

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

APLC/MSP.5/2003/5  
17 October 2003

ENGLISH  
Original: ENGLISH/FRENCH/  
SPANISH

---

Fifth Meeting  
Bangkok, 15-19 September 2003  
Item 18 of the agenda

**FINAL REPORT**

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

- Part I. Organization and Work of the Fifth Meeting
- Part II. Declaration of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties

**Annexes**

- Annex I. Agenda of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties
- Annex II. Report of the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties with respect to Consultations on Preparations for the Convention's First Review Conference
- Annex III. Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit September 2002-September 2003
- Annex IV. Estimated Costs for Convening the Preparatory Meetings for the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction
- Annex V. President's Action Programme

Annexes (continued)

Annex VI. Final Reports of the Standing Committees

Annex VII. Lima Declaration: For a Hemisphere Free of Anti-personnel Mines

Annex VIII. Declaration of the Human Security Network for the Universalization of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction

Annex IX. List of Documents

## PART I

### ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF THE FIFTH MEETING

#### A. Introduction

1. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction provides in article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2, that: “The States parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention, 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”;
- and,

Meetings subsequent to the First Meeting of the States Parties “shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations annually until the first Review Conference”.

2. At its fifty-seventh session, the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 57/74 requested the Secretary-General, “in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention in Bangkok, from 15 to 19 September 2003, and, on behalf of States parties and according to article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the 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 to attend the meeting as observers”.

3. To prepare for the Fifth Meeting, the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, established by the States parties, held two meetings, to which all interested States parties, States not parties to the Convention, the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and relevant non-governmental organizations were encouraged to attend.

4. The first meeting of the Standing Committee was held on 3 and 7 February 2003. During the meeting, participants considered a number of issues relating to the organization of the Fifth Meeting, including a draft of a provisional agenda, a draft of a provisional programme of work, draft rules of procedure and provisional estimated costs for convening the Fifth Meeting. No objections were raised in connection with these proposals and it was the sense of the

Co-Chairs that they would be put before the Fifth Meeting. It was also the Co-Chairs' view that matters pertaining to documentation should proceed in a manner consistent with previous meetings of the States parties (i.e., all other conference documents with the exception of reports submitted under article 7 of the Convention being finalized in all six languages of the Convention and the record of work of the four Standing Committees being communicated to the meeting in the form of final reports prepared by the Co-Chairs of each Standing Committee).

5. The second meeting of the Standing Committee was held on 12 and 16 May 2003. During the meeting, no objections were made with respect to a revised provisional programme of work, and it was the Co-Chairs' sense that it would be put before the Fifth Meeting in place of the programme that had been reviewed at the Standing Committee's February 2003 meeting.

6. The opening of the Fifth Meeting was preceded by a ceremony at which statements were delivered by Her Royal Highness Princess Galyani Vadhana Krom Luang Naradhiwas Rajanagarindra of Thailand, Her Royal Highness Princess Astrid of Belgium, and His Excellency Deputy Prime Minister General Chavalit Yongjaiyudh of Thailand.

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

7. The Fifth Meeting was opened on 15 September 2003 by the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium. The Fifth Meeting elected by acclamation His Excellency Dr. Surakiart Sathirathai, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, as its President in accordance with rule 5 of the rules of procedure.

8. At the opening session, a message addressed to the Fifth Meeting by the Secretary-General of the United Nations was read by Mr. Kim Hak Su, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, and a statement was made by Jody Williams, 1997 Nobel Peace Prize Co-Laureate and Ambassador for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. In addition, a message of the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross was read by Professor Dr. Daniel Thürer, Vice-President of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

9. At its first plenary meeting on 15 September 2003, the Fifth Meeting adopted its agenda as contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/1. On the same occasion, the Fifth Meeting adopted its rules of procedure as contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/3, the estimated costs for convening the Fifth Meeting as contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/4, and its programme of work as contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/2.

10. Also at its first plenary meeting, representatives from Austria, Belgium, Colombia, France, Kenya, Peru, Romania and Switzerland were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the Fifth Meeting.

11. The meeting unanimously confirmed the nomination of Major General Gitti Suksomstarn, Director-General of Thailand Mine Action Center and Ms. Atchara Suyanan, Director-General of the Department of International Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, as Co-Secretaries-General of the meeting. The meeting also took note of the

appointment by the United Nations Secretary-General of Mr. Enrique Roman-Morey, Director of the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, as Executive Secretary of the meeting, and the appointment by the President of Mr. Kerry Brinkert, Manager of the Implementation Support Unit, as the President's Executive Coordinator.

### C. Participation in the Fifth Meeting

12. Eighty-seven States parties participated in the meeting: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, France, Gabon, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of), Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova (Republic of), Monaco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

13. Four States that had ratified or acceded to the Convention, but for which the Convention had not yet entered into force, participated in the meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Belarus, Guyana, Lithuania, Timor-Leste.

14. Nine signatories that have not ratified the Convention participated in the meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Poland, Sudan and Ukraine.

15. A further 19 States not parties to the Convention participated in the meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Bhutan, China, Egypt, Finland, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

16. Delegation information submitted in accordance with rule 4 of the rules of procedure of the meeting was received from 119 States mentioned in paragraphs 12 to 15 above. The meeting took note of this.

17. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the rules of procedure, the following international organizations and institutions, regional organizations, entities and non-governmental organizations attended the meeting as observers: European Commission, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Committee of the Red Cross, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, Organization of American States, Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, United Nations Development Programme, UNICEF, United Nations Department for

Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Mine Action Service. In accordance with rule 1, paragraph 4, the following organizations attended the meeting as observers at the invitation of the meeting: Disability Action Council, International Peace Research Institute, International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance, Korea Mine Action Group, Tamils Rehabilitation Organization, the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) and Mr. Barzani - Mine Action Expert.

18. A list of all delegations to the Fifth Meeting is contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/INF.2/Rev.1.

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

19. The Fifth Meeting held nine plenary meetings from 15 to 19 September 2003.

20. The first four plenary meetings were devoted to the general exchange of views under agenda item 10. Delegations of 53 States parties, 16 observer States and 4 observer organizations made statements in the general exchange of views, including rights of reply.

21. At the fifth plenary meeting, on 17 September 2003, and the sixth plenary meeting, on 18 September 2003, the meeting reviewed the general status and operation of the Convention, expressing satisfaction that 136 States have ratified or acceded to the Convention. The meeting also expressed satisfaction that the international norm established by the Convention is taking hold as demonstrated by the successful record of implementation of the Convention as well as the changing behaviour of many States not parties to the Convention. The meeting expressed satisfaction that efforts to implement the Convention are making a difference, that more than 110 States parties now no longer possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, that considerable areas of mined land have been cleared over the past year, that casualty rates have been reduced in several of the world's most mine-affected States, and that more and better efforts are being undertaken to assist landmine victims.

22. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, States parties took note of the challenges that remain in achieving the Convention's core humanitarian aims, expressing their will to continue to focus with greater clarity in the period leading to the First Review Conference, on those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian aims of the Convention: clearing mined land, assisting victims, destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines and universalizing the Convention's comprehensive prohibition on anti-personnel mines. The importance of this was also noted with respect to confidence building, conflict resolution, peace-building and development.

23. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, States parties underscored the importance of universalization and expressed appreciation for the work of the Universalization Contact Group. In addition, States parties noted the value of military-to-military dialogue, the efforts of parliamentarians and regional initiatives to promote universalization. Also under this agenda item, Switzerland proposed that an informal reflection group discuss the issue of non-State actors. Colombia proposed that discussions on the issue of non-State actors take place within the Universalization Contact Group. Several delegations, while emphasizing the importance of addressing the issue, stressed that at this point discussions should take place outside the framework of the Convention.

24. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, matters regarding mobilization of resources to achieve the Convention's aims were highlighted, with the meeting noting that over US\$ 1.6 billion has been generated for mine action since the Convention entered into force and that mine-affected States parties themselves have made substantial contributions to resolving their own landmine problems. The States parties acknowledged significant challenges that remain and recalled that they collectively have committed to eliminating anti-personnel mines. In this context, the Resource Mobilization Contact Group informed the meeting that it had identified the following concrete goals and objectives: to help understanding the extent of needs; to renew commitments and ensure their sustainability; to engage a wide range of actors; and to make the most out of available resources. In this regard, the meeting called upon: States parties in a position to do so to renew their commitment to ensure sustainability of resources necessary to implement the Convention; mine-affected States parties, United Nations funds, agencies and programmes, the World Bank and regional development banks, international and national non-governmental organizations to integrate mine action into all relevant humanitarian and development activities; and all States parties and relevant organizations to share information on matters pertaining to resource mobilization in advance of the First Review Conference.

25. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, the meeting took note of how informal discussions on various articles of the Convention have improved clarity and understanding. In this regard, 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.

26. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, the meeting considered matters pertaining to reporting under article 7 of the Convention. All States parties were encouraged to place a renewed emphasis on ensuring reports were submitted as required in advance of the First Review Conference. In addition, States parties were encouraged to submit reports electronically and to maximize the potential of the reporting format as an important tool to measure progress and communicate needs.

27. At the sixth plenary meeting, on 18 September 2003, the meeting considered the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention. The President notified the meeting that he had not been informed that any State wished to make such a request at the Fifth Meeting. The meeting took note of this.

28. At the same plenary, the meeting considered the submission of requests under article 8 of the Convention. The President notified the meeting that he had not been informed that any State wished to make such a request at the Fifth Meeting. The meeting took note of this.

29. In addition, within the framework of the seventh and eighth plenary meetings, the meeting held informal consultations on international cooperation and assistance in accordance with article 6 on the following topics: victim assistance and socio-economic reintegration; mine

clearance, mine-risk education and related technologies; and, the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines. These consultations involved a review of the work of the relevant Standing Committees, as recorded in their reports contained in annex VI, with a focus on the actions recommended by the Committees.

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

30. Further to the recommendations made by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the meeting emphasized the value and importance of the Intersessional Work Programme and highlighted the need to continue to focus with greater clarity on the areas most directly related to the core humanitarian aims. In this regard, the meeting called upon States parties requiring assistance for mine clearance, those requiring assistance in meeting the needs of landmine victims, and those in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines to ensure that prior to the First Review Conference plans are in place consistent with the Convention's deadlines, to take concrete steps to implement these plans, and to use the opportunity presented by the Intersessional Work Programme to present their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.

31. Pursuant to consultations undertaken by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the meeting agreed to set the dates of the 2004 meetings of the Standing Committees from 9-12 February and from 21-25 June and identified the following States parties as the Standing Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the First Review Conference:

- Mine Clearance, Mine-Risk Education and Mine-Action Technologies: Cambodia and Japan (Co-Chairs); Algeria and Sweden (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Australia and Croatia (Co-Chairs); Nicaragua and Norway (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Stockpile Destruction: Guatemala and Italy (Co-Chairs); Bangladesh and Canada (Co-Rapporteurs);
- General Status and Operation of the Convention: Mexico and the Netherlands (Co-Chairs); New Zealand and South Africa (Co-Rapporteurs).

32. The States parties noted that as the 2003-2004 Intersessional Programme will culminate in the First Review Conference rather than an annual meeting of the States parties, the appointment of Co-Rapporteurs for 2003-2004 should be made without prejudice to the decisions taken at the Review Conference with respect to these Co-Rapporteurs assuming further roles in the period following the First Review Conference.

33. States parties again recognized the value and importance of the Coordinating Committee in the effective functioning and implementation of the Convention and for operating in an open and transparent manner. The meeting requested that the Coordinating Committee, in a manner

consistent with its mandate, continue to be practical-minded and apply the principle of flexibility with respect to the format of Standing Committee meetings, and their sequencing and respective time allocation, and continue with its practice of making available summary reports of its meetings on the web site of the GICHD. In addition, the meeting requested the President, as Chair of the Coordinating Committee, to continue to report on the Coordinating Committee's functioning.

34. The meeting noted the Director of the GICHD's report on the activities of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), contained in annex III. States parties expressed their appreciation to the GICHD for the manner in which the ISU is making a positive contribution in support of the States parties' efforts to implement the Convention.

35. The meeting again noted the work undertaken by these interested States parties through the establishment of the Sponsorship Programme, which continues to ensure widespread representation at meetings of the Convention. States parties encouraged additional contributions to the Sponsorship Programme to sustain the programme until the First Review Conference and called upon those who have benefited from the programme to review their required level of assistance in order to ensure necessary support for others. In addition, the meeting expressed its appreciation for the Sponsorship Programme and for the efficient management thereof by the GICHD.

36. States parties endorsed, and expressed satisfaction with, the work of the Standing Committees, welcoming the reports of the Standing Committees, as contained in annex VI. The meeting was in general agreement with the recommendations made by the Standing Committees and urged States parties and all other relevant parties, where appropriate, to act with urgency on these recommendations.

37. At its final plenary meeting, on 19 September 2003, on the basis of the report of the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties with respect to Consultations on Preparations for the Convention's First Review Conference, document APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.2 and in accordance with article 12 of the Convention, the meeting agreed to hold the Convention's First Review Conference at the United Nations facilities in Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December 2004 and to hold preparatory meetings in United Nations facilities in Geneva on 13 February and 28-29 June 2004.

38. In addition, the meeting agreed to designate Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria as the President of the First Review Conference, to request that Kenya designate a Secretary-General of the Review Conference, to accept the estimated costs prepared by the United Nations for convening the preparatory meetings as contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.4, and to proceed with a preparatory process in a manner consistent with the elements contained in the report of the President of the Fourth Meeting. Finally, the meeting urged participation at the highest possible level in a high-level segment to be held at the end of the First Review Conference.

39. At the same plenary, the meeting adopted the Declaration of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties - the Bangkok Declaration, which is contained in Part II of this report. In addition, the meeting warmly welcomed the President's Action Programme, contained in annex V, as a practical means of focusing the collective efforts of States parties and other actors in progress in achieving the Convention's core humanitarian aims in the period leading to the Convention's First Review Conference.

#### **F. Documentation**

40. A list of documents of the Fifth Meeting is contained in annex IX to this report. These documents are available in all official languages through the United Nations Official Documents System (<http://www.ods.unog.ch>).

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

41. At its ninth and final plenary meeting, on 19 September 2003, the meeting adopted its draft report, contained in document APLC/MSP.5/2003/CRP.2.

## PART II

### DECLARATION OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES

#### “Bangkok Declaration”

**As adopted at its last plenary meeting on 19 September 2003**

1. We, the States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, gathered in Bangkok along with other States, international organizations and institutions and non-governmental organizations, reaffirm our unwavering commitment to the total eradication of anti-personnel mines and to overcoming the insidious and inhumane effects of these weapons. Meeting one year before our First Review Conference, we commit ourselves to pursue, with renewed vigour, efforts to clear mined areas, assist victims, destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines and promote universal adherence to this important instrument.

2. Meeting in Thailand, a mine-affected country in one of the most mine-affected regions, we are reminded of our common goal in achieving a mine-free world, our dedication towards the goal and ongoing challenges we must overcome both individually and collectively.

3. Recognizing both the human suffering caused by anti-personnel mines and the economic potential of mined areas, we urge countries in Asia and in other regions of the world to build on the momentum of the Fifth Meeting to generate additional public awareness of the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel mines and the benefits from joining the Convention.

4. We recognize that this first-ever gathering of the States parties in Asia is a significant step towards the total eradication of anti-personnel mines. We highlight the importance of universal acceptance of the Convention, which builds mutual confidence between neighbouring States and contributes to peace and security as well as to social and economic development.

5. We celebrate the growing support for the Convention, formally accepted by 136 States, with Belarus, the Central African Republic, Cyprus, the Gambia, Guyana, Lithuania, Sao Tome and Principe and Timor-Leste having joined the Convention since the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties. With an additional 12 countries that signed, but have not yet ratified the Convention, the number of States parties and signatories now totals 148, including more than 40 mine-affected States.

6. We recognize that the international norm established by the Convention is being demonstrated by the successful record of implementation of the Convention, including the conduct of many States not party to the Convention respecting the provisions therein. This record is evidenced by the fact that more than 110 States parties now do not possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, including 50 which have reported that they completed stockpile destruction since the beginning of the process to establish the Convention. A further 11 States parties have taken steps to destroy their stockpiles.

7. We are encouraged that over the past year, a considerable amount of land was cleared of anti-personnel mines and the first of the States parties to have reported mined areas has indicated that it has completed its clearance obligations. While we remain deeply concerned at the

growing number of victims, we are encouraged that there has been a reduction in the number of new victims in some of the world's most mine-affected States and that efforts are being made to address the needs of those individuals and communities affected by anti-personnel mines.

8. We note with great satisfaction that over US\$ 1.6 billion in resources has been generated since the Convention was negotiated to address the global landmine problem, including more than US\$ 180 million in resources provided by mine-affected States parties themselves.

9. While recognizing the success of the Convention, we remain deeply concerned that anti-personnel mines continue to kill, maim and threaten the lives of countless innocent people each day, that the terror of mines prevents individuals from reclaiming their lives and that the lasting impact of these weapons denies communities the opportunity to rebuild long after conflicts have ended.

10. We deplore any use of anti-personnel mines. Such use is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and exacerbates the humanitarian problems already caused by the use of these weapons. We expect those States, which have declared their commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention and which continue to use anti-personnel mines, to recognize that this is a clear violation of their solemn commitment. We call upon all States concerned to respect their commitments.

11. We urge all those who continue to use, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain and/or transfer anti-personnel landmines, to cease immediately and to join us in the task of eradicating these weapons. We call upon States outside the Convention to ratify or accede to the Convention. We also call upon all States in the process of formally accepting the obligations of the Convention to provisionally apply the terms of the Convention. We also underline the need to engage more actively States not party to the Convention by putting greater emphasis on the benefits of their joining the Convention.

12. We reaffirm that progress to free the world from anti-personnel mines will be enhanced if non-State actors embrace the international norm established by this Convention. We urge all non-State actors to cease and renounce the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines according to the principles and norms of international humanitarian law, and to allow mine action to take place. We welcome the efforts of non-governmental organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations in engaging non-State actors on a ban on anti-personnel mines and express our appreciation for the work of these organizations and as well as our desire that individual States parties that are in a position to do so facilitate this work.

13. Recognizing the need to secure full compliance with all obligations of the Convention, we reaffirm our commitment to effectively implement the Convention and to comply fully with its provisions. We do so in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration that characterizes this process. In the event of serious concerns of non-compliance with any of the obligations of the Convention, we acknowledge our individual responsibility as States parties to apply the measures that we are obliged to take in accordance with article 9 of the Convention to prevent or suppress prohibited activities. And we acknowledge our responsibility to seek clarification of concerns of non-compliance in a cooperative spirit in accordance with article 8.

14. We recall that as soon as possible, but not later than 10 years after a State has become party to the Convention, that State party must destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control. We encourage mine-affected States parties, through the use of impact surveys and other means, to better understand the nature and scope of their landmine problems, to develop plans that are consistent with their Convention deadlines, to continue to implement mine-risk education, mine clearance and other mine-action programmes, including victim-assistance programmes, and to integrate these efforts into national development strategies. We urge further national, regional and international initiatives aimed at fulfilling these obligations.

15. We call upon all Governments and people to join in the common task to meet the enormous challenges of mine action, including victim assistance, and to provide the technical and financial assistance required. As States parties committed to the eradication of anti-personnel mines, we reiterate that assistance and cooperation for mine action will flow primarily to those that have forsaken the use of these weapons forever through adherence to, implementation of, and compliance with the Convention.

16. We call upon mine-affected States to act with urgency with respect to their responsibility to provide for the care, rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration of landmine victims, taking into account the specific needs of victims, their families and their communities. And we call upon all other actors to assist the efforts of these States, particularly by supporting programmes that uphold the dignity of victims and ensure an equalization of opportunities for them.

17. We recall that prior to our First Review Conference, the four-year deadline for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines will occur for an additional five States parties. At the same time, we congratulate those States parties that have already destroyed their stockpiles of anti-personnel mines and celebrate the fact that together we have destroyed more than 30 million mines.

18. We warmly welcome the substantial progress made during the Intersessional Work Programme, expressing our satisfaction that its work has been carried out in the Convention's tradition of partnership, dialogue, openness, cooperation and inclusiveness. We note with satisfaction the increased participation of States parties, other States and relevant organizations in the work of the Standing Committees and express our ongoing appreciation for the manner in which the Sponsorship Programme promotes widespread participation in our meetings. To take maximum advantage of the mechanisms available to us, we commit ourselves in the year leading to our First Review Conference to intensify our efforts in those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian aims of the Convention. We furthermore call upon all States parties - particularly mine-affected States parties and those in the process of destroying stockpiled mines - and other interested actors to continue to participate actively in the work of the Standing Committees.

19. We acknowledge the positive contributions made by the other innovative implementation mechanisms that we have created. We are pleased to see that the work of the Coordinating Committee has strengthened the performance of the Intersessional Work Programme. And we express our full satisfaction with the services of the Implementation Support Unit, established by

the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, pursuant to a mandate agreed to by the States parties, which is providing effective independent and professional support to us, the States parties, as we pursue the fulfilment of our responsibilities.

20. We express our gratitude to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and other relevant non-governmental organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and to regional and national organizations and agencies for their important and substantive contribution to the Intersessional Work Programme and to the overall implementation of the Convention. We thank the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining for its essential support and its commitment to the Intersessional Programme as well as the European Commission for its valuable support.

21. We appreciate the United Nations system's contributions to mine action and to the Intersessional Work Programme.

22. We call on Governments, relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations to strengthen their partnership with the media and the private sector to further build public awareness with a view to achieving the universal acceptance of the Convention.

23. In reflecting upon our progress and accomplishments, and in considering the work that lies ahead, we commit ourselves to work together in all regions of the world and we reconfirm our conviction to make anti-personnel mines objects of the past, our obligation to assist those who have fallen victim to this terror, and our shared responsibility to the memories of those whose lives have been lost as a result of the use of these weapons, including those killed as a result of their dedication to helping others by clearing mined areas or providing humanitarian assistance.

24. In the process leading up to the First Review Conference, to be held in Nairobi, Kenya, in 2004, we call upon all States parties and other relevant actors to renew their commitments to the aims of the Convention and to ensure that the Conference will be a significant milestone in marking our achievements and assessing the challenges that remain.

## Annex I

### AGENDA OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES

**As adopted at its first plenary meeting on 15 September 2003**

1. Official opening of the Meeting.
2. Election of the President.
3. Address by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (and other distinguished guests).
4. Adoption of the agenda.
5. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure.
6. Adoption of the budget.
7. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the Meeting and of other officers.
8. Confirmation of the Secretary-General of the Meeting.
9. Organization of work.
10. General exchange of views.
11. Review of the general status and operation of the Convention.
12. Consideration of matters arising from/in the context of reports submitted under article 7.
13. Consideration of requests submitted under article 5.
14. Consideration of requests submitted under article 8.
15. Informal consultations on international cooperation and assistance in accordance with article 6.
16. Date, duration and location of the First Review Conference, and matters pertaining to the preparations for the Review Conference.
17. Any other business.
18. Consideration and adoption of the final document.
19. Closure of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties.

## **Annex II**

### **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO CONSULTATIONS ON PREPARATIONS FOR THE CONVENTION'S FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE**

#### **Introduction**

1. During the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP), the States parties “agreed to mandate the President of the 4MSP to facilitate consultations leading to consideration of a variety of matters at the Fifth Meeting (5MSP) on preparations for the Convention’s First Review Conference”.

2. Open meetings to seek the views of the States parties and relevant organizations were convened by the 4MSP President in Geneva on 31 January and 12 May 2003. Updates on this consultative process were provided by the 4MSP President in Geneva on 6 February and 16 May 2003. Based on subsequent consultations undertaken by the 4MSP President in accordance with his mandate, it is his view that the following constitutes the basis for decisions to be taken by the States parties at the 5MSP.

#### **I. FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE**

##### **A. Date and duration**

3. Given the nature of the issues to be addressed in accordance with the purpose of the First Review Conference, the duration of the Conference will be similar to a meeting of States parties, that is five days. Based upon the level of participation as well as the amount of preparatory work required, the First Review Conference will be held from 29 November to 3 December 2004. The last day of that week will also coincide with the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Convention in Ottawa.

##### **B. Location and venue**

4. The First Review Conference will be held at the United Nations facilities in Nairobi, Kenya.

##### **C. President**

5. Initial consultations indicated the general view that the nationality of the President be de-linked from the country within which the First Review Conference will be held. Subsequent consultations resulted in the view that Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria be designated President of the First Review Conference.

##### **D. Officers**

6. The Secretary-General will be a representative of the host country and will be responsible, in close contact with the President designate and in consultation with the States parties, for coordinating arrangements for the meeting’s opening ceremonies and side events as

well as other efforts in support of the First Review Conference. The Executive Secretary will be nominated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Co-Chairs of the Standing Committees could fill the positions of Vice-Presidents.

#### **E. Participation**

7. Given the importance of the First Review Conference, participation should be at the highest possible level. As has been the Convention's practice, the active participation of all interested States, the ICBL, ICRC and other relevant organizations should be welcomed and encouraged during the First Review Conference.

### **II. PREPARATORY PROCESS**

#### **A. Date and duration**

8. Based upon the understanding of what it is that States parties wish to discuss during the preparatory meetings, as well as in the interest of efficiency, cost-effectiveness and participation, two meetings of one to two days each will be held immediately after the two sets of Standing Committee meetings of 2004 as follows:

- 13 February 2004 (i.e., a one-day meeting following Standing Committee meetings held from 9-12 February 2004); and
- 28-29 June 2004 (i.e., a two-day meeting following Standing Committee meetings from 21-25 June 2004).

#### **B. Location and venue**

9. Preparatory meetings will be held in United Nations facilities in Geneva, with formal documentation services provided by the United Nations and with interpretation provided at preparatory meetings in the six languages of the Convention.

#### **C. Presiding officer**

10. The President-designate or his/her representative will be responsible for, and involved in, all phases of the preparatory process. Given the widespread interest amongst States parties to ensure the success of the First Review Conference, the President-designate could engage a broad range of actors in work related to the preparations for the Conference.

#### **D. Participation**

11. As has been the Convention's practice, the active participation of all interested States, the ICBL, ICRC and other relevant organizations shall be welcomed and encouraged during the preparatory process.

#### **E. Mandate**

12. During preparatory meetings, the States parties will have the opportunity to discuss those matters which would be relevant during the First Review Conference, including:

- Procedural matters such as a draft agenda, a programme of work, rules of procedure and cost estimates;
- The nature and form of the review of the operation and status of the Convention, taking into account what has been achieved during the previous meetings of States parties and the Intersessional Work Programme;
- Preliminary considerations of the need for and the interval between meetings of the States parties that would take place after the First Review Conference;
- Adjustments to the implementation mechanisms that have been established by the States parties since the entry-into-force of the Convention, particularly taking into account possible decisions related to the interval between future meetings of the States parties; and
- Preliminary considerations concerning any conclusions related to the implementation of the Convention.

13. This list of items should not be considered exhaustive nor should it be assumed that these items appear in order of priority.

#### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES**

14. On the basis of this report, it is recommended that the Fifth Meeting of the States parties agrees:

- To hold the Convention's First Review Conference at the United Nations facilities in Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December 2004 and to hold preparatory meetings in United Nations facilities in Geneva on 13 February and 28-29 June 2004;
- To designate Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria as the President of the First Review Conference;
- With estimated costs prepared by the United Nations for convening the preparatory meetings;
- That the preparatory process should proceed in a manner consistent with the elements contained in the Report of the President of the 4MSP; and
- To urge participation at the highest possible level in a high level segment at the First Review Conference.

### **Annex III**

## **REPORT ON THE FUNCTIONING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT UNIT SEPTEMBER 2002-SEPTEMBER 2003**

**Prepared by Ambassador Martin Dahinden  
Director  
Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD)**

### **Background**

1. At the September 2001 Third Meeting of the States parties (3MSP), the States parties endorsed the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and agreed to provide a mandate to the GICHD to establish the ISU. In addition, the 3MSP encouraged States in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the unit and provided a mandate to the President of the Third Meeting, in consultation with the Coordinating Committee, to finalize an agreement with the GICHD on the functioning of the unit.

2. The Council of Foundation of the GICHD accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001. 3. On 7 November 2001, in accordance with the above-mentioned actions taken by States parties at the 3MSP, an agreement on the functioning of the unit was finalized between the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD. This agreement indicates inter alia that the Director of the GICHD shall submit a written report on the functioning of the ISU to States parties and that this report shall cover the period between two meetings of the States parties.

### **Activities**

4. The ISU provided assistance to the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States parties (4MSP) in support of his activities, particularly through the provision of professional advice, ensuring that arrangements were made for activities convened by the President and systematically distributing documents prepared in accordance with the President's responsibilities. Beginning in June, the ISU began to provide support of the President-designate as Thailand commenced preparations in advance of the Fifth Meeting of the States parties (5MSP), in part by ensuring that draft documentation was distributed in a timely manner to all States parties and others, developing a web site on the 5MSP and working closely with the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs.

5. The ISU supported the work of the Coordinating Committee and assisted the President in his efforts to communicate to others the activities of the Coordinating Committee by ensuring that President's Summaries of Coordinating Committee meetings were made available on the GICHD's web site ([www.gichd.ch](http://www.gichd.ch)).

6. The ISU continued to enhance the traditional level of service that the GICHD has provided to the Intersessional Work Programme, particularly by supporting the application by Co-Chairs and Contact Group Coordinators of the 4MSP decision that the Intersessional Work

Programme in the lead-up to the Convention's First Review Conference should focus with even greater clarity on those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention. In this regard, the ISU increased its efforts to inform mine-affected States parties, those in the process of destroying stockpiled mines, and those in a position to provide assistance of the opportunities to participate in and have their voices heard during the Intersessional Work Programme.

7. In support of and at the request of Co-Chairs and Contact Group Coordinators, the ISU undertook research and prepared information documents on various aspects of the status of the Convention. In addition, in response to a request from the Co-Chairs of one Standing Committee, the ISU prepared a bibliography of documentation retained by the ISU on the subject of stockpile destruction.

8. The ISU increasingly became a means for the States parties and others to obtain timely and comprehensive information on the Convention and the implementation of it. The ISU responded to dozens of information requests from States parties, States not party to the Convention, the media and others. The ISU significantly expanded the GICHD web site's Convention-related content, including by ensuring that timely information on the Intersessional Work Programme, meetings of the States parties and preparations for the First Review Conference was made available. Upon receipt of invitations that were consistent with the ISU mandate, the Manager of the ISU made presentations on the implementation of the Convention at various workshops and seminars.

9. The GICHD continued to administer the Sponsorship Programme established by some States parties to the Convention. The aim of the Programme is to support widespread participation in meetings related to the Convention. During each of the two periods of Standing Committee meetings, the Centre administered sponsorship to over 70 delegates. In addition, the ISU provided advice to the Programme's donors' group and information to sponsored delegates on how to maximize their participation in the Intersessional Work Programme.<sup>a</sup>

10. The ISU, in accordance with its mandate, established the Convention's Documentation Centre, to house and make accessible documentation on the establishment of the Convention and its implementation. During the period covered by this report, a consultant completed his six-month task of ensuring that this facility would be operational by January 2003. At present the Documentation Centre contains over 3,000 reports, publications and other media, with new material added regularly.

### **General operations**

11. The 2003 budget for the ISU indicated that the ISU should remain small in number of staff and that in a manner consistent with this provision the staffing of the ISU in 2003 would remain at its level in the second half of 2002. In this context, in 2003 a full-time Implementation Support Officer was hired to replace a temporary staffing situation which had existed in the second half of 2002, with this officer joining the existing full-time ISU Manager and half-time Administrative Assistant.

### **Financial arrangements**

12. In accordance with the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and the agreement between the States parties and the GICHD, the GICHD created a voluntary trust fund for activities of the ISU in late 2001. The purpose of this fund is to finance the on-going activities of the ISU, with the States parties endeavouring to assure the necessary financial resources.

#### **Contributions to the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund<sup>b</sup> 1 January 2002 to 31 August 2003**

	Contributions received in 2002	Contributions received in 2003 <sup>c</sup>
Australia		45 045
Austria	8 030	
Belgium	12 012	14 470
Canada	92 589	46 553
Croatia		1 357
Germany		38 250
Iceland		6 550
Ireland	73 990	
Italy	78 408	
Mexico	8 880	
Netherlands	94 032	
New Zealand		19 064
Norway	100 778	91 750
Total	468 719	263 039

13. In accordance with the agreement between the States parties and the GICHD, in November 2002 the Coordinating Committee was consulted on a 2003 ISU budget,<sup>d</sup> covering the period from 1 January to 31 December 2003 and totalling Sw F 451,000. The President of the Fourth Meeting of the States parties subsequently distributed this budget to all States parties and appealed to the States parties to provide voluntary contributions to the ISU Trust Fund.

14. In accordance with the agreement between the States parties and the GICHD, the Voluntary Trust Fund's 2002 financial statements were independently audited (by Price Waterhouse Coopers). The audit indicated that the financial statement of the Voluntary Trust Fund had been properly prepared in accordance with the accounting policies of the Foundation of the GICHD. The audited financial statement, which indicated that 2002 expenditures totalled Sw F 350,659, was forwarded to the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States parties, the Coordinating Committee and donors.

### **Notes**

<sup>a</sup> The Sponsorship Programme's donors group retains the responsibility for making all decisions related to sponsorship. The Programme is funded on a voluntary basis by these donors through contributions made to a separate trust fund.

<sup>b</sup> All amounts in Sw F.

<sup>c</sup> As of 31 August 2003.

<sup>d</sup> Basic infrastructure costs (e.g. general services, human resources, accounting, conference management) for the ISU are covered by the GICHD and therefore not included in the ISU budget.

## Annex IV

### ESTIMATED COSTS FOR CONVENING THE PREPARATORY MEETINGS FOR THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION

**As prepared by the Secretariat and as accepted at  
the last plenary meeting on 19 September 2003**

1. The attached annex shows a breakdown of the estimated costs for conference and non-conference servicing of the Preparatory Meetings for the First Review Conference of the States Parties, which will be held on 13 February 2004 and 28-29 June 2004, respectively. It should be noted that the costs are estimated on the basis of past experience and anticipated workload. The actual costs will be determined after the closing of the meetings when the exact workload is known. At that time, any adjustments in contributions by the participants sharing the costs will be made accordingly.

2. On the basis of the cost estimates in annex, if approved by the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, the Secretariat will prepare and issue assessment notices in accordance with article 14 (1) of the Convention which states that: "The costs of the meetings of 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."

3. Since the holding of the Preparatory Meetings for the First Review Conference of the States parties shall have no financial implication for the regular budget of the Organization, States parties should proceed with the payment of their share of the estimated costs before holding the meetings.

#### Title of session

**Preparatory meetings of the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention  
on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel  
Landmines and on Their Destruction**

**Geneva, 13 February and 28-29 June 2004**

Conference-servicing items	Meeting servicing Sw F	Pre-session documentation Sw F	In-session documentation Sw F	Summary records Sw F	Post-session documentation Sw F	Support services requirements Sw F	Other requirements Sw F	Total
Interpretation and meeting servicing	45 063							45 063
Translation of documentation		189 684	61 800		64 674			316 158
Support services requirements						4 176		4 176
Other requirements							5 614	5 614
<b>Total</b>	<b>45 063</b>	<b>189 684</b>	<b>61 800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64 674</b>	<b>4 176</b>	<b>5 614</b>	<b>371 011</b>

Total conference-servicing requirements (inclusive of 13 per cent programme support costs)

Sw F 371 011  
US\$\* 272 802

\* - at US\$ 1 = Sw F 1.36.

**Annex V****PRESIDENT'S ACTION PROGRAMME****I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Four years after its entry into force, dramatic progress has been made in implementing the Convention and in promoting its universal acceptance. However, additional efforts will be required to ensure that the Convention lives up to its humanitarian promise. The Convention's First Review Conference in 2004 will be an opportunity to renew our commitment to the total eradication of anti-personnel mines and to overcoming the insidious and inhumane effects of these weapons. With this in mind, the President of the Fifth Meeting of the States parties urges:

- All States parties and relevant organizations to renew their commitments to the implementation of the Convention;
- All mine-affected States parties to ensure that by the First Review Conference plans are in place and concrete steps taken to fully implement the Convention;
- All States parties, relevant international and regional organizations and non-governmental organizations to engage more actively States not party to the Convention, including by emphasizing the benefits of joining the Convention;
- All States not yet party to the Convention to join us in this common effort, recognizing that the Convention is consistent with and supportive of national social and economic development, human security and multilateralism.

2. To focus our collective efforts to achieve these objectives in the period leading to the Convention's First Review Conference, the President has identified the following objectives and actions for consideration.

**II. FOCUSING ON OUR CORE HUMANITARIAN OBJECTIVES****A. Clearing mined land**

3. Forty States parties have reported mined areas. An additional six of those States parties that have not yet submitted article 7 reports, may be mine-affected. Clearing mined areas within 10 years after entry into force of the Convention will be a significant challenge for many of these States. By acting promptly and in a systematic manner, we can ensure that this 10-year period will be well used towards meeting the deadline for mine clearance. It is necessary that in the year leading up to the First Review Conference mine-affected States parties share information about their problems, their national plans consistent with the Convention's deadlines, progress that they have made and their priorities for assistance. It is also essential that States parties and relevant actors render all possible mine survey assistance to States in need. At the same time, States parties should more actively encourage States outside the Convention with mine-clearance capacity and technology to strengthen their involvement in our efforts towards the full eradication of landmines.

## **B. Destroying stockpiled mines**

4. We celebrate the fact that more than 110 States parties now no longer have anti-personnel mine stockpiles and that together the States parties have destroyed more than 30 million mines. However, important challenges remain. Eleven States parties are in the process of destroying their stockpiled anti-personnel mines, but several States parties have yet to begin doing so. While mine clearance and victim assistance require our utmost attention, in the interest of the health of the Convention we must also place a high priority on meeting our deadlines for stockpile destruction. States parties which have completed their stockpile destruction are urged to share their experiences at the bilateral, regional or multilateral levels with States parties for which the deadline is not yet due.

## **C. Assisting victims**

5. Approximately 40 States parties may require assistance to meet the care, rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration needs of landmine survivors. The challenge of meeting these needs is compounded by the fact that countries with the greatest numbers of mine victims are also amongst the world's poorest. The obligation to assist a particular State party's landmine survivors ultimately rests with that State and it is an obligation that lasts for the lifetime of survivors. However, States parties have a responsibility to provide technical and other assistance to support the efforts of the States in need. Because of the nature of this obligation and partnership, it is essential in the year leading to the First Review Conference that States parties requiring assistance provide information about their problems, establish national plans, communicate progress and define their priorities for outside assistance. Victim assistance programmes must take into account the views and needs of survivors and their families, respect the dignity of the survivors and aim to help them to help themselves.

## **D. Universalizing the Convention**

6. With more than two thirds of the world's States having already joined the Convention, the international humanitarian norm established by the Convention has been consolidated. The Convention, however, has not only established a humanitarian norm, it also provides the framework for overcoming the terrible effects of anti-personnel mines. States, whose populations suffer from these effects, should note that their acceptance of the Convention would see them benefit from the Convention's cooperation provisions regarding mine clearance and victim assistance.

7. Among the States remaining outside of the Convention, those that have recently used anti-personnel mines, continue to produce them or possess large quantities of them cause particular concern. Further efforts need to be made to bring these States into the Convention. We need therefore to increase our efforts, individually and collectively, to stress our conviction that no conceivable utility of anti-personnel mines could possibly outweigh and justify the devastating humanitarian costs of these weapons.

### **III. TAKING ACTION TO ACHIEVE OUR OBJECTIVES**

#### **A. Exchanging information**

8. Exchanging information through the Intersessional Work Programme and article 7 reporting has been essential in the implementation of the Convention. Prior to the Convention's First Review Conference, even more priority should be placed on providing mine-affected States parties with sufficient opportunities to share information on their problems, plans, progress and priorities and needs for assistance. Similarly, States parties and others in a position to do so should be given sufficient opportunities to share their plans for assistance.

9. As article 7 reporting provides valuable information to both support cooperation and assess progress, States parties must give due regard to the annual reporting deadlines contained in article 7. States parties, individually or collectively, the article 7 Contact Group, the President and interested organizations should continue to promote implementation of these provisions and provide means to assist States parties in complying with them. A particular emphasis should be placed on encouraging those 14 States parties which have not yet submitted their initial article 7 reports, to do so as soon as possible. In addition, mine-affected States parties should consider maximizing the potential of article 7 reporting by using it, on a voluntary basis, as a tool to communicate to other States parties their plans, challenges and needs regarding mine clearance, victim assistance and stockpile destruction. States parties are encouraged to use "Form J" to indicate resources, expertise and technical advice that they are willing to share, or have shared, with other countries. All States parties should also take full advantage of the mechanisms and tools that have been developed to assist in completing article 7 reports.

10. States parties make considerable efforts to exchange information through the Intersessional Work Programme and article 7 reporting. They should ensure that the information made available is used effectively.

11. Exchanging and sharing information should also be enhanced through bilateral means and at regional level. Information sharing on mine clearance, stockpile destruction and victim assistance should be a continuous process and should serve as a means to achieve the aim of the universalization of the Convention.

#### **B. Mobilizing resources**

12. In article 6, States parties in a position to do so committed themselves on a long-term basis to sustain the process of achieving the Convention's humanitarian aims. States parties can live up to this obligation by continuing to give high priority to mine action within their development and humanitarian policies, particularly with a view to the Convention's 10-year time frame for mine clearance. In this regard, it should be emphasized that the States parties have repeatedly stated that assistance and cooperation for mine action will flow primarily to those that have forsaken the use of these weapons forever through adherence to, implementation of, and compliance with the Convention.

13. Mobilizing resources for mine action is a collective responsibility. While it is important that financial resources continue to be provided by States in a position to do so, it is equally important that affected States parties themselves take full ownership for this responsibility by

integrating mine action into their national development and poverty reduction strategies. Moreover, resources to fulfil the aims of the Convention can be given by a variety of actors and relate to more than simply financial provisions. They can equally be provided by mine-affected States themselves, shared between mine-affected States or they can originate from development banks or the private sector. In this regard, the Resource Mobilization Contact Group should continue its efforts to encourage all relevant actors to ensure that by the First Review Conference a significant renewal of our collective commitment to eliminate anti-personnel mines.

### **C. Regional approaches**

14. In the pursuit of the implementation of the Convention, each region has unique challenges and capacities. States parties should therefore take steps to ensure that regional initiatives and activities to raise awareness on the issue of anti-personnel mines be undertaken as a continuous process, leading towards the First Review Conference. States parties should highlight the issue of landmines in all the regional forums/meetings that they participate in. It is through such regional initiatives and activities that the achievement of the Convention's aims will be realized.

### **D. Actions to promote the universal acceptance of the Convention**

15. States parties, individually and collectively, the Universalization Contact Group, the President and interested organizations should play an active role in promoting the Convention. We should strive to achieve maximum acceptance of the Convention and of the international norm established by it in time for the First Review Conference. To this end, mine-affected States that have not yet joined our common effort should be made aware of the Convention's unique sense of partnership and its mechanisms to promote international cooperation and assistance in the implementation of the Convention. We need to also step up our efforts to make States not party to the Convention realize the benefits from joining the Convention, *inter alia*, through awareness-raising and practical cooperation.

16. States parties and others should use every opportunity at all levels of contacts, bilateral and multilateral, political and military, with States not party to the Convention to urge them to ratify or accede to the Convention. Special emphasis should be placed on those States outside of the Convention that use, produce or possess large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines.

### **E. The role of public conscience**

17. The efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and numerous other non-governmental organizations around the world in calling for a ban of anti-personnel mines is evidence of the important role of public conscience in furthering the principles of humanity. The role of public conscience will remain important in maintaining domestic interest in the landmines issue. Doing so will be essential to sustain the necessary political will and to generate financial and non-material resources to finish the work that remains.

18. The Convention's First Review Conference in 2004 provides an opportunity to focus awareness to an even greater extent on the progress that has been made in implementing the Convention as well as on the challenges that still remain to overcome the inhumane effects of

anti-personnel mines. States parties should continue to reinforce their strong partnership with the ICBL and ICRC, as well as with other significant actors in our common cause, like the United Nations and relevant international and regional organizations.

19. We should also work in partnership with the media as an important instrument in shaping the public conscience and creating public awareness of the landmine issue. At the same time, we should increasingly engage the private sector in our common efforts to address the humanitarian cost of landmines.

#### **F. Cooperation to promote further clarity**

20. The contributions of States parties in informal discussions on matters pertaining to articles 1, 2, 3, of the Convention have improved clarity and understanding with respect to the application of these articles by States parties. States parties should continue to share information in the same informal, cooperative and voluntary manner with a view to developing common understandings on these matters at the First Review Conference.

21. Similarly, States parties should continue to share information in the same manner regarding articles 8 and 9 that make up the Convention's compliance provisions. The primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Convention rests with each individual State party. Particular emphasis should therefore be given to ensure that all States parties that have not yet done so take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to prevent or suppress any activity prohibited by the Convention in accordance with article 9. States parties should also place a high priority on ensuring a more coordinated and effective response to compliance concerns.

## Annex VI

### FINAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES

#### STANDING COMMITTEE ON MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

##### Final Report\* 2002-2003

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of Meetings of the States parties, met in Geneva on 5 February 2003 and 14 May 2003. These meetings were convened by the Standing Committee's Co-Chairs, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium and Mr. Michael Oyugi of Kenya, with support from their Co-Rapporteurs, Ambassador Sam Sotha of Cambodia and Ambassador Kuniko Inoguchi of Japan.

2. Representatives of more than 90 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

3. The Standing Committee focused its attention on the status of the implementation of the relevant elements of the Convention, received an in-depth overview of a country case study, was provided with updates on various thematic matters, and received updates from mine-affected States parties and donors on their specific situations and needs.

#### II. OVERVIEW OF STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION

4. The Co-Chairs reported that 37 States parties have reported mined areas and that an additional 8 States parties, which have not submitted an article 7 report as required or which have not yet had to submit such a report, likely suffer from the impact of mined areas. It was highlighted that Costa Rica had become the first of the mine-affected States parties to indicate that it had completed the implementation of its article 5 obligations. It was also noted that Honduras and Guatemala were on-track to complete implementation of article 5 prior to the Review Conference and that Nicaragua would do the same soon after.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Belgium and Kenya. This report is the Co-Chair's summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2002-2003 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

5. In order to effectively measure progress made and assess collective challenges remaining, the Co-Chairs encouraged relevant States parties to present their specific situations and needs with regard to mine action following the “4P approach” addressing, where possible, Problems, Plans, Progress and Priorities. (See Appendix I to this report.) To assist the process of assessing the state of implementation of article 5, the Co-Chairs presented to the second meeting of the Standing Committee a detailed compilation of information already furnished by the States parties in accordance with the “4P approach”.

6. The ICBL also provided the Standing Committee with comprehensive global overviews of the status of implementation as far as it pertains to mine action. As part of these overviews, the ICBL called for more extensive and relevant reporting, including increased standardization and transparency in reporting.

7. In addressing needs identified by the ICBL, it was indicated that a standardized reporting feature for United Nations-supported mine action centres will be a feature of the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA). It was noted that this feature could support article 7 reporting and result in cost efficiencies, in part through the cost-benefit analysis.

### **III. IMPLEMENTATION PLANS AND PROGRESS**

8. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for updates on implementation plans and progress by mine-affected States parties. Twenty-four (24) States parties took advantage of the opportunities presented by the Standing Committee to share information: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia and Zambia. In addition, El Salvador highlighted that it had completed mine clearance prior to the establishment of the Convention.

9. Many States parties indicated that problems faced include a lack of up-to-date equipment, data and funding. Progress was highlighted with respect to mine risk education (MRE) programming, the creation of mine action centres, completed surveys, and action plans for mine clearance. The need for assistance and coordination was noted by most States parties as a priority in order to meet deadlines according to article 5 of the Convention.

10. Four (4) States not parties, Ethiopia, Libya, Sri Lanka and Turkey, provided updates on their status in relation to mine action and/or accession to the Convention, with Turkey indicating that it is due to deposit its instrument, together with Greece, in 2003. An update on Iraq was provided by the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS).

11. In order to ensure that lessons could be shared between mine-affected countries, the Standing Committee reviewed a detailed case study of Cambodia. It was reported that the Cambodian Mine Action Authority (CMAA) was established in 2002, in response to the need for a national regulator. The CMAA has since: established a database centre, mine action standards and a strategic plan; conducted national workshops, field visits and a planning development process; and integrated mine action in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy. In addition, it was noted that a National Mine Action Strategy, consisting of a Long Term Strategy and a Five-Year Mine Action Plan (2003-2007), is soon to be approved. Various objectives of the

programme were outlined, including: national coordination, improvement of socio-economic action, expanding upon mine action achievements, and the development of MRE and victim assistance. It was reported that Cambodia hosted a *Regional Seminar, Building a Co-operative Future for Mine Action in Cambodia*, 26-28 March 2003 in Phnom Penh.

#### **IV. ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION**

12. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for interested States parties to give updates on assistance and cooperation. Several States parties took advantage of these opportunities, including: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. In addition, the following organizations contributed to the discussions: the GICHD, Handicap International Belgium (HIB), the ICBL, James Madison University's Mine Action Information Centre, JASMAR, Landmine Action UK, the International Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Sudan Landmine Information and Response Initiative (SLIRI), the Sudan Integrated Mine Action Service (SIMAS), and the United Nations system.

13. With respect to the United Nations mine action efforts, it was reported that the United Nations continues to support 35 mine-affected countries and has piloted its mine action rapid response plan in Iraq. The importance of mine action integration and inter-agency cooperation, as well as the need for a humanitarian and disarmament hybrid of mine risk education and mine survey and surveillance activities was stressed. The contributions to the aims of the Convention of various elements of the United Nations system were highlighted, including the efforts of UNMAS, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and UNICEF. Challenges for the future were identified as resource mobilization, mine action integration into development agendas, strengthening national mine action centres, long term strategic planning and emergency response.

#### **Cooperation and assistance between mine-affected States parties**

14. With the assistance of the UNDP, the topic of cooperation and assistance between mine-affected States parties was highlighted. It was reported that the UNDP's Mine Action Exchange Programme (MAX) matches experienced people with countries in need. It was noted that to date participants in this programme have included individuals from Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Croatia and Mozambique, and that exchanges are planned for 2003 in Albania, Cambodia, Somalia and Yemen. The UNDP emphasized that, as a response to the increasing need for horizontal exchanges among developing countries (south-south cooperation), the United Nations had made the promotion of cooperation among mine-affected countries one of its highest priorities and had reflected this in its United Nations Five-Year Mine Action Strategy. Also participating in the discussion on this topic were Norway, Sudan and Yemen.

#### **V. MATTERS OF A THEMATIC NATURE RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION**

##### **A. Mine risk education (MRE)**

15. The growing number of new MRE programmes was highlighted by the ICBL, the quality of which has greatly improved as a result of needs assessments, external evaluations, and the

creation of international standards. However the urgent need for more MRE was also noted. The importance of including MRE needs in article 7 reporting as well as the need to report on planning was also highlighted.

## **B. Technologies for mine action**

16. A general overview of the status of developments in the area of mine action technologies was provided by Belgium. It was reported that the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP), created as a response to the lack of international coordination and cooperation, international standards and inadequate dialogue, had elaborated a work plan of testing and evaluation. Results of brainstorming meetings on mine action technologies, held on 4 February and 13 May 2003, were also reported. (See Appendix II to this report.) South Africa, Sweden and Thailand also contributed to the Standing Committee's discussions on mine action technologies.

## **C. International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)**

17. It was reported that the review board on IMAS met in January for a study on how these international standards have been adapted to national standards. It was highlighted that a total of 27 standards have been endorsed, with 5 new standards being prepared.

## **D. Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)**

18. It was noted that implementation of Version 3 of the IMSMA began this year, with upgrades and translations currently underway. It was highlighted that the IMSMA could be an effective tool to aid in the preparation of article 7 reports as well as funding decisions by donor countries.

## **E. “Village” demining**

19. HIB highlighted the issue of village demining by populations at risk in Cambodia, based on the book by Ruth Bottomley. The need to direct the focus of MRE on targeting the populations most at risk, in part through involving village deminers in MRE as key resource people, was emphasized. It was reported that a number of initiatives have been developed to this end, focusing on the greater involvement of communities.

## **F. Peace-building**

20. The relationship between mine action and peace-building was outlined by PRIO. It was noted that mine action in donor policies is emphasized as a security issue with only marginal references to peace-building. The opportunity for a more active role for the three phases of peace-building - reconciliation, confidence building and conflict resolution - in mine action was illustrated. Possible drawbacks were outlined as increased risks, and focus and speed reduction. The need to strengthen conflict sensibility and for regular assessment of the impact of conflicts was highlighted.

## VI. AN ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS THAT REMAIN

21. The work of the Standing Committee in 2002-2003 placed a necessary emphasis on problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance of the 40+ mine-affected States parties which have an important obligation to fulfil in implementing article 5. However, during the final Intersessional Work Programme prior to the Review Conference, it will be crucial that all relevant States parties communicate their “4Ps” and best make use of the Standing Committee as means to highlight both progress and ongoing challenges. For their part, States parties in a position to do so and other relevant actors should act with urgency to assist the mine-affected States parties in overcoming their challenges. With these points in mind, the Co-Chairs propose that relevant actors consider the following recommendations:

- 21.1. The Co-Chairs recommend that those mine-affected States parties that have not yet done so develop and communicate a comprehensive plan for implementing article 5 in a manner that takes into consideration the article’s 10-year time frame for mine clearance.
- 21.2. The Co-Chairs recommend that the mine-affected States parties use the 2003-2004 Standing Committee meetings to provide updates on their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance, making use of the suggested framework that has been developed to assist them in preparing presentations. (See Appendix I to this report.)
- 21.3. The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties “in a position to do so” continue to make use of the Standing Committee in 2003-2004 to share information on their commitments to ensuring that resources are provided to support those States that need assistance.
- 21.4. The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties pursue a variety of regional approaches to clearing mined areas and delivering mine risk education with a view to fulfilling the aims of the Convention.
- 21.5. The Co-Chairs recommend an ongoing experts dialogue on technologies for mine action, taking into consideration the need to monitor the application of the recommendations made by the experts group in 2002-2003.

## **Appendix I**

### **SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK FOR PREPARING UPDATES TO MEETINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES**

1. In order to assist mine-affected States parties in preparing written and oral presentations (maximum: 8 minutes) on the challenges they face and efforts that are being taken to overcome these challenges, the following framework has been developed. In addition to making a presentation in accordance with this framework, States parties may wish to distribute more lengthy documents, such as national mine action plans.

#### **I. PROBLEMS RELATED TO MINED AREAS AND THE HUMANITARIAN IMPACT OF THESE AREAS**

- I.1. In concrete terms, what is known - and not known - about the extent to which areas are mined and the impact of mined areas? What areas are affected? To what extent are communities and populations affected by mined areas? How many landmine casualties have there been in recent years?
- I.2. Of the affected areas, which are considered to be high, medium and low impact? What methodology was used to determine these priorities?
- I.3. If very little is known about the impact of mined areas, what steps are being taken or considered to obtain necessary information?

#### **II. PLANS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF MINED AREAS**

- II.1. Has a national mine action plan been established? What are the objectives of the plan and how do these objectives relate to the Convention's obligation to clear mined areas within a 10-year time frame?
- II.2. To what extent has mine action been incorporated into national development and poverty reduction strategies? How are mine-affected communities' requests for clearance addressed?
- II.3. What is the use planned for mined land once it has been cleared?
- II.4. To what extent have domestic resources been applied to the problem of mined areas?
- II.5. Have organizational structures been developed to support mine action? What organizations and assets are being deployed and for which activities? How many individuals are involved in activities such as mine clearance, mine risk education, and coordination? What other core assets (e.g., mine detecting dogs, mechanical devices, etc.) are available?

### **III. PROGRESS MADE IN MEETING THE OBLIGATIONS OF ARTICLE 5**

- III.1. If a national mine action plan has been developed, does it note how progress in implementing the plan will be measured?
- III.2. On an annual basis, what area has been cleared and what area has been reduced (in square metres)? How many and what type of landmines and UXO have been cleared?
- III.3. To what extent have populations and communities directly and indirectly benefited from the reduction of suspected areas and from mine clearance? To what extent has progress in mine action resulted in progress in the implementation of national development and poverty reduction strategies?
- III.4. How many (by age and sex) individuals have benefited from mine risk education? To what extent have casualty rates declined?

### **IV. PRIORITIES FOR ASSISTANCE IN IMPLEMENTING NATIONAL PLANS**

- IV.1. What are the priorities for outside assistance in implementing the national mine action plan or in obtaining necessary information regarding the impact of mined areas?

## **Appendix II**

### **MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES: ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DONORS, END-USERS AND TECHNOLOGISTS**

#### **Background**

1. This annex to the final report of the Standing Committee is the outcome of two experts discussions on mine action technologies, which took place at the GICHD on the margins of the meetings of the Standing Committee in February and May 2003. These discussions were convened and chaired by Marc Achery (Royal Military Academy, Belgium) and involved the participation of: A. Antanasiotis (European Commission), D. Barlow (James Madison University), S. Brigot (ICBL), B. Briot (Ministry of Defence, Belgium), J. Dirscherl (GICHD), R. Gasser (European Commission), D. Lewis (International Test and Evaluation Programme), A. McAslan (Cranfield University), A. Sieber (European Commission Joint Research Centre), S. Sekkenes (ICBL), R. Stuart (Canadian Centre for Mine Action Technologies), and C. Weickert (Canadian Centre for Mine Action Technologies).

#### **Introduction**

2. In 1997, at the Mine Action Forum that accompanied the Convention's signing ceremony in Ottawa, concern was expressed at the lack of international coordination and cooperation in mine action technology. It was noted that there were no universal standards for technology, no common view on where resources should be directed, and that inadequate dialogue and understanding existed within and between the research and development communities. While we must acknowledge that further steps are still necessary, since 1997, significant efforts have been undertaken in many of these areas. Some success stories include:

- 2.1. The manufacturing of detectors which combine metal detection with ground penetrating radar (GPR);
- 2.2. The development and use of mechanical devices;
- 2.3. The development of applications based on information technologies (e.g., the Information Management System for Mine Action or IMSMA);
- 2.4. The manufacturing of personal protective equipment and prosthetic feet;
- 2.5. The training of rodents to detect landmines; and,
- 2.6. The suitability and cost of personal protective equipment.

3. Thanks to the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP), much work has been undertaken to test and evaluate equipment, systems and methods against agreed standards, including the CEN (Comité Européen de Normalisation) Workshop Agreement - CWA 14747:2003 "Humanitarian Mine Action - Test and Evaluation - Metal Detectors", published by CEN in July 2003. Nevertheless, further efforts must be carried out, especially to

initiate and increase the coordination and the cooperation between users, donors and technologists in order to develop and bring to the field equipment and tools based on real needs and not assumed needs.

### **Mine action technologies: a very difficult problem**

4. Several factors slow down real progress in the development and fielding of new technology, with the most significant of these factors related to the fact that mine action solutions are not simplistic and that no “silver bullet” is available. It can be said that finding all mines in the ground without a false alarm is a challenge comparable to sending a person to the moon but with much less money. Some of the significant challenging factors include:

- 4.1. A lack of a procurement path makes fielding a technology very difficult. Consequently, developers can face a dead end when research and development as well as prototyping and test and evaluation/validation (if any) are achieved!
- 4.2. Mine action solutions are not universal but rather often country/region specific (e.g. related to specific soil type, climate, vegetation, socio-cultural environment, etc.). A system approach needs to be used.
- 4.3. Mine action technologies are diverse (e.g. ITEP recognizes six different categories: survey, detection, mechanical assistance, manual tools, personnel protection and neutralization.).
- 4.4. Requirements for technologies are not easily defined, nor satisfied.
- 4.5. Some major advances have not been well adequately recognized (e.g. the very significant improvements in metal detectors, personal protective equipment, information technology support tools).
- 4.6. It is now clear that the market for mine action equipment is not large enough by itself to support the cost of bringing products to market.
- 4.7. Both donors and demining organizations are naturally conservative - especially regarding safety.
- 4.8. Donors are reluctant to insist on new and more efficient technologies and deminers often do not change successful clearance methods (even if not efficient) as long as donors accept the status quo.
- 4.9. Some of the problems of new mine action technologies are not technical (e.g. computer staff in field offices leaving once they are trained).

### **Recommendations to donors**

5. Clearly, donors have a key role to play, especially in supporting the introduction to the field of new technologies which offer potential long-term cost-savings (e.g. by supporting the

introduction of new technologies on the condition that they will lead to faster operations, saving lives, and saving money). Specific recommendations for donors to consider are the following:

- 5.1. Donors should invest now in new technologies in order to get future gains in efficiency (thus saving money).
- 5.2. Donors should insist on steady improvements in efficiency from demining organizations.
- 5.3. Donors should insist that clearance contracts, where appropriate, include participation by demining organizations in testing new technologies (with costs repaid by the donors).
- 5.4. In order to solve the problem of the absence of large enough markets for humanitarian demining equipment, donors should envisage dual use technologies, including by leveraging military technologies and making incremental improvements to existing tools.
- 5.5. Donors should understand that the most likely vendors are existing manufacturers (e.g. metal detector manufacturers).
- 5.6. Donors should include in technology funding packages: a staff education package taking into account the social and cultural environment; and, a long-term training package for the maintenance and repair of equipment.
- 5.7. Donors must realize that clearing mined areas more quickly and efficiently may be seen as leading to unemployment for local deminers, who may therefore reject new technologies. Support for improved clearance technologies must be complemented by assistance to local deminers to help them reintegrate into the local productive economy when clearance is complete.
- 5.8. Donors should strive to understand users' real needs, in part through increased contact between donors and technologists. Donors should accept that appropriate technology must correspond to appropriate needs and that mine action funding should not be just a platform to sell donor country's products.

### **Recommendations to end-users**

- 5.9. Demining organizations and mine action centres should identify the best technologies for their geographic/social/cultural/mine - UXO situation with a view to addressing "bottlenecks" and leaving alone other areas where there are no problems.
- 5.10. End-users should make use of the opportunities offered by the members of the International Test & Evaluation Programme (ITEP) to ask specific questions on technology performances and to receive information about "tried and tested tools".
- 5.11. End-users should help technologists understand the real needs of deminers (e.g. inviting them to go to the field to understand the working environment).

## Recommendations to technologists

- 5.12. Technologists should visit the field to truly understand the real needs of end-users.
- 5.13. Technologies should understand that field users will only accept sophisticated technology if it is simple to use and affordable.
- 5.14. The ITEP should be wide-open to end-users' questions and play a key role in providing information about "tried and tested tools", including information on where, why and when they are useful.
- 5.15. Technologists should increase their understanding of the fact that, in addition to technologies related to detection, technologies related to area reduction, strategic planning, programme management and other key areas of mine action are also important.

## Conclusions

6. The Convention states that "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 (the) Convention". This implies that such an exchange is an important underpinning to assisting States parties in the fulfilment of their obligations. It is in the spirit of this provision of the Convention that all actors are urged to apply the recommendations in this document. Donors need to understand that technologists need their support to establish a sound procurement process for fielding new technologies in order to have a more cost-effective mine action. For their part, end-users need to be pro-active, understanding and open to the process of introducing new technologies in the field and to make use of existing tools. End users need to understand that new technologies could save human lives and increase mine action efficiency. Finally, technologists must accept that nothing is more important than understanding the working environment.

## Examples of technology progress

- 6.1. **Metal detectors:** In recent years, manufacturers and scientists have significantly enhanced the capabilities of current metal detectors (much better sensitivity and resolution, much better behaviour in magnetic soils, etc.). Not all soils are suitable for metal detectors as there are dangerous cases where it is impossible to detect metal objects because of soil characteristics. In order to solve this safety problem, an analysis of the soil characteristics is to be undertaken under the umbrella of the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP).
- 6.2. **Hand-held, dual sensor mine detectors** (Metal detector + Ground Penetrating Radar): In 2002, mine detectors were tested successfully in Bosnia and in Lebanon. In 2003, operational tests will be performed with 24 mine detectors in 4 different mine-affected countries. Lessons will be collected and enhancements will be made if needed. The benefits include enhanced detection and a reduced false alarm rate.

- 6.3. **Information technology:** The IMSMA is still evolving. It now includes standard reporting facilities (e.g. reporting obligation of article 7) and can exchange information with Geographical Information Systems (GIS) which allows the use of digitized map and satellite images. Satellite images with appropriate information overlays can be used as maps. Management tools have been developed or are under development (e.g. to assist with planning demining campaigns, cost-benefit analysis regarding the introduction of specific equipment, the definition of a mine clearance strategy at country/region level, etc.).
- 6.4. **Personal Protective Equipment:** A test methodology has been developed based on in-depth analysis of the physics of mine blast damage mechanisms (CCMAT - US) and standards will be developed for personal protective equipment under the umbrella of the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP).
- 6.5. **Prosthetic feet (CCMAT):** These prosthetic feet provide greater comfort for wearer (energy storage and return), much longer lifetime, low maintenance costs and better cosmetic features.
- 6.6. **Educated Rodents (APOPO):** In 2002, rats were tested successfully in Tanzania and proved to be reliable. In 2003, operational tests are foreseen in six different affected countries.
- 6.7. **The International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP):** ITEP is an international programme favouring collaboration between the participating countries to avoid duplication of efforts, dedicated to the test and evaluation of all forms of equipment, systems and methods for use in humanitarian demining. It can be dangerous to rely on data sheets distributed by manufacturers to select equipment and/or to assess their real performances. Therefore, test and evaluation against agreed standards are very important for safety and operational effectiveness as it can be dangerous to rely entirely on manufacturers' data for equipment selection and assessment. For these reasons, the two main activities of ITEP are test and evaluation and the development of standards (which is an ongoing process). Agreed standards for metal detector testing were published at the beginning of July 2003. The process of developing standards for ground penetrating radar (GPR) was launched in 2002. ITEP has also elaborated a work-plan for test and evaluation activities including six technical programmes: survey, detection, mechanical assistance, manual tools, personal protection and neutralization.

## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION**

### **Final Report\* 2002-2003**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of Meetings of the States Parties, met in Geneva on 4 February 2003 and 13 May 2003. These meetings were convened by its Co-Chairs, Ambassador Gérard Chesnel of France and Ms. Fulvia Benavides-Cotes of Columbia, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Peter Truswell of Australia and Ms. Dijana Plestina of Croatia.

2. Representatives of more than 90 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. Landmine survivors, through the Raising the Voices initiative, were active participants. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

3. The Co-Chairs emphasized that in 2002-2003 the Standing Committee could best build upon past achievements by placing an increased emphasis on hearing concrete plans of action and problem areas from the mine-affected States parties.

#### **II. OVERVIEW OF STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

4. The Co-Chairs noted that approximately 40 States parties may require assistance in meeting the needs of landmine survivors within their countries. It was reported by **Handicap International** that there were 7,728 new casualties recorded in 2002, with three quarters of the countries with new casualties being countries with insufficient infrastructure and services to provide for the care and rehabilitation of landmine survivors. The **ICBL** highlighted, however, that the recorded number of new mine casualties in 2002 does not take into account possible large numbers of the mine casualties that are not recorded and that the number of new casualties, therefore, is believed to be much higher. In addition, the ICBL provided an update on its study to measure progress in victim assistance, noting that 21 countries have been examined so far and that by the time of the Review Conference of 2004 the ICBL will be able to produce a comprehensive and detailed report of the progress made in victim assistance.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Colombia and France. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2002-2003 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

### III. UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION: PLANS AND PROGRESS

5. The Co-Chairs emphasized that since the responsibility to assist landmine survivors rests with individual States parties, it is essential that they use the Standing Committee as a forum to communicate their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance. To assist, in advance of both meetings of the Standing Committee, the Co-Chairs distributed a suggested framework for States parties to use in preparing presentations on the extent of their challenges and plans to address the priorities identified in 2002: emergency and continuing medical care; physical rehabilitation/prosthetics; psychological and social support; economic reintegration; national planning; and, laws and public policies.

6. Fifteen States parties took advantage of the opportunities presented by the Standing Committee to share information: **Afghanistan, Albania, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan and Zambia**. In addition, **Turkey**, a State not party, shared information.

- **Emergency and continuing medical care:** Updates on emergency and continuing medical care identified challenges as being: that countries with large numbers of victims are often some of the world's poorest; and, that a lack of qualified medical personnel and trauma treatment - especially in areas where most victims can be found - are often persistent problems.
- **Physical rehabilitation/prosthetics:** While many reported that progress had been made, some problems identified were shortages of prosthetic technicians, a lack of other qualified staff, a lack of funds, and long distances that some individuals must travel to access services.
- **Psychological and social support:** Some reported on specific initiatives, like Croatia which highlighted a project designed to support the needs of young people. Others, like Afghanistan, noted that while a number of services may exist in a country they are often inadequate in addressing the total need.
- **Economic reintegration:** While some successes in the area of economic reintegration were noted, others highlighted that this remains a profound problem especially in countries experiencing broader economic problems.
- **Laws, public policies and national planning:** Several mentioned legislation that had been established and that progress is being made in institutional development in a number of countries. The capacity to implement legislation remains a problem, though, in many cases.

### IV. UPDATE ON ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION

7. The Co-Chairs noted that all States parties and relevant organizations have an important role to play in supporting the efforts of mine-affected States parties. Several States parties, including **Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden** provided updates on assistance and cooperation activities. Several

reported on specific victim assistance initiatives whereas others noted that they are fulfilling their obligations to assist mine-affected States with their responsibility to victims by providing support to broader health-care programmes or to the ICRC. Numerous organizations also contributed to this discussion, including the ICBL which expressed concern that only limited funding was being directed to victim assistance.

## V. REGIONAL APPROACHES

8. In keeping with the call made by the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties to place an emphasis on regional implementation initiatives, the Co-Chairs provided an opportunity for updates on significant relevant activities, noting that comprehensive initiatives are underway in Europe and Asia: **Handicap International Belgium** is undertaking research in South Eastern Europe on behalf of the **International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance**. In addition, **Handicap International France** highlighted its ongoing Regional Assistance Project in South East Asia, noting the importance of partnership between mine-affected and donor States. The Co-Chairs indicated their appreciation for these initiatives and encouraged international and non-governmental organizations to pursue similar efforts in other regions.

## VI. MAXIMIZING THE STANDING COMMITTEE AS A VEHICLE FOR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

9. The Standing Committee received updates on various initiatives being undertaken in other forums: Efforts to establish a new international convention on the rights of persons with disabilities were highlighted. An update was provided on discussions facilitated by the **ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance** which are aimed at producing, in time for the Review Conference, enhanced cooperation between non-governmental organizations which are involved in prosthetic and orthopaedic services. As well, it was reported that the **United Nations** has engaged in a consultative process to establish a policy to assist mine action programmes in better defining their role in victim assistance.

## VII. AN ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS THAT REMAIN

10. The work of the Standing Committee in 2002-2003 succeeded in placing a greater emphasis on the voices of the mine-affected States parties in the work of the Committee. However, with only one year before the Convention's First Review Conference, much more needs to be done.

11. In order for the States parties at the Review Conference to assess progress in the pursuit of their wish "to do their utmost in providing assistance for the care and rehabilitation, including the social and economic reintegration of mine victims", it is essential that the mine-affected States parties themselves communicate how they define their challenges and hence how they will measure progress. Therefore:

- The Co-Chairs recommend that the Standing Committee in 2003-2004 increase efforts to promote the participation by mine-affected States parties in the meetings of the Standing Committee.

- The Co-Chairs furthermore recommend that mine-affected States parties make use of the suggested framework that has been developed to assist them in preparing presentations on their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance. (See the appendix to this report.)
12. The Standing Committee also made it clear in 2002-2003 that the Convention implies that international cooperation and assistance will play a leading role in assisting the States parties in fulfilling their obligations. Many States parties “in a position to do so”, as well as numerous international and non-governmental organizations, have communicated that they are indeed providing necessary assistance and support - either through targeted victim assistance programmes or through broader programming to support the health-care and rehabilitation services or human rights frameworks in mine-affected States. However:
- The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties “in a position to do so” continue to make use of the Standing Committee in 2003-2004 to share information on their particular approaches to ensuring that resources are provided to support those States that need assistance.

13. It was apparent at the Standing Committee meetings in 2002-2003 that regional initiatives can play an extremely valuable role in assisting individual States parties in meeting their obligations. To build upon this:

- The Co-Chairs recommend that additional regional efforts be undertaken in 2003-2004 with a view to enabling States parties with similar challenges to share ideas and experiences, and develop joint strategies and initiatives.

## **Appendix**

### **FRAMEWORK TO ASSIST MINE-AFFECTED STATES PARTIES IN PREPARING FOR MEETINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION**

#### **Introduction**

1. One of the enhancements made during the May 2002 meetings of the Standing Committees established by the States parties to the Convention banning anti-personnel mines was to increase the number of opportunities for participation by States parties. Mine-affected States parties may wish to maximize these opportunities during meetings of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration by preparing presentations on the challenges they face and efforts that are being taken to overcome these challenges. In order to assist these States parties in preparing written and oral presentations (maximum: 10-12 minutes) on these matters, the following framework has been developed.

#### **I. The extent of the challenge**

Provide an overview of the information that is available on landmine survivors, including information on their demographics and the types of injuries that they have suffered, and areas in the country where survivors are most prevalent. Is there an ongoing data collection mechanism to track new mine victims?

#### **II. Addressing the challenge**

In each of the following four areas, provide a brief overview of:

- The current situation with respect to services and facilities required to meet the needs of landmine survivors;
- What you desire the situation to be;
- Your plan to achieve the desired results; and,
- Your priorities for outside assistance.

##### **II.1. Emergency and continuing medical care**

(e.g. first aid and transportation to respond effectively to landmine and other traumatic injuries, surgery, pain management, and additional medical care to assist in the rehabilitation of survivors)

##### **II.2. Physical rehabilitation/prosthetics**

(e.g. physiotherapy, production and fitting of prostheses, pre and post-prosthetic care, repair and adjustment of prostheses, provision and maintenance of assistive devices and wheelchairs, and rehabilitative assistance for the deaf and blind)

**II.3. Psychological and social support**

(e.g. peer support groups, professional counselling, sports and associations for the disabled)

**II.4. Economic reintegration**

(e.g. skills and vocational training, literacy training, income-generating projects, small business loans, and job placement)

**III. Laws and public policies**

Provide an overview of any laws and policies that are in place to promote and enhance the effective treatment, care and protection for all disabled citizens, including landmine survivors. In addition, what laws or policies are in place with respect to accessibility to the built-up environment? What mechanisms and/organizations exist to promote the rights of persons with disabilities? What programmes exist to raise public awareness on disability issues?

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION

### Final Report\* 2002-2003

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of the Meetings of the States Parties, met in Geneva on 6 February 2003 and 15 May 2003. These meetings were convened by the Standing Committee's Co-Chairs, Mr. René Haug of Switzerland and Mr. Radu Horumbă of Romania, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Luigi Scotto of Italy and Mr. Carlos J. Arroyave of Guatemala.

2. Representatives of more than 90 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

3. In accordance with the President's Action Programme of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP), the Standing Committee focused its attention on: States parties with a deadline for stockpile destruction in 2003; bilateral and regional assistance and cooperation in the area of stockpile destruction; and technical aspects related to the implementation of stockpile destruction obligations.

#### II. OVERVIEW OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION

4. The Standing Committee attached great importance to that fact in 2003 the first deadlines for the stockpile destruction occurred, particularly with a view to ensuring that all States parties could comply with this important obligation. It was highlighted with great satisfaction that all States parties with a 2003 deadline indicated that they will comply with this obligation and will no longer possess anti-personnel mines stockpiles beyond their respective deadlines. **The exchange of information on the completion of stockpile destruction was the most significant part of the Standing Committee meetings.**

5. By the end of the May 2003 meeting of the Standing Committee, the following 16 States parties declared that they had completed their stockpile destruction since the 4MSP: **Brazil, Chad, Croatia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Netherlands, Moldova,**

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Switzerland and Romania. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2002-2003 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

**Mozambique, Portugal, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkmenistan, and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.** In addition, **Uganda** indicated that it will be able to meet its 1 August 2003 deadline with international help and assistance and **Venezuela** indicated that it would destroy its stockpiles prior to the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (5MSP).

6. With respect to **Guinea**, which had a 1 April 2003 deadline, the Co-Chairs noted that no official information had been obtained concerning the existence of stockpiled anti-personnel mines by that country. The Co-Chairs also noted that while it is assumed that **Barbados, Equatorial Guinea, Namibia** and the **Solomon Islands** do not have stockpiles, these States parties have not yet provided an article 7 report to indicate this.

7. Several States parties indicated that they carried out the final part of the destruction of their anti-personnel mines in the presence of ministers, representatives of other States parties and international and non-governmental organizations, and national and international media. The Co-Chairs commended these States parties for ensuring transparency and allowing for verification of their destruction programmes and invited other States parties with future deadlines to do the same.

8. The following 14 States parties with deadlines in 2004 and beyond gave updates on their stockpile destruction programmes: **Argentina, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Chile, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Romania, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zambia.** In addition, three States not parties to the Convention made statements concerning stockpile destruction, **Belarus, Ukraine, and Serbia and Montenegro**, as did one armed non-State actor from **Somalia**. This information from States not party to the Convention was warmly welcomed, particularly information which also outlined plans to accede to the Convention in due course.

9. The ICBL gave overviews of the global situation regarding stockpile destruction, noting: that approximately 30 million anti-personnel mines have been destroyed so far by the States parties; and, that as of May 2003, 46 States parties had completed their destruction, 10 States parties were in the process of destroying their stockpiles, and 8 other States parties had yet to commence their stockpile destruction programmes. In addition, it was noted that 15 States parties have yet to submit article 7 reports confirming the presence or the absence of stockpiled anti-personnel mines.

10. The Co-Chairs distributed a chart presenting an up-to-date picture of the status of stockpile destruction. The Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs will continue to update and circulate revised versions of this chart, including at the 5MSP. This chart is also available on the GICHD web site.

### **III. UPDATE ON ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION**

11. The Co-Chairs commended national and international efforts to assist States parties and other countries in fulfilling the Convention's obligations in the area of stockpile destruction. During the meetings of the Standing Committee, the following States parties and organizations gave an update on, or mentioned in their presentations, ongoing assistance efforts with respect to stockpile destruction: **Canada, France, Portugal, the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA), the European Commission (EC), the Organization of American States,**

the **Reay Group of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe**, the **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** and the **GICHD**. In addition, **Italy, Japan, Jordan** and **Thailand** noted their willingness to assist other countries in stockpile destruction with equipment, know-how and trained personnel.

12. The following States parties requested international assistance and financial support for their stockpile destruction activities: **Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Uganda, Senegal, and Tajikistan**. The following States not parties the same: **Belarus, Serbia and Montenegro, and Ukraine**.

13. At the request of the Co-Chairs, the Standing Committee was briefed on the challenges posed by the destruction of large stocks of PFM-type mines in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union and on the safety risks posed by specific construction features and toxic substances that PFM mines contain. Two States not parties to the Convention which possess large stockpiles of these mines, Ukraine and Belarus, stressed that without assistance they would have difficulty destroying their stockpiles and that this impeded their ratification of, or accession to, the Convention.

14. Bulgaria, the GICHD, Ukraine, and the EC provided updates on the technical and environmental challenges of transporting and destroying PFM and PMN landmines. Canada, the EC, NAMSA, the UNDP, and the GICHD provided updates on ongoing assistance efforts with respect to the destruction of these mines. These updates highlighted the risks of continued storage and the explosive degradation of such mines as they approach the end of their shelf life. In addition, it was highlighted that there is a need to develop a comprehensive funding and technology approach for the destruction of these mines. The ICRC reported on a seminar in Kiev, where among other issues, the destruction of PFM mines was noted as a major impediment for the ratification of the Convention.

#### **IV. MATTERS OF A THEMATIC NATURE RELATED TO DESTRUCTION AND POST-DESTRUCTION ACTIVITIES**

##### **A. “E-mine” web site**

15. The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) provided an update on its “e-mine” web site ([www.mineaction.org](http://www.mineaction.org)), which now includes new functions and more comprehensive information on stockpile destruction in various countries.

##### **B. Correct use of Form B and Form D of article 7 reports**

16. It was noted that in some cases States parties have entered the same information on stockpiled anti-personnel mines under Forms B and D of their article 7 reports, suggesting that they have stockpiles of anti-personnel mines even though they have fulfilled their obligations under article 4 (note: Form B corresponds to stockpiled anti-personnel mines whereas Form D corresponds to anti-personnel mines retained for the development of and training in various activities noted in article 3). The United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs clarified that reports in Form D regarding the number of anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with article 3 should not be included in the number of mines still stockpiled as reported in Form B.

### **C. Preservation of information and data on stockpile destruction**

17. The Co-Chairs recommended in their February 2003 “food-for-thought” paper that information, data and lessons learned with respect to stockpile destruction programmes should be preserved and safeguarded. In this respect the Standing Committee appreciated the offer by the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to serve as a depository for such information and data. As a result of the efforts of the ISU in this area, a bibliography on stockpile destruction sources can be presented at the 5MSP.

### **D. Contact group**

18. The Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs decided that, considering the excellent compliance with stockpile destruction deadlines in 2003, meetings of a contact group on stockpile destruction would only be warranted should a need arise related to difficulties of one or more States parties in meeting their article 4 obligations.

### **E. Declaration and destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines discovered after the completion of stockpiles destruction**

19. In their “food-for-thought” paper, the Co-Chairs raised the issue of a possible discovery of formerly unknown stockpiles. Although the importance of this issue was acknowledged, discussions on this matter were inconclusive.

## **V. AN ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS THAT REMAIN**

20. The Standing Committee in 2003 marked impressive progress with respect to meeting the obligations outlined in article 4 of the Convention and with respect to efforts of States parties to cooperate and assist each other in stockpile destruction. Excellent compliance with the destruction deadlines during 2003 has become one of the Convention’s success stories.

### **A. Follow-up in 2003-2004**

21. While during 2003 it appears that all States parties with stockpile destruction deadlines fulfilled their article 4 obligations, there is a need to continue to carefully monitor implementation of the article to identify, in a timely manner, possible assistance needs of a few cases that may have difficulty in meeting future deadlines. There is a need to be vigilant and to make every effort to uphold the so far flawless compliance record. A flawless compliance record in 2004 not only will strengthen the Convention further but also will provide an important input to the First Review Conference in 2004. With these factors in mind, the Co-Chairs recommend the following actions in 2003-2004:

- 21.1. That the Standing Committee give increased attention to those States parties with stockpile destruction deadlines between the end of the 5MSP and the First Review Conference;
- 21.2. That States parties whose deadlines fall within the period leading to the First Review Conference provide updates to the Standing Committee and Co-Chairs on their plans and progress, and communicate any needs for assistance at their earliest convenience;

- 21.3. That States parties whose deadlines fall in 2005 and beyond complete, if possible, their stockpile destruction before the First Review Conference;
- 21.4. That, to promote transparency, strengthen the Convention and support universalization efforts, States parties complete their final destruction events in the presence of representatives of other States parties and international and non-governmental organizations, and national and international media;
- 21.5. That States parties and international and regional organizations continue to provide assistance in the area of stockpile destruction assistance; and
- 21.6. That an emphasis continue to be placed on the destruction of PFM mines with a view to ensuring the formal acceptance, by the time of the Review Conference, by those States for which this continues to be an issue.

**B. Follow-up on thematic issues related to destruction and post-destruction activities**

22. The Standing Committee in 2002-2003 discussed various broader thematic areas that warrant follow-up over the next year. The Co-Chairs thus recommend the following:

- 22.1. That States parties and international and non-governmental organizations use the UNMAS “e-mine” web site to share and access information on stockpile destruction;
- 22.2. That States parties provide information and data on national stockpile destruction programmes, destruction technologies, national policies and case studies to the Implementation Support Unit in its role as a depository for such information and data;
- 22.3. That, in their article 7 reports, States parties indicate the number of anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with article 3 only in Form D; and
- 22.4. That the Co-Chairs convene a meeting of the Contact Group on stockpile destruction at their convenience whenever needs arise to discuss difficulties faced by one or more States parties in fulfilling article 4 obligations.

## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE GENERAL STATUS AND OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### **Final Report\*** **2002-2003**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of meetings of the States parties, met in Geneva on 3 and 7 February 2003, and 12 and 16 May 2003. These meetings were convened by its Co-Chairs, Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria and Mr. Gustavo Laurie of Peru, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Ms. Socorro Rovirosa of Mexico and Mr. Alexander Verbeek of the Netherlands.

2. Representatives of more than 90 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

3. The Co-Chairs emphasized that the programmes they had developed for the Standing Committee meetings were intended to provide a broad overview of progress towards the achievement of the Convention's core humanitarian aims while at the same time providing opportunities for dialogue on specific articles of the Convention.

#### **II. OVERVIEW OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

4. The President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP) provided updates on the general status of implementation of the Convention, particularly noting actions that had been taken in the context of the President's Action Programme and its emphasis on achieving the core humanitarian aims of the Convention.

With respect to universalization, it was noted that whereas at the end of the 4MSP 128 States had formally accepted the Convention, by the end of the May 2003 meeting of the Standing Committee the number of States that had ratified or acceded to the Convention stood at 134. With respect to stockpile destruction, it was noted that the first deadline for destruction occurred on 1 March 2003 and that all 45 States parties which had a deadline on that date had reported that they had completed destruction in accordance with article 4. With respect to mine clearance, it was noted that while 45 States parties may have mined areas, the first of the States

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Austria and Peru. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2002-2003 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

parties that had reported mined areas had indicated that it had completed clearance in accordance with article 5. And concerning victim assistance, it was noted that while the Convention had made gains in highlighting at the international level the challenges faced by landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities, much more needed to be done at the national level to communicate the State-specific challenges, plans to overcome them, progress that has been made and priorities for outside assistance. The President of the 4MSP also highlighted the breadth of regional activity that has taken place during 2002-2003, which he had noted in the President's Action Programme as being a priority during this period.

### **III. OVERVIEW OF THE GENERAL STATUS OF UNIVERSALIZATION**

5. It was reported that between the end of the 4MSP and the end of the May 2003 Standing Committee meeting, six additional States had ratified or acceded to the Convention: The Gambia, Central African Republic, Cyprus, Sao Tome et Principe, East Timor, and Lithuania. In addition, several other States - including Greece, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Turkey - reported that they were in the final stages of formally accepting the Convention.

6. The ongoing work of the Universalization Contact Group was highlighted, with special note given to the role of States parties' partners in universalization efforts - including the work undertaken by actors such as parliamentarians, the Human Security Network and the ICBL, or within multilateral forums including the Non-Aligned Movement, the Inter-Parliamentary Union and regional organizations. In addition, a new initiative to promote increased military-to-military dialogue was highlighted.

### **IV. MOBILIZING RESOURCES TO ACHIEVE THE CONVENTION'S HUMANITARIAN AIMS**

7. It was recalled that at the 4MSP it was suggested that all relevant actors take necessary steps and maintain frequent contact to ensure that by the Review Conference a significant renewal of the collective commitment is made to eliminating anti-personnel mines. In this regard, the establishment of a Resource Mobilization Contact Group was welcomed.

8. Matters regarding resource mobilization which were highlighted included the role of States parties - both traditional donors but also mine-affected countries themselves. The Contact Group Coordinator distributed detailed reports on resources generated since the Convention's establishment, with these reports indicating in part that mine-affected States parties have made substantial contributions to resolving their own landmines problems. The roles of multilateral organizations and development banks in resource mobilization were highlighted as well. In addition, it was stressed that resource mobilization must be considered more than simply money raised but rather should be understood in the context of both the need for integration of mine action into broader development programming and an increased emphasis on national ownership and coordination.

## **V. MATTERS RELATED TO THE GENERAL OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### **A. Intersessional Work Programme**

9. The Co-Chairs proceeded with their traditional role of consulting with a view to developing a list of prospective Co-Rapporteurs for the 2003-2004 Intersessional Work Programme. Based on these consultations, the Co-Chairs reported that they will propose to the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (5MSP) the following:

- 9.1. Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention: South Africa and New Zealand;
- 9.2. Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Nicaragua and Norway;
- 9.3. Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Algeria and Sweden;
- 9.4. Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction: Bangladesh and Canada.

10. At both meetings of the Standing Committee, the Co-Chairs emphasized their understanding that the States parties' expectations for the Co-Rapporteurs who would serve during the 2003-2004 Intersessional Work Programme would be different than in the past given that the culmination of the upcoming Intersessional Programme will be a Review Conference rather than an annual meeting of the States parties. That is, the Co-Chairs noted that the appointment of Co-Rapporteurs for 2003-2004 should be made without prejudice to the decisions taken at the Review Conference with respect to these Co-Rapporteurs assuming further roles in the period following the Review Conference.

### **B. Coordinating Committee**

11. As requested by the States parties at the 4MSP, the Chair of the Coordinating Committee reported on its activities, noting that, between the 4MSP and the May meetings of the Standing Committees, the Coordinating Committee had met seven times with its focus on preparations for the Standing Committee meetings, enhancing participation in these meetings and encouraging an emphasis on progress in the pursuit of the Convention's core humanitarian aims.

### **C. Implementation Support Unit**

12. The Director of the GICHD and the Manager of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) provided updates on the work of the ISU, noting in particular the establishment of the Convention's documentation centre and enhanced efforts to ensure that the States parties receive the information they need in order to participate fully in the work of the Convention. It was also noted that between the approval of the mandate to establish the ISU at the end of the May meetings of the Standing Committees, 11 States parties had made financial contributions to the ISU Trust Fund.

#### **D. Sponsorship Programme**

13. The Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme provided updates to the Standing Committee, noting that while additional donors continue to join the programme, demand for funds continues to outpace supply. The Coordinator stressed that additional resources will be needed to sustain the programme into 2004 and that it was hoped that those who have benefited from the programme would review their required level of assistance in order to ensure necessary support for others.

#### **E. Preparations for the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (5MSP)**

14. In keeping with past practice, the first meeting of the Standing Committee reviewed a draft agenda, a draft programme of work, draft rules of procedure and provisional cost estimates for the 5MSP. At the second meeting of the Standing Committee, a revised draft programme of work was reviewed, taking into consideration the need to make various changes to accommodate the meeting's opening ceremony. It was the Co-Chairs' sense that the draft agenda, revised draft programme of work, draft rules of procedure and provisional cost estimates could be put before the States parties for their acceptance at the 5MSP.

15. The Standing Committee also noted the appointment by the United Nations Secretary-General of Mr. Enrique Roman-Morey as Executive-Secretary of the 5MSP, the nomination by Thailand of two individuals who would serve as Co-Secretaries-General of the 5MSP, and of updates provided by Thailand on various organizational matters.

16. In addition, in the context of discussions on preparations for the 5MSP, it was announced that various States parties intended to host regional activities, either before the 5MSP or in the period leading to the Review Conference.

### **VI. MATTERS PERTAINING TO PARTICULAR ARTICLES OF THE CONVENTION**

#### **A. Article 1**

17. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for States parties to share information in an informal and voluntary manner in their national experiences in the implementation of article 1, particularly with respect to operational understandings of the word "assist" in article 1, paragraph 1 (c). It was noted that an increasing number of national views was bringing greater clarity to this matter. The ICBL, while expressing concern about joint operations involving States parties and States not party to the Convention with respect to military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq, indicated its belief that there are a number of areas where common views are emerging regarding what States parties should not do when engaged in such joint operations. It reiterated its view that a common understanding of this matter would strengthen the Convention.

#### **B. Article 2**

18. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for States parties to share information in an informal and voluntary manner on their national experiences in the implementation of article 2. Several States parties shared their experiences and points of view regarding the application and

understanding of the article. The ICBL urged greater progress in clarifying the definitions contained in the article, reiterating its view that mines which are capable of being activated by the unintentional act of a person, meet the definition of an anti-personnel mine under the Convention. The ICRC reiterated its view that a mine which is likely to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a person is an anti-personnel mine, regardless of intent or of how the mine is labelled.

### **Addressing the humanitarian impact of mines that may pose similar risks to civilian populations as anti-personnel mines**

19. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for States parties to discuss steps taken, and possible approaches, to reduce the humanitarian impact of mines that may pose similar risks to civilians as anti-personnel mines. The ICRC recalled that it had hosted an experts meeting in March 2001 in order to identify practical steps to this end and proposed that in the lead-up to the First Review Conference a process be undertaken to identify “best practices” which would culminate in an “understanding” on this issue for possible adoption at the Review Conference. However, at the May 2003 meeting of the Standing Committee the ICRC concluded that States parties apparently are unwilling to engage in such a process. For their part, several States parties expressed their view that matters related to mines other than anti-personnel mines should be discussed within the context of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, whereas others stressed the importance of keeping this matter on the agenda of the Standing Committee.

### **C. Article 3**

20. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for States parties to share information in an informal and voluntary manner on their national experiences in retaining, using and planning to use anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 3. Some States parties made use of this opportunity to express their views on the article or to provide further clarity on mines retained. Several confirmed that the understanding of negotiators of the Convention was that the number of mines retained in accordance with the article should be in the hundreds or thousands, but not in the tens of thousands. The ICBL expressed its concern about some States parties, which in its view are retaining excessive numbers of mines and, in particular, regarding the number of mines retained by one State party. Several States parties shared this concern. The ICBL further reiterated its view that States parties should provide voluntary information in their article 7 reports on the intended purpose and actual use of anti-personnel mines in accordance with the article.

### **D. Article 7**

21. The Coordinator of the Article 7 Contact Group reported on the status of article 7 reporting, noting that by the end of the May 2003 meetings of the Standing Committees 90 per cent of initial reports had been submitted in accordance with paragraph 1 of the article. In addition, it was emphasized that in accordance with paragraph 2 of the article, article 7 reporting is an annual obligation with States parties required to submit reports by 30 April of each year.

22. It was noted that the United Nations had transferred responsibility for the receipt of article 7 reports from New York to the Office of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs in Geneva. States parties were urged to submit reports electronically to the following address: mbc\_article7@un.org.

23. It was also noted that three States not parties had voluntarily submitted article 7 reports in accordance with the encouragement to do so in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/74.

## **E. Article 8**

### **Dialogue related to the facilitation and clarification of compliance**

24. Updates were provided on the ongoing informal dialogue related to the facilitation and clarification of compliance, with it being noted that the non-governmental organization VERTIC had prepared a *Guide to Fact Finding Missions*. Some States parties indicated their appreciation for this effort whereas others questioned the need for such a guide.

25. While no other suggestion had been made for a discussion topic in the context of this ongoing dialogue, the open invitation for States parties to propose topics was highlighted. (*Following the May 2003 meeting of the Standing Committee, a request has been made for discussions on the relationship between articles 8 and 9*). For its part, the ICBL urged an ongoing, lively dialogue in part given its view that in the event of serious allegations of non-compliance article 8 should be made operational.

### **Matters pertaining to compliance concerns**

26. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for informal discussions on any matter related to compliance concerns. The ICBL again urged the States parties, in time for the Review Conference, to place a high priority on ensuring a more coordinated and effective response to compliance concerns. It was also noted that the ICBL recalled that the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties states that treaty signatories must refrain from acts that would defeat the spirit and purposes of the instrument that they have signed.

## **F. Article 9**

27. The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for States parties to share experiences with respect to efforts to establish legislative, administrative and other matters in accordance with article 9 to prevent or suppress any activity prohibited by the Convention. It was noted that 35 States parties have adopted legislation, 21 States parties are in the process of doing so and 13 States parties consider existing laws sufficient to meet article 9 obligations.

## **VII. AN ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS THAT REMAIN**

### **A. The general status of implementation and universalization**

28. The Intersessional Work Programme's focus in 2002-2003 on the Convention's core humanitarian aims highlighted progress and challenges in those areas most pertinent to the achievement of the Convention's promise:

- 28.1. The Co-Chairs therefore recommend that the Standing Committee in 2003-2004 again ensure that central focus is placed on assessing progress with respect to the core humanitarian aims as well as on those key areas - such as resources and information - that drive progress.
29. With respect to universalization, the Standing Committee's emphasis in 2002-2003 on partnership and the contributions that could be offered by a multitude of actors underscored the importance of the Universalization Contact Group as an informal means to coordinate cooperative universalization efforts:
- 29.1. The Co-Chairs therefore recommend that the Contact Group enhance its efforts in 2003-2004 in the aim of ensuring that more States not party to the Convention ratify or accede to it in advance of the Review Conference.
  - 29.2. In addition, the Co-Chairs recommend that all States parties, the President of the 5MSP and all interested actors continue to play an active role in promoting acceptance of the Convention.

## B. The general operation of the Convention

30. In 2002-2003, the States parties were well served by the implementation mechanisms that they have established. With this in mind, the Co-Chairs recommend the following:

- 30.1. With respect to the **Intersessional Work Programme**, the Co-Chairs recommend that the States parties emphasize the value and importance of the Intersessional Programme in the final year leading to the Review Conference and highlight the need to continue to focus with great clarity on the areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives.
- 30.2. Furthermore with respect to the Intersessional Work Programme, the Co-Chairs recommend that all mine-affected States parties, those requiring assistance in meeting the needs of landmine survivors, and those in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, be encouraged to use the opportunity presented by the Intersessional Programme to present the problems they face in these areas, their plans to overcome these challenges, progress that has been made, and priorities for outside assistance.
- 30.3. Concerning the schedule for the Intersessional Work Programme between the 5MSP and the Review Conference, the Co-Chairs recommend that Standing Committee meetings be held the weeks of 9-12 February 2004 and 21-25 June 2004, and, that the Coordinating Committee continues to be practical-minded and applies the principle of flexibility with respect to the format of Standing Committee meetings, and their sequencing and respective time allocations.
- 30.4. With respect to the **Coordinating Committee**, the Co-Chairs recommend that the States parties again recognize the value and importance of the Coordinating Committee in the effective functioning and implementation of the Convention and for operating in an open and transparent manner.

- 30.5. With respect to the **Implementation Support Unit**, the Co-Chairs recommend that the States parties express their appreciation to the GICHD for the manner in which the ISU is making a positive contribution in support of the States parties' efforts to implement the Convention.

31. Mechanisms that have emerged on an informal basis also have played a significant role in contributing to the effective operation and implementation of the Convention.

- 31.1. With respect to the **Sponsorship Programme** in particular, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties express their appreciation for the manner in which the Sponsorship Programme has helped ensure more widespread participation at meetings of the Convention.

### C. The articles of the Convention

- 31.2. Given the increasing clarity that has emerged to date with respect to States parties' understandings of the application of **article 1** and **article 3**, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to share information, in an informal and voluntary manner in the year preceding the Convention's First Review Conference, with a view to developing common understandings on these matters at the Review Conference.
- 31.3. Similarly, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to share information in an informal and voluntary manner in meetings of the Standing Committee on their experiences in applying **article 2** and with respect to mines that may pose similar risks to civilians as anti-personnel mines with a view to achieving a convergence of views on outstanding issues.

32. With respect to **article 6**, 2002-2003 was a watershed year in increasing understanding of matters pertaining to resource mobilization and in highlighting our collective responsibility to generate the necessary resources and to apply them in an effective manner in the aim of ensuring that the Convention can live up to its humanitarian promise.

- 32.1. In this regard, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Resource Mobilization Contact Group continue its intensive efforts to encourage all States parties, multilateral organizations, development banks, the private sector and other relevant actors to renew their commitments prior to or during the Review Conference.
- 32.2. With respect to **article 7**, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to give due regard to the reporting requirements contained in the article with a view to ensuring a 100 per cent rate of compliance with the article by the time of the First Review Conference.
- 32.3. Furthermore, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Article 7 Contact Group, individual States parties, the President of the 5MSP and relevant organizations continue to promote these provisions and means to assist States parties in complying with them.

- 32.4. In addition, the Co-Chairs again recommend that States parties maximize the potential of the existing reporting format as an important tool to measure progress in the implementation of the Convention and for mine-affected States parties to communicate their needs to other States parties.
- 32.5. On matters related to **article 8**, the Co-Chairs recommend that the dialogue on facilitation and compliance should continue in an open-ended format and that Canada should continue facilitating this dialogue as long as interest holds.
- 32.6. In recalling that **article 9** is the cornerstone of the Convention's compliance mechanisms, the Co-Chairs recommend that, in advance of the Review Conference, all States parties that have not yet done so take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures to prevent or suppress any activity prohibited by the Convention.
- 32.7. In addition, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties use the opportunity presented by the Standing Committee to highlight good practices in the application of article 9 and to request assistance if necessary.

## Annex VII

### LIMA DECLARATION: FOR A HEMISPHERE FREE OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES

We, the experts of the American States parties to the Ottawa Convention, meeting at Lima on 14 and 15 August 2003 in the regional seminar “Towards a Hemisphere Free of Anti-personnel Mines” convened by the Governments of Peru and Canada and the Assistance Program for Integral Action against Anti-personnel Mines of the Organization of American States to assess hemispheric countries’ strengths and weaknesses in implementing policies against mines pursuant to relevant resolutions of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, namely AG/RES.1934 (XXXIII-0/03), Support for the Program of Integral Action Against Anti-personnel Mines in Central America, AG/RES.1935 (XXXIII-0/03), “Support for Action against Mines in Ecuador and Peru”, AG/RES.1936 (XXXIII-0/03), “The Americas As an Anti-personnel-Land-Mine-Free Zone”,

Welcoming the substantial progress made by the peoples and Governments of the Americas in promoting the processes of humanitarian demining and the use of appropriate technology, destruction of mine stockpiles, preventive education regarding the risk of accidents from anti-personnel mines and unexploded ordnance, and assistance to the victims of such explosive devices and to their families,

Recognizing that anti-personnel mines remain a serious threat to peace and personal safety in the hemisphere and an obvious obstacle to the socio-economic development of productive areas in some of our countries,

Reaffirming the imperative need for the total eradication of anti-personnel mines,

Acknowledging the international community’s contribution to the programmes and projects promoted by our countries for achieving the objective of making the western hemisphere an anti-personnel-mine-free zone within the time limits set in the Ottawa Convention,

Acknowledging also the important and valuable contribution that the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States has been making, through the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy’s programme of support for integral action against anti-personnel mines, to action against anti-personnel mines in the hemisphere,

Gathered together in this regional seminar in the spirit of full compliance with the principles of international humanitarian law and of the relevant international instruments and declarations, agree as follows:

1. To reassert the importance of respecting the principles and discharging the obligations set out in international law with respect to action against anti-personnel mines, which are valid for all nations;
2. To reiterate the importance of continued support by the States parties to the Ottawa Convention for the process which that instrument has initiated in the world;

3. To stress that the States of the Americas have acted consistently with their undertakings to sign and ratify the Ottawa Convention and discharge the obligations it contains;

4. To reassert the necessity of attaining the goals of worldwide elimination of anti-personnel landmines and transformation of the Americas into an anti-personnel-mine-free zone;

5. To urge that our States should continue to view action against anti-personnel mines as a national and regional priority and to provide the political momentum and the resources necessary to maintain the Americas' leading position in this regard;

6. Urge the countries that have not yet done so to ratify or to consider acceding to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, or Ottawa Convention, as soon as possible so as to ensure its full universality and implementation;

7. To thank the international community for its solidarity with, and valuable support for the countries of the Americas in their efforts to eradicate the scourge of anti-personnel mines, and to urge the friendly countries comprising the donor community in question to continue and to the extent possible increase their assistance to the countries of the region;

8. To welcome the accelerated destruction of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines in the region undertaken using countries' own resources or funds from international cooperation, and to express special appreciation for States' efforts to achieve the swift elimination and/or the reduction to minimum levels of stocks intended for training or research purposes;

9. To appeal earnestly to all the world's Governments to join with us in tackling the considerable challenges resulting from the need to provide appropriate comprehensive care (physical, psychosocial and socio-economic rehabilitation) to survivors of accidents with anti-personnel mines and their families and to give technical and financial support to sustainable programmes to that end;

10. To uphold firmly the aim and necessity of converting the Americas into an anti-personnel-land-mine-free zone, an aim expressed in the Declaration of the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Ottawa Convention and various resolutions of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States and endorsed in the Managua Appeal;

11. To request the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, through the latter's Unit for the Promotion of Democracy, and other international bodies to continue, to the extent that they are able and resources permit, supporting humanitarian demining and action against anti-personnel mines in those countries that require it;

12. Welcomes the proposal by the Government of Ecuador that the agreements reached in the present forum should be followed up at the next regional conference, to be held in Quito in June 2004;

13. To ask for the present Declaration to be taken into account at the forthcoming Special Security Conference in Mexico on 27 and 28 October 2003;

14. To submit the “Lima Declaration: For a Hemisphere Free of Anti-personnel Mines” to the Fifth Conference of States Parties to the Ottawa Convention, to be held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 15 to 19 September 2003;

15. To thank all participants for their efforts and valuable cooperation in ensuring the success of the present regional seminar;

16. To congratulate and thank the Government of Peru, the Government of Canada and, through the Assistance Program for Integral Action against Anti-personnel Landmines, the Organization of American States for their arrangements and services in connection with the present seminar and to entrust their representatives with the due dissemination of the contents of the present Declaration to the organizations, conferences and international forums responsible for dealing with this sensitive issue.

Done at Lima, Peru, 15 August 2003

## Annex VIII

### **DECLARATION OF THE HUMAN SECURITY NETWORK FOR THE UNIVERSALIZATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION**

The countries members of the Human Security Network, namely Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Norway, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and, in its capacity as an observer, South Africa, reaffirm their pledge to intensify and coordinate their efforts in support of the universalization and implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

Anti-personnel mines are among the greatest threats to human security. They mutilate and kill civilians and are still wreaking havoc. They hinder economic development and reconstruction in affected areas. In this sense, they are a cause of famine, not to say of poverty in the countries concerned.

The countries members of the Network reiterate their conviction that no conceivable military use of anti-personnel mines can justify these weapons' devastating human costs.

The Convention prohibiting the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines is a vital instrument of human security.

The countries members of the Network reaffirm their pledge to promote worldwide awareness of anti-personnel mines and of their serious effects on human security.

To that end, the Network commits itself to promoting universal acceptance of the Convention and of the rules therein. In this connection, the Ministers of the Human Security Network approved in May 2003 a medium-term plan encompassing the concrete activities of the Network and its members in support of the universalization and implementation of the Convention. The Network stands ready to exchange experience and strengthen cooperation with countries interested in stockpile destruction, demining and assistance to victims.

While welcoming the recent ratifications, the members of the Network appeal to all States which have not yet done so to accede to the Convention.

The Network looks forward eagerly to the first Review Conference which, subject to a decision by the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, will be held in Kenya, in Africa, where anti-personnel mines constitute a serious threat to a great many peoples' human security and thus affect their freedom to live safe from fear and need. The Network urges all States parties and all concerned organizations to participate in the Review Conference with a view to reaffirming their undertakings regarding the Convention and its humanitarian objectives so as to complete the task of ridding the world of anti-personnel mines.

Bangkok, 15 September 2003

## Annex IX

### LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Symbol	Title
APLC/MSP.5/2003/1	Provisional agenda
APLC/MSP.5/2003/2	Provisional programme of work
APLC/MSP.5/2003/3	Rules of procedure
APLC/MSP.5/2003/4	Estimated costs for convening the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction
APLC/MSP.5/2003/5	Final Report
APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.1	Draft Declaration of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties “Bangkok Declaration”
APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.2	Draft Report of the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties with Respect to Consultations on Preparation for the Convention’s First Review Conference
APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.3	Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit September 2002-September 2003
APLC/MSP.5/2003/L.4	Estimated costs for convening the Preparatory Meetings for the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction
APLC/MSP.5/2003/SC.1/1	Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies - Final Report 2002-2003
APLC/MSP.5/2003/SC.2/1	Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-economic Reintegration - Final Report 2002-2003

<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Title</b>
APLC/MSP.5/2003/SC.3/1	Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction - Final Report 2002-2003
APLC/MSP.5/2003/SC.4/1	Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention - Final Report 2002-2003
APLC/MSP.5/2003/INF.1	List of the reports on transparency measures
APLC/MSP.5/2003/INF.2/Rev.1	List of participants
APLC/MSP.5/2003/CRP.1	President's Action Programme
APLC/MSP.5/2003/CRP.2	Draft report, Part I - Organization and work of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.5/2003/MISC.1	Provisional list of participants

For technical questions on how to obtain the above documents, contact the UN ODS via e-mail at <http://www.ods.unog.ch/ods/>. Access to ODS is free for staff members of the United Nations Secretariat, for a limited number of users in specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system, and for up to 20 users in Member States of the United Nations. Requests for access can be submitted to the following person:

Ms. Margaret Wachter  
E-mail: [mwachter@unog.ch](mailto:mwachter@unog.ch)  
Fax: +41 22 917-0736  
Telephone: +41 22 917-3657

-----