provided, inter alia, through the United Nations system, international or regional organizations or institutions, non-governmental organizations or institutions, or on a bilateral basis, or by contributing to the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance, or other regional funds that deal with demining.
5. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines.
6. Each State Party undertakes to provide information to the database on mine clearance established within the United Nations system, especially information concerning various means and technologies of mine clearance, and lists of experts, expert agencies or national points of contact on mine clearance.
7. States Parties may request the United Nations, regional organizations, other States Parties or other competent intergovernmental or non-governmental fora to assist its authorities in the elaboration of a national demining program to determine, inter alia:
  - a) The extent and scope of the anti-personnel mine problem;

- b) The financial, technological and human resources that are required for the implementation of the program;
  - c) The estimated number of years necessary to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under the jurisdiction or control of the concerned State Party;
  - d) Mine awareness activities to reduce the incidence of mine-related injuries or deaths;
  - e) Assistance to mine victims;
  - f) The relationship between the Government of the concerned State Party and the relevant governmental, inter-governmental or non-governmental entities that will work in the implementation of the program.
8. Each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of this Article shall cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs.

### **Article 7**

#### *Transparency measures*

1. Each State Party shall report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations 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 on:
  - a) The national implementation measures referred to in Article 9;
  - b) The total of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed by it, or under its jurisdiction or control, to include a breakdown of the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine stockpiled;
  - c) To the extent possible, the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under its jurisdiction or control, to include as much detail as possible regarding the type and quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine in each mined area and when they were emplaced;
  - d) The types, quantities and, if possible, lot numbers of all anti-personnel mines retained or transferred for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques, or transferred for the purpose of destruction, as well as the institutions authorized by a State Party to retain or transfer anti-personnel mines, in accordance with Article 3;
  - e) The status of programs for the conversion or de-commissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities;
  - f) The status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, including details of the methods which will be used in destruction, the location of all destruction sites and the applicable safety and environmental standards to be observed;

- g) The types and quantities of all anti-personnel mines destroyed after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party, to include a breakdown of the quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine destroyed, in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, respectively, along with, if possible, the lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine in the case of destruction in accordance with Article 4;
  - h) The technical characteristics of each type of anti-personnel mine produced, to the extent known, and those currently owned or possessed by a State Party, giving, where reasonably possible, such categories of information as may facilitate identification and clearance of anti-personnel mines; at a minimum, this information shall include the dimensions, fusing, explosive content, metallic content, colour photographs and other information which may facilitate mine clearance; and
  - i) 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.
2. The information provided in accordance with this Article shall be updated by the States Parties annually, covering the last calendar year, and reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations not later than 30 April of each year.
3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit all such reports received to the States Parties.

### **Article 8**

#### *Facilitation and clarification of compliance*

1. The States Parties agree to consult and cooperate with each other regarding the implementation of the provisions of this Convention, and to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance by States Parties with their obligations under this Convention.
2. If one or more States Parties wish to clarify and seek to resolve questions relating to compliance with the provisions of this Convention by another State Party, it may submit, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a Request for Clarification of that matter to that State Party. Such a request shall be accompanied by all appropriate information. Each State Party shall refrain from unfounded Requests for Clarification, care being taken to avoid abuse. A State Party that receives a Request for Clarification shall provide, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, within 28 days to the requesting State Party all information which would assist in clarifying this matter.
3. If the requesting State Party does not receive a response through the Secretary-General of the United Nations within that time period, or deems the response to the Request for Clarification to be unsatisfactory, it may submit the matter through the Secretary-General of the United Nations

- to the next Meeting of the States Parties. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit the submission, accompanied by all appropriate information pertaining to the Request for Clarification, to all States Parties. All such information shall be presented to the requested State Party which shall have the right to respond.
4. Pending the convening of any meeting of the States Parties, any of the States Parties concerned may request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to exercise his or her good offices to facilitate the clarification requested.
  5. The requesting State Party may propose through the Secretary-General of the United Nations the convening of a Special Meeting of the States Parties to consider the matter. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall thereupon communicate this proposal and all information submitted by the States Parties concerned, to all States Parties with a request that they indicate whether they favour a Special Meeting of the States Parties, for the purpose of considering the matter. In the event that within 14 days from the date of such communication, at least one-third of the States Parties favours such a Special Meeting, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene this Special Meeting of the States Parties within a further 14 days. A quorum for this Meeting shall consist of a majority of States Parties.
  6. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties, as the case may be, shall first determine whether to consider the matter further, taking into account all information submitted by the States Parties concerned. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall make every effort to reach a decision by consensus. If despite all efforts to that end no agreement has been reached, it shall take this decision by a majority of States Parties present and voting.
  7. All States Parties shall cooperate fully with the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties in the fulfillment of its review of the matter, including any fact-finding missions that are authorized in accordance with paragraph 8.
  8. If further clarification is required, the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall authorize a fact-finding mission and decide on its mandate by a majority of States Parties present and voting. At any time the requested State Party may invite a fact-finding mission to its territory. Such a mission shall take place without a decision by a Meeting of the States Parties or a Special Meeting of the States Parties to authorize such a mission. The mission, consisting of up to 9 experts, designated and approved in accordance with paragraphs 9 and 10, may collect additional information on the spot or in other places directly related to the alleged compliance issue under the jurisdiction or control of the requested State Party.
  9. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall prepare and update a list of the names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts provided by States Parties and

- communicate it to all States Parties. Any expert included on this list shall be regarded as designated for all fact-finding missions unless a State Party declares its non-acceptance in writing. In the event of non-acceptance, the expert shall not participate in fact-finding missions on the territory or any other place under the jurisdiction or control of the objecting State Party, if the non-acceptance was declared prior to the appointment of the expert to such missions.
10. Upon receiving a request from the Meeting of the States Parties or a Special Meeting of the States Parties, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall, after consultations with the requested State Party, appoint the members of the mission, including its leader. Nationals of States Parties requesting the fact-finding mission or directly affected by it shall not be appointed to the mission. The members of the fact-finding mission shall enjoy privileges and immunities under Article VI of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted on 13 February 1946.
  11. Upon at least 72 hours notice, the members of the fact-finding mission shall arrive in the territory of the requested State Party at the earliest opportunity. The requested State Party shall take the necessary administrative measures to receive, transport and accommodate the mission, and shall be responsible for ensuring the security of the mission to the maximum extent possible while they are on territory under its control.
  12. Without prejudice to the sovereignty of the requested State Party, the fact-finding mission may bring into the territory of the requested State Party the necessary equipment which shall be used exclusively for gathering information on the alleged compliance issue. Prior to its arrival, the mission will advise the requested State Party of the equipment that it intends to utilize in the course of its fact-finding mission.
  13. The requested State Party shall make all efforts to ensure that the fact-finding mission is given the opportunity to speak with all relevant persons who may be able to provide information related to the alleged compliance issue.
  14. The requested State Party shall grant access for the fact-finding mission to all areas and installations under its control where facts relevant to the compliance issue could be expected to be collected. This shall be subject to any arrangements that the requested State Party considers necessary for:
    - a) The protection of sensitive equipment, information and areas;
    - b) The protection of any constitutional obligations the requested State Party may have with regard to proprietary rights, searches and seizures, or other constitutional rights; or
    - c) The physical protection and safety of the members of the fact-finding mission.

In the event that the requested State Party makes such arrangements, it shall make every reasonable effort to demonstrate through alternative means its compliance with this Convention.

15. The fact-finding mission may remain in the territory of the State Party concerned for no more than 14 days, and at any particular site no more than 7 days, unless otherwise agreed.
16. All information provided in confidence and not related to the subject matter of the fact-finding mission shall be treated on a confidential basis.
17. The fact-finding mission shall report, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties the results of its findings.
18. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall consider all relevant information, including the report submitted by the fact-finding mission, and may request the requested State Party to take measures to address the compliance issue within a specified period of time. The requested State Party shall report on all measures taken in response to this request.
19. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties may suggest to the States Parties concerned ways and means to further clarify or resolve the matter under consideration, including the initiation of appropriate procedures in conformity with international law. In circumstances where the issue at hand is determined to be due to circumstances beyond the control of the requested State Party, the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties may recommend appropriate measures, including the use of cooperative measures referred to in Article 6.
20. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall make every effort to reach its decisions referred to in paragraphs 18 and 19 by consensus, otherwise by a two-thirds majority of States Parties present and voting.

### **Article 9**

#### *National implementation measures*

Each State Party shall take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention undertaken by persons or on territory under its jurisdiction or control.

### **Article 10**

#### *Settlement of disputes*

1. The States Parties shall consult and cooperate with each other to settle any dispute that may arise with regard to the application or the interpretation of this Convention. Each State Party may bring any such dispute before the Meeting of the States Parties.
2. The Meeting of the States Parties may contribute to the settlement of the dispute by whatever means it deems appropriate, including offering its good offices, calling upon the States parties to a dispute to start the settlement procedure of their choice and recommending a time-limit for any agreed procedure.
3. This Article is without prejudice to the provisions of this Convention on facilitation and clarification of compliance.

### **Article 11**

#### *Meetings of the States Parties*

1. The States Parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention, including:
  - a) The operation and status of this Convention;
  - b) Matters arising from the reports submitted under the provisions of this Convention;
  - c) International cooperation and assistance in accordance with Article 6;
  - d) The development of technologies to clear anti-personnel mines;
  - e) Submissions of States Parties under Article 8; and
  - f) Decisions relating to submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5.
2. The First Meeting of the States Parties shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations within one year after the entry into force of this Convention. The subsequent meetings shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations annually until the first Review Conference.
3. Under the conditions set out in Article 8, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene a Special Meeting of the States Parties.
4. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend these meetings as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.

**Article 12**  
*Review Conferences*

1. A Review Conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations five years after the entry into force of this Convention. Further Review Conferences shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations if so requested by one or more States Parties, provided that the interval between Review Conferences shall in no case be less than five years. All States Parties to this Convention shall be invited to each Review Conference.
2. The purpose of the Review Conference shall be:
  - a) To review the operation and status of this Convention;
  - b) To consider the need for and the interval between further Meetings of the States Parties referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 11;
  - c) To take decisions on submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5; and
  - d) To adopt, if necessary, in its final report conclusions related to the implementation of this Convention.
3. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend each Review Conference as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.

**Article 13**  
*Amendments*

1. At any time after the entry into force of this Convention any State Party may propose amendments to this Convention. Any proposal for an amendment shall be communicated to the Depositary, who shall circulate it to all States Parties and shall seek their views on whether an Amendment Conference should be convened to consider the proposal. If a majority of the States Parties notify the Depositary no later than 30 days after its circulation that they support further consideration of the proposal, the Depositary shall convene an Amendment Conference to which all States Parties shall be invited.
2. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend each Amendment Conference as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.
3. The Amendment Conference shall be held immediately following a Meeting of the States Parties or a Review Conference unless a majority of the States Parties request that it be held earlier.

4. Any amendment to this Convention shall be adopted by a majority of two-thirds of the States Parties present and voting at the Amendment Conference. The Depositary shall communicate any amendment so adopted to the States Parties.
5. An amendment to this Convention shall enter into force for all States Parties to this Convention which have accepted it, upon the deposit with the Depositary of instruments of acceptance by a majority of States Parties. Thereafter it shall enter into force for any remaining State Party on the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance.

#### **Article 14**

##### *Costs*

1. The costs of the Meetings of the States Parties, the Special Meetings of the States Parties, the Review Conferences and the Amendment Conferences shall be borne by the States Parties and States not parties to this Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately.
2. The costs incurred by the Secretary-General of the United Nations under Articles 7 and 8 and the costs of any fact-finding mission shall be borne by the States Parties in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately.

#### **Article 15**

##### *Signature*

This Convention, done at Oslo, Norway, on 18 September 1997, shall be open for signature at Ottawa, Canada, by all States from 3 December 1997 until 4 December 1997, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 5 December 1997 until its entry into force.

#### **Article 16**

##### *Ratification, acceptance, approval or accession*

1. This Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval of the Signatories.
2. It shall be open for accession by any State which has not signed the Convention.
3. The instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession shall be deposited with the Depositary.

**Article 17**

*Entry into force*

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the sixth month after the month in which the 40th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited.
2. For any State which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession after the date of the deposit of the 40th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, this Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the sixth month after the date on which that State has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

**Article 18**

*Provisional application*

Any State may at the time of its ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, declare that it will apply provisionally paragraph 1 of Article 1 of this Convention pending its entry into force.

**Article 19**

*Reservations*

The Articles of this Convention shall not be subject to reservations.

**Article 20**

*Duration and withdrawal*

1. This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.
2. Each State Party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this Convention. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other States Parties, to the Depositary and to the United Nations Security Council. Such instrument of withdrawal shall include a full explanation of the reasons motivating this withdrawal.
3. Such withdrawal shall only take effect six months after the receipt of the instrument of withdrawal by the Depositary. If, however, on the expiry of that six-month period, the withdrawing State Party is engaged in an armed conflict, the withdrawal shall not take effect before the end of the armed conflict.

4. The withdrawal of a State Party from this Convention shall not in any way affect the duty of States to continue fulfilling the obligations assumed under any relevant rules of international law.

**Article 21**

*Depositary*

The Secretary-General of the United Nations is hereby designated as the Depositary of this Convention.

**Article 22**

*Authentic texts*

The original of this Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Twelve States Parties whose deadlines have passed have not submitted an initial transparency report.

<sup>2</sup> Burma, Eritrea, Georgia, India, Iraq, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, and Yugoslavia have used antipersonnel mines since 1999. The treaty has since entered into force for Eritrea (February 2002) and Serbia and Montenegro (March 2004).

<sup>3</sup> Angola, Ecuador, Ethiopia, and Venezuela have admitted using antipersonnel mines after signing the Mine Ban Treaty. There have been serious allegations regarding Burundi, Rwanda and Sudan as signatories and Uganda as a State Party.

<sup>4</sup> China, Finland, India, Israel, Latvia, Morocco, Pakistan, South Korea, Sri Lanka, and the United States are party to CCW Amended Protocol II but not the Mine Ban Treaty. Poland and Ukraine are party to Amended Protocol II and signatories of the Mine Ban Treaty. Latvia and Sri Lanka have expressed their intent of joining the Mine Ban Treaty in the near future. Morocco states that it is in de facto compliance with the Mine Ban Treaty.

<sup>5</sup> Amended Protocol II also regulates the use of booby-traps, other explosive devices and, to a limited extent, antivehicle mines.

<sup>6</sup> Of these, at least 17 are thought to possess antipersonnel mines: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brunei, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Myanmar (Burma), Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Syria, and Vietnam. The others are: Bahrain, Bhutan, Kuwait, Libya, Micronesia, Oman, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu, and United Arab Emirates.

<sup>7</sup> The ten countries that abstained in voting on UNGA Resolution 51/45S: Belarus, China, Cuba, Israel, North Korea, South Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Syria, and Turkey. Belarus and Turkey acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty in September 2003.

<sup>8</sup> Voting results by year on the annual UNGA resolution calling for the universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty: 1997 (Resolution 52/38A) – 142 in favor, none against, 18 abstaining; 1998 (Resolution 53/77N) – 147 in favor, none against, 21 abstaining; 1999 (Resolution 54/54B) -- 139 in favor, one against, 20 abstaining; 2000 (Resolution 55/33V) – 143 in favor, none against, 22 abstaining; 2001 (Resolution 56/24M) – 138 in favor, none against, 19 abstaining; 2002 (Resolution 57/74) -- 143 in favor, none against, 23 abstaining; 2003 (Resolution 58/53) – 153 in favor, none against, 23 abstaining.

<sup>9</sup> Belarus, Eritrea, Estonia, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, and Turkey consistently voted for the resolutions prior to their accession.

<sup>10</sup> Thirty-five States have ratified the Amendment of CCW Article 1 as of 1 October 2004: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Holy See, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Romania, Serbia & Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

<sup>11</sup> Israel and Sri Lanka used antipersonnel mines after December 1998, but prior to when they became States Parties to Amended Protocol II.

<sup>12</sup> There is confirmed use by Afghanistan, Angola, Burma/Myanmar, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, and FR Yugoslavia.

<sup>13</sup> There is compelling evidence of use by Burundi, Georgia, Rwanda, Sudan, and Uganda. All of these governments deny use.

<sup>14</sup> There are 51 confirmed current and past producers. Not included in that total of 51 are the following. Five States Parties have been cited as past producers, but deny it: Croatia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Thailand, and Venezuela. Croatia unsuccessfully attempted to replicate production of the PMA-3 antipersonnel mine but discontinued this activity. Officials from Nicaragua note that the former government produced crude antipersonnel mines around 1985 during the civil war period but this activity stopped before the end of the war. In addition to those five, there remain unanswered ambiguities about past antipersonnel mine production in Sudan and Syria. Jordan declared possessing a small number of mines of Syrian origin in 2000. It is unclear if this represents the result of production, export, or capture. There was one unconfirmed US government report in 2000 that identified Sudan as a current producer of landmines, an allegation not been seen before or since.

<sup>15</sup> Thirty-three States Parties that once produced antipersonnel mines include: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>16</sup> Production of antipersonnel mines in Finland ended in the early 1970s. Israel confirmed to Landmine Monitor in 2004 that its production lines for antipersonnel mines have been decommissioned. Mine Ban Treaty signatory Poland has voluntarily disclosed that its production activities stopped in 1988.

<sup>17</sup> Albania, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Peru, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda, and the United Kingdom. Fourteen others have not officially declared the ultimate disposition of production capabilities in transparency reports despite admissions or evidence of prior production activities, which includes the loading, assembling, and packing of antipersonnel mines:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Serbia and Montenegro, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe. For many of these states, however, antipersonnel mine production ceased prior to entry into force of the treaty.

<sup>18</sup> Former major producers and exporters include: Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina (former Yugoslavia), Bulgaria, Czech Republic (former Czechoslovakia), France, Germany (including former East Germany), Hungary, Italy, and United Kingdom.

<sup>19</sup> Approximately 158,000 antipersonnel mines declared by States Parties cannot be attributed to a source because of the use of non-standard nomenclature by the declaring state.

<sup>20</sup> Ex-USSR states now party to the Mine Ban Treaty Belarus, Lithuania, Moldova, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan declared stockpiles; Estonia has not. All states of the ex-Yugoslavia declared stockpiles: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, and Slovenia.

<sup>21</sup> Other major suppliers were Brazil, Germany (including the former East Germany), Spain, and the former Yugoslavia, followed by Belgium, Chile, former Czechoslovakia, France, Israel, Italy, Pakistan, and Singapore. Lesser exporters included Argentina, Egypt, Hungary, India, Iran, North Korea, Portugal, South Africa, Syria, and the United Kingdom.

<sup>22</sup> Statement by Ambassador Paul Meyer, Canada, to the Conference on Disarmament, 29 July 2004.

<sup>23</sup> As of 1 October 2004, Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, Cyprus, Guinea-Bissau, and Mauritania had begun destruction, while Algeria, Bangladesh, DR Congo, Greece, and Zambia were in the planning stage.

<sup>24</sup> As of 1 October 2004, the following states have completed the destruction of their antipersonnel mine stockpiles: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Republic of Congo, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia FYR, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Yemen, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>25</sup> In addition to the 13 States Parties already carrying out stockpile destruction, Guyana, Serbia & Montenegro, and Turkey hold stocks, and it is likely that Burundi and Sudan do as well.

<sup>26</sup> The following States Parties have declared not possessing antipersonnel mine stockpiles: Andorra, Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Comoros,

Costa Rica, Cote D'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Fiji, The Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Nauru, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, St. Kitts & Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo, and Trinidad & Tobago.

<sup>27</sup> Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Guyana, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Sao Tome & Principe, Serbia & Montenegro, Sudan, Turkey need to officially declare the presence or absence of antipersonnel mine stockpiles.

<sup>28</sup> According to new information received by Landmine Monitor in 2004, which has yet to be confirmed, Russia's stockpile could total closer to 22-25 million antipersonnel mines.

<sup>29</sup> Seventeen States Parties that once stockpiled antipersonnel mines chose not to retain any under Article 3: Albania, Austria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Switzerland, Turkmenistan.

<sup>30</sup> It is not known whether Afghanistan, Botswana, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., DR Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Guyana, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, St. Vincent & Grenadines, Sao Tome & Principe, Serbia & Montenegro, or Sudan will choose to retain antipersonnel mines under Article 3.

<sup>31</sup> Thirty-four States Parties retain between 1,000 and 5,000 antipersonnel mines: Angola, Argentina, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Czech Rep., Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, France, Germany, Hungary, Kenya, Macedonia FYR, Mali, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zambia.

<sup>32</sup> Twenty States Parties retain less than 1,000 antipersonnel mines: Colombia, Republic of Congo, Cyprus, El Salvador, Eritrea, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Moldova, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Tajikistan, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>33</sup> Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Italy, Spain, Turkmenistan originally intended to retain over 10,000 antipersonnel mines or over.

<sup>34</sup> Forty States Parties have enacted implementation legislation: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Rep., France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, St. Vincent & Grenadines, Seychelles, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad & Tobago, United Kingdom, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>35</sup> Twenty-seven States Parties are in the process of enacting legislation: Albania, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Croatia, DR Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Gabon, Guinea, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Uganda, and Yemen.

<sup>36</sup> Thirty-four States Parties have deemed existing law sufficient or do not consider new legislation is necessary: Algeria, Andorra, Antigua & Barbuda, Belarus, Bulgaria, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Guinea Bissau, Holy See, Jordan, Kiribati, Lesotho, Macedonia FYR, Madagascar, Mexico, Moldova, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, and Venezuela.

<sup>37</sup> Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., Chad, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominica, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, The Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Liberia, Lithuania, Malawi, Maldives, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, Sao Tome e Principe, Serbia & Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, and Uruguay.

<sup>38</sup> Available at [www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JR2C?OpenDocument](http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JR2C?OpenDocument), accessed on 14 October 2004.

<sup>39</sup> Previous editions of the *Landmine Monitor Report* contain statements on or developments regarding the legality of joint operations from Australia, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Rep., Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe. Each individual country report in this edition contains a summary of their position and statements.

<sup>40</sup> Stuart Maslen, *Commentaries on Arms Control Treaties, Volume 1, The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2004), pp. 92-95.

<sup>41</sup> Previous editions of the *Landmine Monitor Report* contain statements or developments on the issue of foreign stockpiling and transit of antipersonnel mines from States Parties Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Guinea, Hungary, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Portugal, Samoa, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Each individual country report in this edition contains a summary of their position and statements.

<sup>42</sup> Apart from the seven States Parties, the countries have included: Bahrain, Greece, Kuwait, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea. *Landmine Monitor* had included then non-State Party Turkey on this list

in the past, but Turkey now denies the presence of US stockpiles of antipersonnel mines. Greece is also a State Party now, but the current status of US mines there is unknown.

<sup>43</sup> Previous editions of the *Landmine Monitor Report* contain statements or developments on the applicability of Article 2 to all mines from States Parties Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Each individual country report in this edition contains a summary of their position and statements.

<sup>44</sup> States Parties that possess Claymore-type mines: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Lithuania, Malaysia, Moldova, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Serbia & Montenegro, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>45</sup> States Parties that do not possess Claymore type mines: Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Czech Rep., El Salvador, France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Turkmenistan, Uruguay, and Yemen.

<sup>46</sup> One known minefield remains in Djibouti, but it is under the jurisdiction and control of France.

<sup>47</sup> Afghanistan, Angola, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, DR Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Estonia, FYR Macedonia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iraq, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Perú, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Tajikistan, Yemen, and Zambia, as well as the Caucasus region, Kosovo, Somaliland, and Western Sahara.

<sup>48</sup> NGO perspective on the Debris of War, “Cost-effectiveness in Humanitarian Mine Action,” Presentation to the Resource Mobilization Contact Group, Geneva, 10 February 2004.

<sup>49</sup> The total for square meters cleared excludes area reduction and battle area clearance where known. If not specified as antipersonnel or antivehicle, “landmines” are included in the antipersonnel mine total.

<sup>50</sup> Ruth Bottomley, *Crossing the Divide, Landmines, Villagers and Organisations*, (Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, 2003), p. 130.

<sup>51</sup> Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, France (Djibouti), FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Perú, Senegal, United Kingdom (Falklands/Malvinas), Yemen and Zimbabwe.

<sup>52</sup> Statement by the Delegation of the United States, Organization of American States AG/RES.2003 (XXXIV-O/04), “Americas as an AP Landmine-Free Zone,” 8 June 2004.

<sup>53</sup> Countries listed here are countries where a national body has been created in order to be responsible for coordination of mine action activities. Countries where this responsibility lies within the Ministry of Defense, the Defense Forces or similar are not listed.

<sup>54</sup> The NGOs are DanChurchAid, Danish Demining Group, the HALO Trust, Handicap International, and Norwegian People's Aid. Landmine Action UK has joined more recently and MAG is an observer. The presentation can be found at [www.dca.dk/usr/noedhjaelp/DCAweb.nsf/UNIDInformationsdokumenter/555046DC275A908DC1256E3F003D02E6?OpenDocument](http://www.dca.dk/usr/noedhjaelp/DCAweb.nsf/UNIDInformationsdokumenter/555046DC275A908DC1256E3F003D02E6?OpenDocument), accessed on 13 October 2004.

<sup>55</sup> For more information see the UNDP contribution in this *Landmine Monitor Report*.

<sup>56</sup> Statement by ICBL and UNICEF at the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 22 June 2004.

<sup>57</sup> For a broader definition of mine risk education, see *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, p. 34.

<sup>58</sup> UNMAS, "Guide for the management of mine risk education," IMAS 07.11, First Edition, 23 December 2003, p. 2.

<sup>59</sup> The ICRC reported in June 2004 that it had just decided, after a two-week workshop, to change "mine awareness" to "mine risk education." "Mine Risk Education Working Group Minutes," 23 June 2004.

<sup>60</sup> See for instance, International Committee of the Red Cross, "ICRC Afghanistan Mine Action Program Annual Report (January-December 2003)," January 2004, p. 6.

<sup>61</sup> Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, FYR Macedonia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Perú, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Vietnam and Yemen, as well as Chechnya, Kosovo and Palestine.

<sup>62</sup> *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, p. 33.

<sup>63</sup> Other international agencies active in mine risk education have included: Africare, Association for Aid and Relief-Japan, Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale, Australian Volunteers International, the BBC/Afghan Education Project, Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief, CAMEO, CARE, Caritas, Catholic Relief Services, Danish Demining Group, HAMAP Démineurs, HELP, HMD Response, HUMAID, INTERSOS, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Landmine Survivors Network, Médecins sans Frontières, MERLIN, Mines Awareness Trust, Non Violence International, Norwegian People's Aid, Oxfam, Peace Trees Vietnam, Potsdam

Kommunikation, Solidarity Service International, Santa Barbara Foundation, Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, World Education, World Learning, World Rehabilitation Fund, World Vision. Occasionally, international private companies also conducted MRE.

<sup>64</sup> Email to Landmine Monitor (HI) from Reuben McCarthy, MRE Officer, UNICEF New York, 1 October 2004.

<sup>65</sup> GICHD, *The Role of the Military in Mine Action*, Geneva, June 2003, p. 13.

<sup>66</sup> Ian Mansfield, “The Role of the Military in Mine Action,” *Disarmament Forum: Disarmament, Development and Mine Action*, UNIDIR, Issue Number 3, 2003, p. 39.

<sup>67</sup> The Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices method was first applied to MRE by HI. See *Landmine Monitor 2003*, p. 37.

<sup>68</sup> *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, p. 218.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, p. 465.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*, p. 497.

<sup>71</sup> See [www.mineactionstandards.org](http://www.mineactionstandards.org).

<sup>72</sup> “MRE Working Group Meeting - 19 September 2003 Bangkok: Minutes of the meeting,” undated, p. 6.

<sup>73</sup> See *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, p. 37.

<sup>74</sup> UNMAS, “Internal Review of the Landmine and Unexploded Ordnance Safety Project (LSP) (July-December 2003),” New York, May 2004.

<sup>75</sup> Recent statements and more information on the Sub-Group are available at [www.icbl.org/wg/mre](http://www.icbl.org/wg/mre), as well as in the ICBL section of this *Landmine Monitor Report*.

<sup>76</sup> Afghanistan, Thailand, Senegal, Eritrea, Mauritania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Mozambique, Jordan, Uganda, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Sudan, Burundi, Malawi, Albania, Perú, Republic of Congo and Chad.

<sup>77</sup> For more details on Victim Assistance funding see *Landmine Monitor Report 2004: Executive Summary*.

<sup>78</sup> For the purposes of Landmine Monitor research, casualties include the individuals killed or injured as a result of an incident involving antipersonnel mines, antivehicle mines, improvised explosive devices, dud cluster munitions, and other unexploded ordnance. From the information available in many countries it is not always possible to determine with certainty the type of weapon that caused the incident. Where this level of detail is available, information is included in the country report. If only incidents caused by UXO are identified in a particular country, then that country is not included in the table.

<sup>79</sup> These include Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, Somaliland, and Western Sahara.

<sup>80</sup> The reported new casualties should be viewed as a minimum as some heavily mine-affected countries were not able to provide statistics for the full year, for example, Iraq. Some reports refer to several people killed or injured without a specific figure being given; no estimates are included in the total. Furthermore, the figures for mine casualties involving women and children should also be viewed as a minimum; in many instances, this level of detail was not made available to Landmine Monitor.

<sup>81</sup> In 2002, more than 8,333 new mine/UXO casualties were reported, in 2001 more than 8,417, and in 2000 more than 8,378. The total figure since 1999 includes almost 3,000 new casualties identified over various time periods in 2004.

<sup>82</sup> In addition to the mine-affected countries, Landmine Monitor has identified mine and UXO survivors in: Bolivia, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Estonia, Hungary, Kenya, Indonesia, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panamá, Tanzania, and Timor Leste.

<sup>83</sup> Rahul Chandran, Director, Comprehensive Disabled Afghans Program, presentation to the Opening Ceremony of the Asia-Pacific Landmine Monitor Researcher's Meeting, Kabul, 27 March 2004.

<sup>84</sup> For further information, see ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance, *Guidelines for the Care and Rehabilitation of Survivors*; see also, *Providing assistance to landmine victims: A collection of guidelines, best practices and methodologies*, compiled by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, Socio-Economic Reintegration and Mine Awareness, May 2001.

<sup>85</sup> More detailed information was compiled by Handicap International in *Landmine Victim Assistance: World Report 2002*, which examines a wide range of indicators to determine a State's capacity to adequately address the needs of persons with disabilities, including landmine survivors.

<sup>86</sup> For the full report see Handicap International, "Lessons Learned Workshop: A Review of Assistance Programs for War Wounded and other Persons Living in Mine-Affected Countries," Paris, 25-28 May 2004, available at [www.handicap-international.org](http://www.handicap-international.org).

<sup>87</sup> See also Handicap International, “Landmine Victim Assistance in South East Europe,” Brussels, September 2003, available at [www.handicapinternational.be/downloads/ITFVASstudyfinalreport.pdf](http://www.handicapinternational.be/downloads/ITFVASstudyfinalreport.pdf), accessed 14 October 2004.

<sup>88</sup> More information on the SC-VA, including texts of presentations, is available at [www.gichd.ch](http://www.gichd.ch).

<sup>89</sup> Fourteen States Parties submitted the Form J with their Article 7 Report in 2001: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Honduras, Japan, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Perú, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.

<sup>90</sup> In addition nine States Parties, (Benin, Chad, Chile, Malta, Romania, Rwanda, Slovakia, Tanzania, and Uruguay), submitted the Form J to report on other issues. Poland, though not a State Party, also submitted an Article 7 Report with the Form J to report on its support for mine action.

<sup>91</sup> UNGA Resolution 56/168.

<sup>92</sup> For more information see [www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights); see also [www.rightsforall.com](http://www.rightsforall.com).

<sup>93</sup> In some cases, donors are not reporting for the calendar year 2003. Among the countries reporting for different fiscal years are the US (October 2002-September 2003), Japan (March 2003-February 2004), Canada (April 2003-March 2004), UK (April 2003- April 2004), and Australia (July 2003-June 2004).

<sup>94</sup> For example, with respect to the Euro, Landmine Monitor has used these average rates: in 2003, €=\$1.13; in 2002, €=\$0.95; in 2001, €=\$0.90. US Federal Reserve, “List of Exchange Rates (Annual),” 2 January 2004.

<sup>95</sup> Mine Ban Treaty Resource Mobilization Contact Group, “A review of resources to achieve the Convention’s Aims,” Presented by Norway to the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention, 25 June 2004. The countries reporting the largest contributions included Croatia (\$90.5 million), Jordan (\$35.1 million), Nicaragua (\$15.6 million), Yemen (\$9 million), Colombia (\$8.5 million), Mozambique (\$4.6 million), Thailand (\$3.6 million), Chad (\$3.5 million), Serbia and Montenegro (\$3.5 million), and Peru (\$3.4 million).

<sup>96</sup> Others with increased mine action funding were Ireland (up 18 percent), Finland (17 percent), New Zealand (14 percent), and Switzerland (6 percent). Switzerland only provided figures in US dollars.

<sup>97</sup> Others with decreased mine action funding were Denmark (6 percent), Germany (4 percent), United Kingdom (2 percent) and Norway (0.25 percent). The Netherlands only provided figures in US dollars.

<sup>98</sup> Includes contributions from the Czech Republic, Slovenia, United Arab Emirates, and ten smaller donors.

<sup>99</sup> Includes China (\$6.2 million), Luxembourg (\$3.8 million), Saudi Arabia (\$3 million), Slovenia (\$3 million), Iceland (\$1.3 million), South Korea (\$1 million), and \$2 million for other donors such as Brazil, Czech Republic, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Portugal, Slovakia, South Africa, and more. The total also includes \$2.5 million provided by the United Arab Emirates for Lebanon through the UN Voluntary Trust Fund in 2002 and 2003, but does not include the unknown bilateral contribution as part of the UAE's \$50 million pledge for mine action in and re-development of South Lebanon.

<sup>100</sup> Figures for years prior to 2003 are taken from the Executive Summary of *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, although in some cases, corrections to earlier years have been received. In most but not all instances, the figures for earlier years are calculated at the exchange rates for those years.

<sup>101</sup> All amounts are expressed in US dollars. This data was collated following an analysis by Landmine Monitor of Form J attachments to Article 7 reports, the audited accounts of the ICRC Special Appeal for Mine Action and the ICRC Special Fund for the Disabled, information provided by the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF), USAID, "Patrick J. Leahy War Victims Fund: 2004 Portfolio Synopsis," p. 74, and other relevant data provided to Landmine Monitor. Full details are available on request.

<sup>102</sup> Contributions to mine victim assistance from the European Commission in 1999 and 2003 are included in these calculations.

<sup>103</sup> It should be noted that ICRC financial accounts are based on a calendar year whereas some donors have different fiscal years. In some instances, reported contributions are not reflected in the figures presented in the ICRC analysis due to timing differences.

<sup>104</sup> ICRC Special Appeal Mine Action 1999-2003. Landmine Monitor analysis of KPMG Auditor's Report "Assistance for Mine Victims: Auditor's report on supplementary information on the Special Appeal" for the years ended 31 December 1999, 31 December 2000, 31 December 2001, 31 December 2002, and 31 December 2003. Exchange rates used are taken for the US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Annual)," 2 January 2004 and 31 December 2002: for 2003 US\$1 = CHF 1.3454; US\$1 = CHF1.5567 for 2002; US\$1 = CHF1.6891 for 2001; US\$1 = CHF 1.6904 for 2000; and US\$1 = CHF 1.5045 for 1999. Only the portion of contributions relating to mine victim assistance activities has been included in the total funding provided by donors.

<sup>105</sup> ICRC Special Appeal Mine Action 1999-2003. Landmine Monitor analysis of KPMG Auditor's Report "Assistance for Mine Victims: Auditor's report on supplementary information on the Special Appeal" for the years ended 31 December 1999, 31 December 2000, 31 December 2001, 31 December 2002, and 31 December 2003. Exchange rates used are taken for the US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Annual)," 2 January 2004 and 31 December 2002: for 2003 US\$1 = CHF 1.3454; US\$1

---

= CHF1.5567 for 2002; US\$1 = CHF1.6891 for 2001; US\$1 = CHF 1.6904 for 2000; and US\$1 = CHF 1.5045 for 1999.

<sup>106</sup> Email from Sabina Beber, Head of International Relations, ITF, 13 May 2004; see also *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, p. 445.

<sup>107</sup> International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance, “Annual Report 2002,” p. 19.

<sup>108</sup> Others included the DR Congo (\$3.8 million), Yemen (\$3.63 million), Albania (\$3.6 million), Ethiopia (\$2.5 million), Kosovo (\$2.2 million), Somaliland (\$2.1 million), Georgia (\$1.4 million), Guinea-Bissau (\$1.2 million), Thailand (\$1.2 million), Chad (\$1.2 million), and Jordan (\$1.1 million).