

*Landmine Monitor Report 2003:
Toward a Mine-Free World*

Executive Summary



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

Copyright © August 2003 by Human Rights Watch
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America
This report was printed on recycled paper using vegetable based ink.

ISBN: 1-56432-287-4
Library of Congress Control Number: 2003107386
Cover photograph © 2002 by Suresh Studio, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan, India
Cover design by Rafael Jiménez

For a copy of Landmine Monitor Report 2003, please contact:

International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL)
www.icbl.org/lm
Email: lm@icbl.org

Human Rights Watch
1630 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20009, USA
Tel: +1 (202) 612-4321, Fax: +1 (202) 612-4333, Email: hrwdc@hrw.org
www.hrw.org

Handicap International
rue de Spa 67, B-1000 Brussels, BELGIUM
Tel: +32 (2) 286-50-59, Fax: +32 (2) 230-60-30, Email: stan.brabant@handicap.be
www.handicap-international.be

Kenya Coalition Against Landmines
PO Box 57217, Nairobi, KENYA
Tel: +254 (2) 573-099, Fax: +254 (2) 223-307
Email: kcal@africaonline.co.ke

Mines Action Canada
1 Nicolas Street, Suite 1210, Ottawa, ONT K1N 7B7, CANADA
Tel: +1 (613) 241-3777, Fax: +1 (613) 244-3410, Email: macinfo@web.ca
www.minesactioncanada.org

Norwegian People's Aid
PO Box 8844, Youngstorget NO-0028, Oslo, NORWAY
Tel: +47 (22) 03-77-00, Fax: +47 (22) 20-08-70, Email: lm@npaid.org
www.npaid.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| ABOUT LANDMINE MONITOR..... | 1 |
| MAJOR FINDINGS | 4 |
| BANNING ANTIPERSONNEL MINES | 9 |
| Universalization | 9 |
| Implementation – The Intersessional Work Program | 11 |
| Convention on Conventional Weapons..... | 12 |
| Global Use of Antipersonnel Mines..... | 13 |
| Global Production of Antipersonnel Mines..... | 16 |
| Global Trade in Antipersonnel Mines..... | 17 |
| Global Stockpiles of Antipersonnel Mines | 18 |
| Stockpile Destruction..... | 19 |
| Mines Retained for Training and Research..... | 22 |
| Transparency Reporting..... | 24 |
| National Implementation Measures | 25 |
| Special Issues of Concern | 26 |
| Joint Military Operations and “Assist”..... | 26 |
| Foreign Stockpiling and Transit of Antipersonnel Mines..... | 27 |
| Antivehicle Mines with Antihandling Devices and Sensitive Fuzes | 28 |
| Claymore Mines..... | 30 |
| HUMANITARIAN MINE ACTION..... | 32 |
| Landmine Problem..... | 34 |
| Survey and Assessments | 35 |
| Mine Clearance..... | 36 |
| Planning and Coordination..... | 42 |
| International Developments – Coordination and Information..... | 44 |
| Demining Technology Research and Development | 46 |
| Mine Risk Education..... | 46 |
| LANDMINE CASUALTIES AND SURVIVOR ASSISTANCE | 52 |
| New Casualties in 2002-2003 | 52 |
| Scale of the Problem | 53 |
| Casualty Data Collection | 54 |
| Addressing the Needs of Survivors..... | 56 |
| Capacities of Affected States to Provide Assistance to Landmine Survivors..... | 58 |
| International Developments | 63 |
| MINE ACTION FUNDING | 66 |
| Mine Action Donors | 69 |
| States and Victim Assistance | 75 |
| Major Mine Action Recipients..... | 78 |
| Other Mine Action Recipients in 2002..... | 81 |
| REGIONAL OVERVIEWS..... | 83 |
| Africa | 83 |
| Americas | 90 |
| Asia and Pacific | 95 |
| Europe and Central Asia | 102 |
| Middle East and North Africa | 109 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1997 Mine Ban Treaty | 115 |
| Mine Ban Treaty States Parties and Signatories..... | 130 |
| Non-Signatories | 132 |

ABOUT LANDMINE MONITOR

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

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

The Landmine Monitor system features a global reporting network and an annual report. A network of 110 Landmine Monitor researchers from 90 countries gathered information to prepare this report. The researchers come from the ICBL's campaigning coalition and also from other elements of civil society, including journalists, academics and research institutions. In 2003, the functions of the Landmine Monitor's central database were transferred to the Landmine Monitor website. The website has developed into a sophisticated and user-friendly database in its own right, equipped with a powerful search engine that can comprehensively search every Landmine Monitor annual report and its other research products.

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

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

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

Landmine Monitor Report 2003 contains information on every country of the world with respect to landmine ban policy, use, production, transfer, stockpiling, mine action funding, mine clearance, mine risk education, landmine casualties, and survivor assistance. It does not only report on States Parties and their treaty obligations, but looks at signatory states and non-signatories as well. All countries are included in this report in the belief it will provide an important means to measure global effectiveness on mine action and banning the weapon. Appendices with information from key players in mine action, such as UN agencies and the International Committee of the Red Cross, are also included.

As was the case in previous years, Landmine Monitor acknowledges that this ambitious report has its shortcomings and should be viewed as a work in progress. The Landmine Monitor is a system that is continuously updated, corrected and improved. Comments, clarifications, and corrections from

governments and others are sought, in the spirit of dialogue and in the common search for accurate and reliable information on a difficult subject.

Landmine Monitor 2003 Process

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

Research grants for *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* were awarded in October 2002, following a meeting of the Core Group in Geneva in September 2002. Members of the global research network met in four regional meetings between November 2002 and February 2003 to discuss preliminary findings, exchange information, assess what research and data gathering had already taken place, identify gaps, and ensure common research methods and reporting mechanisms for the Monitor. In February and March 2003, draft research reports were submitted to the Landmine Monitor research coordinators for review and comment. From 7-9 April 2003, the research network met in Rome, Italy to discuss final reports and major findings with the research coordinators, as well as to engage in ICBL workshops and advocacy discussions. Throughout April, May, June and July 2003, Landmine Monitor's team of regional and thematic coordinators verified sources and edited country reports, with a team at Human Rights Watch taking responsibility for final fact-checking, editing and assembly of the entire report. This report was printed during August and presented to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty in Bangkok, Thailand in September 2003.

Landmine Monitor thanks the donors to the initiative and this fifth annual report. *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* reflects the ICBL's views and Landmine Monitor's donors are in no way responsible for, and do not necessarily endorse, the material contained in the report. It was only possible to carry out this work with the aid of grants from:

- Government of Australia
- Government of Austria
- Government of Belgium
- Government of Canada
- Government of Denmark
- Government of France
- Government of Germany
- Government of Italy
- Government of The Netherlands
- Government of Norway
- Government of Sweden
- Government of Switzerland
- Government of United Kingdom

- European Commission

MAJOR FINDINGS

It is abundantly clear from the wealth of information in *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* that the Mine Ban Treaty and the ban movement more generally are making tremendous strides in eradicating antipersonnel landmines and in saving lives and limbs in every region of the world. Significant challenges remain, however.

The reporting period for *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* is May 2002 to May 2003. Editors have where possible added important information that arrived in June and July 2003. Statistics for mine action and landmine casualties are usually given for calendar year 2002.

+Widespread international rejection of antipersonnel mines

As of 31 July 2003, a total of 134 countries were States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, and another 13 had signed but not yet ratified, constituting more than three-quarters of the world's nations. Since the last Landmine Monitor report, nine countries joined the treaty including Afghanistan and Cyprus, which are both mine-affected. A number of other governments took significant steps toward joining and were poised to ratify or accede.

-Universalization challenges

Forty-seven countries, with a combined stockpile of some 200 million antipersonnel mines, remain outside of the Mine Ban Treaty. They include three of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (China, Russia, and the United States), most of the Middle East, most of the former Soviet republics, and many Asian states.

+Fewer governments using antipersonnel mines

In this reporting period (since May 2002), at least six governments used antipersonnel mines, compared to at least nine governments in *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* and at least 13 governments in *Landmine Monitor Report 2001*. As of July 2003, only two governments—Myanmar and Russia—were using antipersonnel mines on a regular basis. Government forces in Afghanistan, Angola, and Sri Lanka used antipersonnel mines in the previous reporting period, but not the current period. Like Afghanistan, Angola is now party to the Mine Ban Treaty.

-Possible antipersonnel mine use by Mine Ban Treaty signatories

Landmine Monitor cannot definitively conclude that any of the 13 signatory governments used antipersonnel mines in this reporting period, but it has received ever-more compelling reports of use of antipersonnel mines by the Burundi Army. There are also serious allegations of use by government forces in Sudan. Both governments deny any mine-laying.

-New and continued use by governments

The only government to be added to the list of mine users was Iraq, as Saddam Hussein's forces used antipersonnel mines in the lead-up to and during the 2003 conflict in Iraq. The governments of India,

Pakistan, Nepal and Russia have all acknowledged using antipersonnel mines in this reporting period. It is also clear that government forces in Myanmar (Burma) continued to lay mines. There have been credible reports of use by Georgia, but the government denies it.

+Fewer Non-State Actors using antipersonnel mines

Opposition groups are reported to have used antipersonnel mines in at least eleven countries: Burma, Burundi, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia (Abkhazian forces), India, Nepal, Philippines, Russia (Chechen forces), Somalia, and Sudan. This compares to reports of use by non-state actors in at least fourteen countries in the previous reporting period.

+Commitments by Non-State Actors

In the reporting period, two groups in Iraqi Kurdistan and 15 factions in Somalia signed the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment for non-state actors, agreeing to implement a comprehensive ban on antipersonnel mines.

+Decreased production

At least 36 nations have ceased production of antipersonnel mines, including thirty States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, and six non-signatories (Finland, Greece, Israel, Poland, Serbia and Montenegro, and Turkey). Taiwan has also stopped production. In several countries that have not formally stopped, there appears to have been no production for a number of years, such as in the US (since 1997), South Korea, and Egypt. Russia stated that for the past eight years, it has not produced its most common blast mine (PMN series) or its scatterable PFM-1 "Butterfly" mines.

-Ongoing production

Landmine Monitor identifies fifteen countries as producers of antipersonnel mines, although it is not known how many were actively producing mines in this reporting period. Nepal for the first time admitted that it has produced antipersonnel mines, making it the first addition to the ranks of the producers since Landmine Monitor reporting started in 1999.

+De facto global ban on trade in antipersonnel mine

Global trade in antipersonnel mines has dwindled to a very low level of illicit trafficking and unacknowledged trade. There were no confirmed instances of antipersonnel mine transfers, as the *de facto* global ban on trade held tight. Several countries outside the Mine Ban Treaty formally extended or reconfirmed their moratoria on exports of antipersonnel mines, including Belarus, China, Israel, Poland, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, Turkey and the US.

+Millions of stockpiled antipersonnel mines destroyed

Some four million stockpiled antipersonnel mines have been destroyed since the last Landmine Monitor report, bringing the total to more than 50 million in recent years. Another eighteen Mine Ban Treaty States Parties have reported completing destruction of their stockpiles, destroying almost 10.8 million mines: Brazil, Chad, Croatia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Italy, Japan, Jordan, FYR Macedonia,

Moldova, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkmenistan, and Uganda. Another twelve States Parties are in the process of destroying their stockpiles. With one notable exception, it appears States Parties are meeting their respective four-year deadlines for destruction of stockpiled antipersonnel mines that began on 1 March 2003.

-The case of Turkmenistan

Turkmenistan reported that it completed its stockpile destruction by its 1 March 2003 deadline, destroying almost 700,000 mines in an eighteen-month period. However, it also reported that it plans to retain 69,200 mines for training. The ICBL believes that 69,200 mines is an unacceptable, and likely illegal, number as it is obviously not the “minimum number absolutely necessary,” as required by the treaty. The ICBL has expressed its view that retention of such a number of mines in fact means that Turkmenistan did not fully destroy its stocks, and is therefore in violation of a core treaty obligation.

+Stockpile destruction by non-States Parties

Russia reported for the first time that it destroyed more than 16.8 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines between 1996 and 2002, including 638,427 in 2002. It had previously reported destruction of about 1 million antipersonnel mines. Ukraine, a Mine Ban Treaty signatory, completed the destruction of nearly 405,000 mines between July 2002 and May 2003. As a signal of its support for the Mine Ban Treaty, non-signatory Belarus destroyed 22,963 PMN-2 antipersonnel mines in 2002.

-Millions of mines stockpiled by non-States Parties

Landmine Monitor estimates that there are approximately 200-215 million antipersonnel mines currently stockpiled by 78 countries. Non-signatories account for all but about 10 million of those mines, including China (estimated 110 million), Russia (estimated 50 million), US (10.4 million), Pakistan (estimated 6 million), India (estimated 4-5 million), Belarus (4.5 million), and South Korea (2 million).

-Failure to meet transparency reporting requirement

Fifteen States Parties have not submitted their initial transparency measures reports as required by Article 7 of the Mine Ban Treaty, including Angola, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Suriname. These states have also not officially declared the presence or absence of antipersonnel mine stockpiles, and their compliance with the destruction requirement.

+Voluntary transparency reporting by non-States Parties

In this reporting period, Latvia and Poland submitted voluntary Article 7 transparency reports, each revealing details of their antipersonnel mine stockpiles. Greece also provided stockpile information publicly for the first time. These steps followed the examples set by Belarus, Lithuania and Ukraine.

+Increased mine action donations

Mine action funding has totaled over \$1.7 billion since 1992, including \$1.2 billion since the Mine Ban Treaty was opened for signature in 1997. For 2002, Landmine Monitor has identified \$309 million in mine action funding by more than 23 donors, a 30 percent increase from the previous year. In 2001, Landmine Monitor reported that global mine action funding had stagnated. Donors that increased their

mine action contributions in 2002 included Japan (\$49.4 million spent), European Commission (\$38.7 million), Norway (\$25.2 million), Germany (\$19.4 million), and the Netherlands (\$16 million). Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Switzerland also recorded increases. Non-States Parties Greece and China also increased assistance significantly. One donor—Japan—is responsible for well over half of the increase in mine action donations in 2002.

-Donor decreases in mine action funding

Mine action funding fell for four of the biggest donors: the United States (down \$5.5 million); Denmark (down \$3.8 million); Sweden (down \$2.6 million); and the United Kingdom (down \$1.4 million).

+Increases in funding received

Among the mine-affected countries, the biggest increases in mine action funding in 2002 were registered in Afghanistan (\$50 million increase), Vietnam (\$12 million), Angola (\$7.7 million), Cambodia (\$6.3 million), and Sri Lanka (about \$5.5 million). Among the major recipients, no significant decreases were reported except where expected in Kosovo.

-More funding needed

More than two-thirds of the 2002 funding increase went to a single country, Afghanistan. Even greater increases in mine action funding will be needed in the future to cope fully with the global landmine problem and to enable Mine Ban Treaty States Parties to meet their ten-year deadlines for mine clearance.

+Expanding mine action programs

The number of mine-affected countries reporting organized mine clearance operations increased in 2002, and there were substantial increases in the amount of land cleared in many countries. Landmine Monitor recorded humanitarian mine clearance in at least 35 countries and instances of limited mine clearance in 32 countries. Costa Rica declared itself mine-free in December 2002. Peace agreements and cease-fires in Angola, Sri Lanka, and Sudan enabled the expansion of mine action activities. Landmine Monitor recorded mine risk education programs in 36 countries in 2002 and 2003.

-Still too many mine-affected countries

Landmine Monitor research identifies 82 countries that are affected to some degree by landmines and/or unexploded ordnance, of which 45 are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty. No mine clearance was recorded in 16 of the affected countries and no mine risk education activities were recorded in 25 countries.

+Fewer new mine victims in some countries

The reported landmine casualty rate declined in 2002 in the majority of mine-affected countries. Where an increase was reported in 2002 this generally appears to be due to population movements within affected areas (Cambodia), or to a new or expanded conflict (India and Palestine). In other mine-affected

countries, the increase appears to be largely the result of improved data collection: Burma, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, and Thailand. It is likely that there are between 15,000 and 20,000 new landmine casualties each year, a significant reduction in the long-standing and commonly cited estimate of 26,000 new casualties each year. However, the lack of reliable reporting in some countries, and the underreporting of casualties in many countries, must be acknowledged.

-Continued casualties means more mine victims needing assistance

In 2002 and through June 2003, there were new landmine casualties reported in 65 countries; the majority (41) of these countries were at peace, not war. Only 15 percent of reported casualties in 2002 were identified as military personnel. In 2002, the greatest number of reported new casualties were found in: Chechnya (5,695 casualties recorded), Afghanistan (1,286), Cambodia (834), Colombia (530), India (523), Iraq (457), Angola (287), Chad (200), Nepal (177), Vietnam (166), Sri Lanka (142), Burundi (114), Burma/Myanmar (114), and Pakistan (111). Significant numbers (over 50) of new casualties were also recorded in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Laos, Palestine, Senegal, Somalia, and Sudan.

- Inadequate assistance to landmine survivors

In many mine-affected countries the assistance available to address the needs of survivors is inadequate and it would appear that additional outside assistance is needed in providing for the care and rehabilitation of mine survivors. In this reporting period, Landmine Monitor has identified at least 48 mine-affected countries where one or more aspects of assistance are reportedly inadequate to meet the needs of mine survivors.

BANNING ANTIPERSONNEL MINES

The Mine Ban Treaty was opened for signature on 3 December 1997. After achieving the required 40 ratifications in September 1998, the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force on 1 March 1999, becoming binding international law. This is believed to be the fastest entry-into-force of any major multilateral treaty ever. Since 1 March 1999, states must accede and cannot simply sign the treaty with intent to ratify later. For a state that ratifies or accedes now, the treaty enters into force for it on the first day of the sixth month after the date on which that state deposited its instrument of ratification. That state is then required to make its initial transparency report to the UN Secretary General within 180 days (and annually thereafter), destroy stockpiled mines within four years, and destroy mines in the ground within 10 years. It is also required to take appropriate domestic implementation measures, including imposition of penal sanctions.

Universalization

A total of 134 countries are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, as of 31 July 2003.¹ Another 13 countries have signed, but not ratified the treaty.² Thus, 147 countries have legally committed to the core obligations of the treaty, including no use of antipersonnel mines.³

Since the publication of *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, nine additional countries have become States Parties. Four countries acceded: Afghanistan (11 September 2002), Comoros (19 September 2002), Central African Republic (8 November 2002), and Timor-Leste (7 May 2003). Five countries ratified: Cameroon (19 September 2002), The Gambia (23 September 2002), Cyprus (17 January 2003), São Tomé e Príncipe (31 March 2003), and Lithuania (12 May 2003).

Two of these new States Parties are mine-affected (Afghanistan and Cyprus).

Since the Mine Ban Treaty was opened for signature in December 1997, over three-quarters of the world's nations have joined the treaty. This indicates widespread international rejection of any use or possession of antipersonnel mines, and widespread commitment to mine clearance and assistance to mine survivors.

Most of the major mine-affected countries are now States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty. These include: Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Thailand in Asia; Angola, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea and Mozambique in Africa; Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia in Europe; Colombia and Nicaragua in the Americas. These countries—among the biggest users of antipersonnel mines in the past—have now foresworn the weapon.

¹ For the purposes of this report, Landmine Monitor identifies as a State Party any country that has given its consent to be bound by the Mine Ban Treaty. Some of these countries have not completed the six-month waiting period for formal entry-into-force mandated by the treaty. Also, in this report the term ratification is used as shorthand for “consent to be bound.” The treaty allows governments to give consent to be bound in a variety of ways, including ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession – all of which give binding legal status beyond signature.

² Thirteen states have signed but not ratified the Mine Ban Treaty as of 31 July 2003: Brunei, Burundi, Cook Islands, Ethiopia, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Marshall Islands, Poland, Sudan, Ukraine, and Vanuatu.

³ Under Article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, when a State has signed a treaty, it “is obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose” of that treaty.

Every country in sub-Saharan Africa is a State Party or signatory, except Somalia, which does not have a functioning government; every country in the Americas region, except the US and Cuba; every member of the European Union, except Finland; every member of NATO, except the US and Turkey (which is about to accede). Major Asia-Pacific nations have joined, such as Australia, Indonesia, and Japan.

In 2002 and 2003, there were many encouraging movements toward accession or ratification in countries not yet party to the Mine Ban Treaty. Belarus, with one of the largest antipersonnel mine stockpiles in the world, completed all the domestic measures necessary for its accession on 30 July 2003. The parliament of Serbia and Montenegro passed legislation to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty on 20 June 2003. The foreign ministers of Greece and Turkey affirmed that their countries would proceed to submit simultaneously their respective instruments of adherence, having completed all the domestic procedures to join the treaty. In April 2003, Guyana's National Assembly approved ratification of the Mine Ban Treaty. In Burundi, a draft law for ratification of the Mine Ban Treaty was adopted by the Council of Ministers in March 2003 and by the Senate in June 2003. In Sudan, in May 2003, Foreign Minister Mustafa Osman Ismail announced that the Council of Ministers had officially and unanimously endorsed the Mine Ban Treaty and had transmitted it to Parliament for ratification.

Estonia's Prime Minister has stated that the government is seriously considering joining the Mine Ban Treaty and has started the process of internal deliberations for joining. In April 2003, the Latvian Ambassador to the UN in Geneva said the country would probably join the Mine Ban Treaty in 2004. In October 2002, the Sri Lankan government announced its willingness to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty contingent upon reaching an agreement with the rebel LTTE on the non-use of landmines. An official from Papua New Guinea indicated in May 2003 that accession would be completed before the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in September 2003. In the Cook Islands, ratification legislation is being considered by the Parliament.

Sustained and systematic universalization efforts among States Parties, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and United Nations (UN) agencies continue. The Universalization Contact Group, coordinated by Canada, met several times in 2002 and 2003 to strategize and identify universalization targets. There were numerous important regional conferences and other meetings and missions aimed at universalization, including in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burma, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal, Poland, Russia, Sri Lanka, Turkey and Ukraine. (See ICBL chapter in this *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*). For most countries that have joined to the treaty since 2000, there seems to be a tangible relationship between the occurrence of either a States Parties or intersessional meeting and the ratification/accession of the treaty for those countries. Since February 2000, 24 of the 44 states ratified the treaty within two weeks before or after such a meeting.

Virtually all of the 47 non-signatories have endorsed the notion of a comprehensive ban on antipersonnel mines at some point in time, and many have already at least partially embraced the Mine Ban Treaty. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 57/74 calling for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty was adopted on 22 November 2002 by a vote of 143 in favor, none opposed, and 23 abstentions. The same eighteen states not party to the treaty voted for the resolution as did for the resolution last year: Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bhutan, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Mongolia, Nepal, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tonga, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, and

Yugoslavia.⁴ The 23 abstentions were four more than on a similar resolution last year. State Party Tajikistan described its abstention as a “mistake.”

Despite the large and growing number of States Parties, there is concern that the pace of new ratifications and accessions has slowed. There were three ratifications in December 1997 at the time of the treaty signing conference, then 55 ratifications/accessions in 1998, 32 in 1999, 19 in 2000, 13 in 2001, eight in 2002, and four from January to July 2003.

Forty-seven countries (24 percent of the world’s total) have not yet joined the treaty. This includes three of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council: China, Russia, and the United States. Most of the Middle East, most of the former Soviet republics, and many Asian states are outside the treaty. Major antipersonnel mine producers and stockpilers, such as China, India, Pakistan, Russia, and the US are not part of the treaty. Moreover, there has been little or no positive change in the ban policies of some states in the past year, including the US, Russia, and China. Universalization still remains the biggest challenge facing ban supporters.

Implementation – The Intersessional Work Program

During 2002-2003, the intersessional work program, established in 1999 to carry the work of the Mine Ban Treaty forward between the annual Meetings of States Parties, continued to help maintain international attention on the global antipersonnel mine problem, consolidate global mine action efforts, provide a global picture of priorities, and contribute to the full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. The ICBL remained a full and active participant in the intersessional process, showing that the strong partnership with governments continues.

The four Standing Committees—Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration; Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies; Stockpile Destruction; and General Status and Operation of the Convention—each met twice in 2002 and twice in 2003 at the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) in Geneva. An Action Program issued by the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties (Belgium) served as the basis for planning for the fourth year of intersessional work. The Standing Committees focused more than ever before on the needs, gaps and resources available for the implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, especially its mine action components, in the period leading up to the first Review Conference in November 2004.

The Coordinating Committee (CC) of the States Parties met monthly in 2002 and 2003, with the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties as its chair. The CC consists of the co-chairs and co-rapporteurs of the intersessional Standing Committees, the chairs of the ad hoc contact groups for Universalization (Canada), Articles 7 & 9 (Belgium), Resource Mobilization (Norway), and the Sponsorship Group (UK), and the presidents of past and forthcoming Meetings of States Parties. The meetings discussed practical coordination matters relating to the intersessional work program and preparations for the annual Meetings of States Parties. The ICBL and ICRC continued to participate in these meetings on a regular basis.

Since the Mine Ban Treaty’s Implementation Support Unit (ISU) became operational in January 2002, it has more than proven its worth by ensuring better preparations for the intersessional meetings,

⁴ Non-States Parties Afghanistan and Comoros also voted for the resolution in 2001, but have subsequently acceded.

providing valuable support to all interested States, serving as an information source, and contributing to strategic thinking on how to achieve the overall goals of the treaty. The ICBL works very closely with the ISU. The ISU together with the Sponsorship Group of interested States Parties helps to enable full participation in the intersessional program of mine-affected countries with limited resources.

Participation in the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in February and May 2003 reached record levels, with more than 500 persons in attendance, representing 126 countries (96 States Parties and 30 non-States Parties), dozens of members of the ICBL, Landmine Monitor researchers, the ICRC, international and regional organizations, UN agencies, and academic institutions.

Convention on Conventional Weapons

A total of 90 countries are States Parties to the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW), as of 31 July 2003. In December 2001, States Parties to the CCW agreed to expand the scope of the CCW to apply to internal as well as international armed conflicts; by July 2003, 14 had ratified this amendment to Article 1 of the Convention.⁵ The States Parties also agreed to form a Group of Governmental Experts to explore the problems posed by explosive remnants of war (ERW) and mines other than antipersonnel mines (MOTAPM).

In December 2002, the States Parties agreed to a mandate to negotiate an instrument on generic, post-conflict remedial measures for ERW and to continue work on MOTAPM. The ICBL and other NGOs have challenged States Parties to conclude a strong, effective, legally binding instrument in 2003 on the wider problem of explosive remnants of war, including cluster munitions. The ICBL and other NGOs have also urged the negotiation of a legally binding instrument to end the civilians casualties caused by antivehicle mines, and has encouraged all States to examine their national stocks to take steps to eliminate antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes or antihandling devices that cause the mine to function like an antipersonnel mine, as these are already prohibited by the Mine Ban Treaty.

The Group of Governmental Experts met for one week in March 2003 and two weeks in June 2003. They will meet again in November. Ambassador Chris Sanders of the Netherlands, the coordinator of the group's work on ERW, put forward a draft framework paper in March, and a draft instrument in June. It is unclear if the negotiations will conclude in November; while most States Parties support a new protocol on ERW, the United States and a few others have raised objections to a legally-binding instrument.

A total of 69 countries are States Parties to Amended Protocol II of the CCW, as of 31 July 2003. Amended Protocol II regulates landmines, booby-traps and other devices; it took effect on 3 December 1998. Just ten of the 69 States Parties to Amended Protocol II have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty: China, Estonia, Finland, India, Israel, Latvia, Morocco, Pakistan, South Korea, and the US. Several of these have indicated they are likely to join the Mine Ban Treaty, including Estonia, Latvia, and Finland. Thus, very few of the States Parties to Amended Protocol II continue to assert the right to use antipersonnel mines.

Two States Parties to Amended Protocol II are known to have used antipersonnel mines since December 1998: India and Pakistan. US forces in Afghanistan have incorporated Soviet-era minefields

⁵ The 14 are: Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Estonia, France, Holy See, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, South Korea, Sweden, and the UK.

into their perimeter defense, deriving military advantage from these minefields. India, Pakistan, and the US are obligated to comply with CCW Amended Protocol II requirements to mark and monitor minefields to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians. But none of these countries provided detailed information on measures taken in their annual national reports for Amended Protocol II submitted in December 2002.

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

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

Amended Protocol II States Parties China, Pakistan, and Ukraine have deferred compliance with the self-destruction and self-deactivation requirements for remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines provided in the Technical Annex. They have up to nine years to come into full compliance with the technical specifications. The deadlines for this action are 3 December 2007 for China and Pakistan, and 15 May 2008 for Ukraine. Ukraine, a signatory of the Mine Ban Treaty, is taking steps to destroy its stockpile of 5.9 million PFM-type remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines. India and Pakistan have reported that new compliant remotely-delivered antipersonnel mines are being developed and tested.

Global Use of Antipersonnel Mines

The drop in global use of antipersonnel mines that began to take hold in the mid-1990s continued in this reporting period. In recent years, antipersonnel mines have been used by fewer countries and in lesser numbers than seen from the 1960s through the early 1990s, when the global landmine crisis was created. There have been notable aberrations from the general pattern of decreased use, but the overall trend has been positive, even with respect to non-States Parties, as the international norm against the antipersonnel mine has spread.

In this reporting period, since May 2002, Landmine Monitor has confirmed that six governments used antipersonnel mines: India, Iraq, Myanmar (Burma), Nepal, Pakistan, and Russia. This compares to use by at least nine governments listed in *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* and 13 governments in *Landmine Monitor Report 2001*.⁶ There are credible allegations of mine use by three other governments, but Landmine Monitor has not been able to definitively confirm the allegations: Burundi, Georgia, and Sudan. All three governments strongly deny using antipersonnel mines.

As of July 2003, it appears that only Myanmar and Russia are laying antipersonnel mines on a regular basis. India, Pakistan, and Nepal have all stopped their mine-laying operations, and the government of Iraq has ceased to exist. Since the cessation of mine-laying operations by India and

⁶ The change from the 2002 report to the 2003 report reflects the addition of Iraq and the removal of Angola, Afghanistan, Georgia, and Sri Lanka.

Pakistan in mid-2002, there has not been a single government engaged in massive, sustained use of antipersonnel mines.

During the reporting period, it is likely that the greatest number of mines were used by the government forces of Myanmar, Nepal, and Russia (in Chechnya). The most extensive use of antipersonnel mines by rebels was also likely in those three countries, as well as in Colombia.

Mine Ban Treaty States Parties

In this reporting period, Landmine Monitor has found no concrete evidence of use of antipersonnel mines by any State Party to the Mine Ban Treaty.

Mine Ban Treaty Signatories

Landmine Monitor cannot definitively conclude that any signatory government used antipersonnel mines in this reporting period. However, Landmine Monitor has received ever-more compelling reports of use of antipersonnel mines inside Burundi by government forces, as well as rebels. The government strongly denies these allegations, stating that only rebels use mines. In Sudan, government and rebel forces exchanged accusations of mine use, while both deny responsibility.

States Parties Ecuador and Venezuela in their Article 7 transparency reports indicated that they used antipersonnel mines after signing the Mine Ban Treaty in December 1997, but prior to entry into force. Angola, now a State Party, has also acknowledged use while still a signatory. The ICBL believes that use of antipersonnel mines by a signatory is a violation of international humanitarian law, in that the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties states that treaty signatories must refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the instrument they have signed.

Mine Ban Treaty Non-Signatories

The governments of India, Pakistan, Nepal and Russia have all acknowledged using antipersonnel mines in this reporting period. It is clear that government forces in Myanmar continued to lay mines. Saddam Hussein's forces used antipersonnel mines in the lead-up to and during the 2003 conflict in Iraq. There have been credible reports of use by Georgia, but the government denies it.

Armed Non-State Actors

Opposition groups are reported to have used antipersonnel mines in at least eleven countries. Non-state actors have used mines in Burma (Myanmar), Burundi, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia (in Abkhazia), India, Nepal, Philippines, Russia (in Chechnya), Somalia, and Sudan. This compares to reports of use by non-state actors in at least fourteen countries in the previous reporting period.

In addition, there have been a small number of reported incidents of use of antipersonnel mines, improvised explosive devices or booby-traps by non-state actors in countries such as Afghanistan, Algeria, Indonesia, and Serbia and Montenegro (including Kosovo).

Key Developments Since Landmine Monitor Report 2002

Cessation of Use of Antipersonnel Mines

Use of antipersonnel mines by both government and rebel forces in three of the most mine-affected countries stopped during the previous Landmine Monitor reporting period. Use stopped in Afghanistan (aside from a few sporadic incidents) with the fall of the Taliban in late 2001, in Sri Lanka with the cease-fires in December 2001, and in Angola with the peace agreement in April 2002.

After increased use by both government and rebel forces in Nepal in 2002, there has been little or no use by either side since the January 2003 cease-fire. At some point in 2002, apparently in mid-year, India and Pakistan stopped their major mine-laying operations begun in December 2001.

Initiation of Use of Antipersonnel Mines

Iraq is the only government to be added to the list of antipersonnel mine users in this reporting period. In March and April 2003, it laid significant numbers of antipersonnel and antivehicle mines in numerous locations throughout the country. Coalition forces did not use antipersonnel mines.

Two more rebel groups (New Mon State Party and Hongsawatoi Restoration Party) were identified as mine users in Burma, bringing the total to 15 groups in that country. The Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) in the Philippines resumed its use of antipersonnel mines, despite having signed the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment prohibiting all use.

Ongoing and Increased Use of Antipersonnel Mines

There was substantially increased use of mines and improvised explosive devices by both government and Maoist rebel forces in Nepal in 2002. The government for the first time openly acknowledged use, admitting to laying some 10,000 mines in all 75 districts of the country. As noted above, the January 2003 cease-fire has brought a virtual halt to mine use in Nepal.

There was also expanded use by guerrilla forces in Colombia, particularly FARC-EP and UC-ELN, as well as AUC paramilitary forces; the government reported 638 incidents of mine use in 2002.

Mine use was reportedly on the rise in Burundi, with both rebel and government forces blamed. The UN reported, "2002 saw an escalation of the conflict, and increases in mine use in provinces such as Gitega and Mwaro." Some incidents in Burundi point to continued use of mines by both sides even after the December 2002 cease-fire agreement prohibiting mine use.

In Burma, government forces and 15 different rebel groups used antipersonnel mines; during this reporting period, it appears that mines were laid most extensively in Karen State.

There was also ongoing use of antipersonnel mines by both Russian federal forces and rebels in Chechnya; the rebels are said to use mines on an almost daily basis.

The government of Georgia has had an official moratorium on the use of antipersonnel mines in place since September 1996. However, there have been credible reports of use in both 2001 and 2002 in areas near Abkhazia. Abkhazian authorities have stated that that in mid-2002, troops from both Abkhazia and Georgia mined areas around the Marukh mountain pass. The government of Georgia denies any use of antipersonnel mines.

Mine-laying by India and Pakistan that began in December 2001 likely continued into this reporting period, but was apparently halted sometime in mid-2002. India may have laid millions of mines on the border.

Also in India, non-state actors continued to use antipersonnel mines and improvised explosive devices in Jammu and Kashmir, Central India, and North East India. A number of rebel groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo allegedly used mines, including RCD-Goma, UPC, RCD-ML, and MLC. There were reports of continued mine use by various factions in Somalia. In the Philippines, in addition to new use by the MILF, the New People's Army and the Abu Sayyaf Group continued to use mines.

Global Production of Antipersonnel Mines

At least 36 nations have ceased production of antipersonnel mines. Thirty are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty.⁷ The other six are Finland, Greece, Israel, Poland, Serbia and Montenegro, and Turkey. Taiwan has also stopped production.

Landmine Monitor identifies fifteen countries that continue to produce antipersonnel landmines. This year, Landmine Monitor is adding Nepal to the list, reflecting the open admission by government officials that production has taken place. This marks the first time that the number of antipersonnel mine producers has increased since Landmine Monitor reporting started in 1999.

Antipersonnel Landmine Producers

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

Nine of the fifteen mine producers are in Asia (Burma, China, India, Nepal, North Korea, South Korea, Pakistan, Singapore, and Vietnam), three in the Middle East (Egypt, Iran, and Iraq), two in the Americas (Cuba and United States), and one in Europe (Russia).

India and Pakistan are actively engaged in new production of antipersonnel mines that are compliant with Amended Protocol II of the CCW. But, for most of the rest of these countries, it is not known if production lines were active in 2002 and 2003.

In several cases, there appears to have been no production for a number of years. The US has not produced antipersonnel mines since 1997. South Korea produced only Claymore mines in 1998-2000 and no mines since then. Egypt has unofficially stated that it ceased production in 1988. Russia has stated that it has not produced or supplied to its troops antipersonnel mines of the PFM-1, PMN, PMN-2, and PMN-4 types for the past eight years.

In September 2002, Iran said it has not produced antipersonnel mines since the end of its war with Iraq in 1988. However, last year Landmine Monitor reported that hundreds of Iran-manufactured antipersonnel mines with production stamps of 1999 and 2000 were encountered by demining organizations in Afghanistan.

⁷ States Parties that once produced antipersonnel mines include: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe. Others have been cited as past producers, but deny it: Croatia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Thailand, and Venezuela.

Since the coalition occupation of Iraq, any industrial production of antipersonnel mines that may have been taking place has, presumably, ceased. Landmine Monitor will keep Iraq on the list of producers until a new government officially renounces antipersonnel mine production.

Global Trade in Antipersonnel Mines

In recent years, Landmine Monitor findings indicate that the trade in antipersonnel mines has dwindled to a very low level of illicit trafficking and unacknowledged trade. The scope and nature of the global landmine trade, which now appears to be defunct, is reflected in the Mine Ban Treaty transparency reports. Between March 1999 and July 2003, 39 States Parties declared stockpiles of antipersonnel mines imported from at least 23 countries in their Article 7 transparency measures reports.⁸ These numbers are likely to increase over the coming year as more countries submit initial transparency reports. States Parties have included significant supplementary information about the countries of origin and dates of acquisition of their antipersonnel mine stockpile.

The *de facto* global antipersonnel mine transfer ban established during the 1992-1997 period has been reconfirmed and extended in 2002. Several countries outside the Mine Ban Treaty have extended their moratoria on exports and transfers of antipersonnel mines during this reporting period. Belarus extended its moratorium through the end of 2007. China reaffirmed its limited moratorium in December 2002. Israel extended its export moratorium until July 2005. Poland adopted a new law prohibiting all transfers. Russia continues observing its limited export moratorium while in the process of extending it. Singapore affirms that its indefinite moratorium is still in effect. South Korea announced the indefinite extension of its moratorium in December 2002. Turkey made its export moratorium permanent. The US extended its export moratorium through October 2008.

Questions remain about exports from Iran. *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* reported that new Iranian antipersonnel mines had been found in Afghanistan and also intercepted en-route to Palestine. An export moratorium was instituted by Iran in 1997, but it is not known if it is still formally in effect.

Following are some examples of possible continuing illicit trade. According to a media account, in May 2003, a Panamanian court sentenced four Panamanians and three Colombians to 20 and 60 months imprisonment for attempting to import into Colombia weapons acquired in Nicaragua, which included thirteen Russian antipersonnel mines. A former official from the Central African Republic said that landmines were brought into the CAR from Chad during the coup attempt in October 2002; there is no independent confirmation of this allegation. In July 2003, the head of the Transitional National Government in Somalia accused Ethiopia of supplying arms, including landmines, to Somali factions; Ethiopia dismissed the claim. A media report in November 2002 claimed that Turkish customs officials had detained a truck containing a large load of weapons, including antipersonnel mines, at the border with Georgia, allegedly coming from Kazakhstan.

⁸ Antipersonnel mines from the following countries have been declared in the stockpiles of States Parties as of 31 July 2003: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, former Czechoslovakia, France, Germany (including the former East Germany), Iran, Israel, Italy, Libya, Pakistan, Portugal, Singapore, former Soviet Union, Spain, South Africa, Syria, UK, US, former Yugoslavia, and Zimbabwe. This total does not include stockpiles resulting from domestic production or inherited stockpiles declared by successor states, which exclude consideration of States Parties Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan.

Transfers for Purposes Permitted by the Mine Ban Treaty

Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty permits the transfer of antipersonnel mines for the purpose of their destruction or for training and research needs. During 2002, two companies in Germany received quantities of antipersonnel mines for destruction from foreign sources. Spreewerk Lubben destroyed 42,175 mines received from Taiwan. The company EBV destroyed 5,984 BLU-92 Gator antipersonnel mines transferred from the Netherlands. In 2001, Canada reported the transfer of 180 mines from the US and 110 from Yugoslavia, and Ecuador transferred 1,644 mines to the US, all for demining research purposes.

Global Stockpiles of Antipersonnel Mines

Landmine Monitor estimates that there are approximately 200-215 million antipersonnel mines currently stockpiled by 78 countries. This new estimate reflects the concrete progress of implementing the Mine Ban Treaty and the rejection of the weapon, even among states not party to the ban on antipersonnel mines. *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* cited an estimate of 230 million antipersonnel mines stockpiled globally. The rapid destruction of antipersonnel mine stockpiles accounts for the reduction, most notably Russia's new claim that it destroyed nearly 17 million antipersonnel mines since 1996.

Landmine Monitor estimates 22 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty stockpile between one million and two million antipersonnel mines, as of 31 July 2003. The sizable range in the estimate reflects that several new States Parties likely to have substantial stocks have not yet officially reported their numbers, including Afghanistan, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Eritrea.

Landmine Monitor estimates that the 13 signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty stockpile approximately 8.5 to 9 million antipersonnel mines. Ukraine has reported that it possesses a stockpile of 6.35 million. Poland and Greece recently declared stockpiles in excess of one million antipersonnel mines each. Indonesia in May 2002 revealed it has a stockpile of 16,000 antipersonnel mines. These voluntary declarations, as well as one by non-signatory Serbia and Montenegro, were indicators of their commitment to the objectives of the Mine Ban Treaty. Ethiopia and Sudan also likely hold stockpiles, though Sudan claims to have mines only for training. Brunei, Burundi, and Guyana also acknowledge possessing antipersonnel mines. Signatories Cook Islands, Haiti, Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu are unlikely to stockpile antipersonnel mines.

Landmine Monitor estimates that the greatest numbers of antipersonnel mines, between 190 million and to 205 million, are stockpiled by states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty. The largest stockpiles likely belong to China (estimated 110 million) and Russia (estimated 50 million). Other states with large stockpiles include the US (10.4 million), Pakistan (estimated 6 million) India (estimated 4-5 million), Belarus (4.5 million), South Korea (2 million), and Serbia and Montenegro (1.3 million). Other states not party to the treaty believed to have large stockpiles are Burma, Egypt, Finland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, North Korea, Syria, Turkey, and Vietnam.

Russia has publicly claimed for the first time that it destroyed more than 16.8 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines between 1996 and 2002. This startling information is inconsistent with past

statements and documents. Taking this new information into account, Landmine Monitor has reduced its estimate of Russia's stockpile to 50 million antipersonnel mines.

In addition to governments, many rebel groups also have stockpiles of antipersonnel mines, including groups in Burma, Chechnya, Colombia, DR Congo, Kashmir, Philippines, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Uganda.

Stockpile Developments Since May 2002

States Parties

- Algeria declared a stockpile of 165,080 antipersonnel mines.
- Bangladesh declared a stockpile of 204,227 antipersonnel mines.
- Chile declared a stockpile of 213,076 antipersonnel mines.
- Republic of Congo declared a stockpile of 5,090 antipersonnel mines.
- Cyprus voluntarily revealed that it has a stockpile of 48,615 antipersonnel mines.
- Guinea-Bissau declared a stockpile of 4,997 antipersonnel mines.
- Lithuania voluntarily revealed that it stockpiles 8,091 antipersonnel mines.
- Mauritius declared a stockpile of 93 antipersonnel mines.
- Tajikistan declared a stockpile of 3,339 antipersonnel mines under its control and 18,200 mines under the control of Russian forces.
- Tanzania declared a stockpile of 23,987 antipersonnel mines.
- Togo declared a stockpile of 436 antipersonnel mines.
- Venezuela declared a revised stockpile of 46,136 antipersonnel mines, up from 22,136.

Non-States Parties

- Greece voluntarily declared a stockpile of 1,078,557 antipersonnel mines.
- Latvia voluntarily declared a stockpile of 2,980 antipersonnel mines.
- Poland voluntarily declared that it possesses 1,055,971 antipersonnel mines.
- Serbia and Montenegro voluntarily declared that it stockpiles 1,320,621 antipersonnel mines.
- The figure for the US stockpile of antipersonnel mines has been updated and reduced to 10.4 million, based on information provided to the US Congress in 2002.

Stockpile Destruction

Since 1992, a total of 69 countries have destroyed approximately 52 million antipersonnel mines. Sixty-three States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty have destroyed 30 million antipersonnel mines. Since May 2002, 18 States Parties completed the destruction of their stockpiles, eliminating a combined total of almost 10.8 million antipersonnel mines over the course of their destruction programs. About 3 million mines were destroyed in the past year by States Parties, and more than one million by non-States Parties (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Somaliland).

An important milestone in the implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty was reached on 1 March 2003: the four-year deadline for destruction of stockpiled antipersonnel mines for all countries that were

party to the treaty when it first entered into force on 1 March 1999. Fulfillment of this obligation by States Parties was not only an important test of the health and viability of the treaty, but a sign of the impact of the international norm against the antipersonnel mine. Positive movement by States Parties toward destruction of stockpiled mines has also motivated non-States Parties to destroy antipersonnel mines.

It would appear that all States Parties with a 1 March 2003 deadline met their obligation, with the minor exception of Djibouti, which was two days late, and the major issue related to Turkmenistan, which reported completion of destruction, but also declared retention of 69,200 antipersonnel mines. The ICBL expressed its view that retention of such a number of mines in fact means that Turkmenistan did not fully destroy its stocks, and that it is not keeping “the minimum number absolutely necessary” as required by the treaty, and is therefore in violation of a core treaty obligation.

A total of 99 States Parties have either completed destruction of antipersonnel mines stockpiles, or declared never having a stockpile. Fifty-one States Parties have completed destruction of their stockpiles.⁹ Eighteen States Parties completed destruction since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*: Brazil, Chad, Croatia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Italy, Japan, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, Mozambique, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkmenistan, and Uganda.

Forty-eight States Parties have officially declared not stockpiling antipersonnel mines.¹⁰ In the reporting period, Barbados, Comoros, Dominica, The Gambia, Ghana, Malawi, Maldives, Niger, Seychelles, and Trinidad and Tobago officially confirmed that they do not possess stockpiles of antipersonnel mines.

Twelve States Parties are in the process of destroying their stockpiles. Six initiated the destruction process since the previous *Landmine Monitor Report*: Afghanistan, DR Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Tajikistan, Tanzania, and Venezuela. Six others continued destruction programs: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Romania, Tunisia, and Uruguay.

Four States Parties (Algeria, Bangladesh, Republic of Congo, and Kenya) have not begun the destruction process, but each has developed a plan to destroy their stockpiles in advance of the treaty-mandated deadline.

⁹ The 51 States include: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, FYR Macedonia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Moldova, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

¹⁰ The 48 States include: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Comoros, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, The Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Niger, Niue, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Rwanda, St. Kitts & Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad & Tobago, and Zambia.

Fifteen States Parties have not officially declared the presence or absence of antipersonnel mine stockpiles because of their failure to submit transparency measures reports on time.¹¹ The deadline for stockpile destruction has passed for three of these countries (Equatorial Guinea, Guinea and Namibia).¹²

Four States Parties will announce their plans when they submit their initial transparency measures reports: Central African Republic, Cyprus, Timor-Leste, and São Tomé e Príncipe.¹³

Stockpile Destruction Developments since May 2002

Completed Destruction

- Brazil completed destruction of its stockpiled mines, destroying 27,397 antipersonnel mines between December 2001 and January 2003.
- Chad completed destruction of its 4,490 stockpiled antipersonnel landmines in January 2003.
- Croatia completed destruction of its 199,003 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in October 2002.
- Djibouti destroyed its stockpile of 1,118 antipersonnel mines on 2 March 2003.
- El Salvador completed destruction of its 6,539 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 20 February 2003.
- Gabon reported that its stockpile of 1,082 antipersonnel mines was destroyed when the treaty entered into force for Gabon.
- Italy completed the destruction of over 7.1 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines in November 2002.
- Japan completed destruction of its 1,000,089 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 8 February 2003.
- Jordan completed the destruction of its stockpile of 92,342 antipersonnel mines on 23 April 2003.
- FYR Macedonia completed destruction of its stockpile of 38,921 antipersonnel mine stockpile on 20 February 2003.
- Moldova completed destruction of its antipersonnel mine stockpile on 26 November 2002.
- Mozambique completed destruction of its stockpile of 37,318 antipersonnel mines on 28 February 2003.
- In the Netherlands, stockpile destruction was completed in December 2002, with the destruction of 5,984 Gator antipersonnel mines.
- Nicaragua completed destruction of its 133,435 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 28 August 2002.
- Portugal completed destruction of its 231,781 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in February 2003.
- Slovenia completed destruction of its stockpile of 168,898 antipersonnel mines on 25 March 2003.
- Thailand completed destruction of its 337,725 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 24 April 2003.
- Turkmenistan reported that it completed its stockpile destruction by 1 March 2003, destroying almost 700,000 mines in an eighteen-month period.
- Uganda completed destruction of its stockpile of antipersonnel mines in July 2003.

¹¹ The 15 States include: Angola, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, and Suriname. Of those 15, those believed to stockpile antipersonnel mines are Angola, Eritrea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Suriname, and possibly Guinea.

¹² Equatorial Guinea has stated that it does not stockpile antipersonnel mines. Namibia claims to only retain mines for training and research purposes. Guinea's stockpile status is not currently known.

¹³ Of these, only Cyprus is believed to stockpile antipersonnel mines.

Other Destruction Developments

States Parties

- In Afghanistan, ceremonial destructions of antipersonnel landmines were conducted on 12 May 2003 to emphasize the government's commitment to implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty.
- Argentina and the OAS signed an agreement in June 2003 for cooperation and technical assistance in the destruction of the country's 90,000 stockpiled antipersonnel mines.
- Chile destroyed 185,446 antipersonnel mines from August 2002 to May 2003.
- Colombia began its stockpile destruction program in June 2003.
- In the DR Congo, the NGO Handicap International Belgium reported destroying 1,660 antipersonnel mines from rebel stockpiles in 2002 and 2003.
- Guinea-Bissau destroyed 1,000 mines in September 2002.
- Romania destroyed 486,000 antipersonnel mines from April 2002 to April 2003.
- Tajikistan began destroying its stockpiled mines in August 2002.
- Tanzania destroyed its first 9,837 antipersonnel mines in March 2003.
- Tunisia has destroyed another 13,684 stockpiled antipersonnel mines, and plans to complete destruction in September 2003.
- Uruguay destroyed another 400 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in June and October 2002.
- Venezuela began stockpile destruction in May 2003.

Non-States Parties

- As a signal of its support for the Mine Ban Treaty, non-signatory Belarus destroyed 22,963 PMN-2 antipersonnel mines in 2002.
- Russia reported for the first time that it destroyed more than 16.8 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines between 1996 and 2002, including 638,427 in 2002.
- In Somaliland, 2,382 stockpiled antipersonnel landmines were destroyed in November 2002.
- Ukraine, a Mine Ban Treaty signatory, completed the destruction of nearly 405,000 PMN-type mines between July 2002 and May 2003.

Mines Retained for Training and Research

Of the 134 States Parties, 62 retain over 280,000 antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty. This is an increase of 11 countries and at least 112,000 mines since the publication of the *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*.

Of these 62 states, five intend to keep more than 10,000 mines. These five countries account for nearly half of all the mines retained by States Parties. Turkmenistan alone accounts for 25 percent, with 69,200 mines retained. Others with very high levels are Brazil (16,545), Sweden (16,015), Algeria (15,030), and Bangladesh (15,000).

Six more States Parties intend to keep more than 5,000 antipersonnel mines. Thirty-four intend to keep between 1,000 and 5,000 mines. Another 17 are retaining less than 1,000 mines. Colombia, Mozambique, and Rwanda have reversed earlier decisions and now have chosen to retain mines.

A total of 55 States Parties have chosen not to retain any antipersonnel mines. Joining this category in this reporting period are Afghanistan, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, and Qatar. Of those not retaining, 13 states once stockpiled mines, but have destroyed them or are in the process of destroying them. The number of States Parties that have not yet declared whether they intend to retain any antipersonnel mines has decreased from 22 to 17.

The most distressing development in this area is Turkmenistan's announcement that it plans to retain 69,200 mines for training. At the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in May 2003, several States Parties expressed concern over Turkmenistan's retention of such a large quantity of mines. The ICBL believes that 69,200 mines is an unacceptable, and likely illegal, number. It is obviously not the "minimum number absolutely necessary," as required by the treaty.

Another disturbing development is that some states are retaining their entire stockpile of antipersonnel mines for research and training purposes. Lithuania has stated its intention to retain its entire stockpile of 8,091 antipersonnel mines, the seventh largest amount of all States Parties, despite the fact that it conducts only small scale demining training in cooperation with other Baltic countries. Latvia appears poised to follow Lithuania's lead, keeping all 2,980 mines, based on its voluntary Article 7 submission of 1 May 2003. Togo (436), Ireland (116 mines), Mauritius (93 mines), and Botswana (unknown number) are also among this group. Antipersonnel mines do not affect any of these countries. Zambia originally proposed retaining its entire stockpile of 6,691 antipersonnel mines under Article 3, but it has reconsidered its position and announced that this total will be reduced.

One encouraging trend is the significant number of States Parties that have reduced the number of mines retained from the high levels originally proposed. Australia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Peru, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Thailand have taken this step in previous years. During this reporting period: Chile reduced the number of mines retained from 28,647 to 6,245; Italy reduced from a ceiling of 8,000 mines retained to 811; Mauritania reduced from 5,728 to 843; the United Kingdom reduced from 4,949 to 1,783; and Uganda reportedly reduced from 2,400 to 1,764.

Against the trend of reducing the numbers of mines retained, a handful of countries have actually increased their holdings. FYR Macedonia is now retaining 4,000 antipersonnel mines, a vastly greater amount than the 50 originally declared. Venezuela, in modifying the number of mines in its stockpile, also increased the number of mines retained from 2,214 to 4,614. Previously undeclared antipersonnel mines held by a private defense manufacturer in Sweden have necessitated an increase in mines retained from 13,948 to 16,015. Bosnia and Herzegovina is now holding 2,525 antipersonnel mines, 120 more than previously reported.

The ICBL continues to question the need for live mines for training and calls on States Parties to continue to evaluate the necessity of this exception. Several States Parties also echoed this view in interventions made at the intersessional Standing Committee meetings, including Afghanistan, Austria, New Zealand, and Norway.

The ICBL believes that it is important to have complete transparency on mines retained for training and strongly supports the recommendation of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of

the Convention that States Parties should in their Article 7 reports “include information on the intended purpose and actual use” of retained mines.

An increasing number of States Parties are declaring the number of antipersonnel mines actually consumed each year, and for what precise training and research purposes. Fifteen States Parties reported consumption of 3,806 antipersonnel mines for permitted purposes in 2002.¹⁴ Most States Parties did not report any activities or consumption of their retained mines in 2002, and some of these countries have apparently not used or consumed any mines retained for training or research since 1999.

Transparency Reporting

As of 31 July 2003, the UN has received initial Article 7 transparency measures reports from 113 States Parties. The overall compliance rate of States Parties submitting initial transparency measures reports is a highly commendable 88 percent, up from 75 percent reported last year and 63 percent reported in 2001. A total of 21 State Parties have submitted initial reports since May 2002: Algeria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Chile, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Maldives, Niger, Seychelles, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela.

Efforts over the past year to promote full transparency have halved the number of late initial reports. *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* noted that 30 States Parties were late in submitting their initial reports. As of 31 July 2003, a total of 15 States Parties are still late in submitting their initial transparency measures report: Angola, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, and Suriname.

For Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Namibia, and the Solomon Islands, the deadline for submission of their initial report was in 1999, which represents what can only be considered gross negligence in fulfilling the treaty's transparency obligation.

As of 31 July 2003, the rate of compliance for annual reports due on 30 April 2003 for calendar year 2002 is 62 percent. A total of 76 reports were submitted to the UN by the 123 States Parties obligated to submit annual updates. Of the 47 States Parties not submitting an annual update in 2003, half of them also did not submit reports in 2002 for calendar year 2001.¹⁵

In a very encouraging development, several states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty have submitted voluntary Article 7 reports, including Lithuania in 2002 when it was a signatory, and Latvia and Poland in 2003. At the May 2003 Standing Committee meeting, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium (President of

¹⁴ The 15 States include: Japan (1,610), Sweden (1,002), Netherlands (314), Belgium (293), Australia (213), Croatia (200), South Africa (55), Denmark (33), Germany (19), France (17), Slovakia (14), Canada (12), Luxembourg (10), Ireland (9), and Brazil (5).

¹⁵ Those not submitting include: Andorra,* Antigua and Barbuda,* Bahamas, Belize,* Benin, Bolivia,* Botswana,* Cape Verde,* Chad, Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire,* Equatorial Guinea,* Eritrea,* Fiji, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Grenada,* Guatemala, Guinea,* Honduras, Kenya, Kiribati,* Liberia,* Madagascar,* Maldives, Mali,* Namibia,* Nauru,* Nigeria, Niue, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis,* Saint Lucia,* Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,* Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone,* Solomon Islands,* Spain, Swaziland,* Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan,* and Uruguay. (* indicates States Parties that also failed to submit an annual update in 2002 covering events in 2001).

the Fourth Meeting of States Parties) suggested that all non-States Parties that voted in favor the UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74, which calls for universalization and implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, should be encouraged to submit voluntary transparency reports.

During this reporting period, the responsibility for maintaining the online database for Article 7 reports was shifted from UN offices in New York to Geneva.¹⁶ This transition did not go as smoothly as anticipated, due to technical and capacity problems, as well as the fact that many States Parties do not submit their reports in electronic format. Solving these problems should be a high priority during the next intersessional period to ensure that reports are posted in a timely and comprehensive manner, especially near the 30 April annual deadline.

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

National Implementation Measures

Only 36 of the 134 States Parties have passed new domestic laws to implement the treaty and fulfill the obligations of Article 9 of the Mine Ban Treaty.¹⁷ None have done so in this reporting period.

A total of 19 States Parties report that steps to enact legislation are underway.¹⁸ Those initiating the process in the past year include Bangladesh, Benin, Republic of Congo, Jamaica, and Togo.

Thirty-one States Parties have indicated that they do not believe any new law is required to implement the treaty, a significant increase from the 18 reported in the *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*. Croatia, the Netherlands, Thailand and Tunisia reported that legislation was in the process of being adopted in previous years, but now deem existing law sufficient. Other countries that have adopted this position, whose views were previously unknown to Landmine Monitor, include the Holy See, Maldives, Paraguay, Qatar, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Tajikistan, and Tanzania.

In many cases, governments believe no steps are necessary because they have never stockpiled antipersonnel mines and are not mine-affected. The ICBL is concerned, however, about the need for all states to pass legislation that includes penal sanctions for any potential future violations of the treaty, and provides for full implementation of all aspects of the treaty.

Landmine Monitor is unaware of any progress to enact appropriate domestic measures to implement the Mine Ban Treaty, as required in Article 9, in 48 States Parties.

¹⁶ <http://disarmament.un.org/mineban.nsf>

¹⁷ The one addition to the list since *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* is Honduras, which Landmine Monitor recently learned enacted implementation legislation in June 2000. The 36 States Parties are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe.

¹⁸ The 19 States include: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bangladesh, Benin, Republic of Congo, Croatia, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Philippines, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Yemen, and Zambia.

Special Issues of Concern

Joint Military Operations and “Assist”

Article 1 of the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty obligates State Parties to “never under any circumstances...assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention.” To ensure uniform implementation of the treaty, States Parties must reach a common understanding of how this obligation applies to joint military operations and the meaning of “assist.” The ICBL believes that it is critical for States Parties to sort out the different understandings about what acts are permitted and which are prohibited.

Events since entry into force concretely demonstrated the necessity of reaching a common understanding. Since 1 March 1999, States Parties have participated in joint combat operations with the forces of non-States Parties or armed non-state actors wherein antipersonnel mines were reportedly used by the non-State Party or non-state actor; States Parties have placed their forces under the operational command of a non-State Party; States Parties have participated in joint training and peacekeeping operations with non-State Parties; and, non-States Parties have transferred antipersonnel mines stockpiled in a State Party and transited them across the territory of other States Parties for possible use in combat.

While the majority of States Parties have yet to make their views known, at least 30 states have expressed some views and interpretations. A majority of the 30 States Parties have declared that they will not participate in planning and implementation of activities related to antipersonnel mine use in joint operations or training.¹⁹

Some States Parties made new policy statements regarding joint military operations with states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty or have offered their national interpretation of the term “assist.” Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here; see individual country reports for details.

- Australia has placed limitations on its forces so as not to violate treaty commitments during joint operations.
- Bosnia and Herzegovina states that its forces would not participate in joint military operations with any forces planning, exercising, or using antipersonnel mines.
- Bulgaria stated in February 2003 that while it participates in joint exercises with some neighboring countries not party to the Mine Ban Treaty, no prohibited activities involving antipersonnel mines are planned or executed during the exercises.
- Croatia reports that its military would not assist in the use of antipersonnel mines within Croatia or in other countries, including those not party to the Mine Ban Treaty.
- Japan noted that under Article 9 of its Constitution, its armed forces cannot be deployed outside of its territory and cannot participate in any joint military operations.
- Luxembourg states that its forces are not authorized to participate, actively or passively, in operations involving the use of antipersonnel mines.

¹⁹ Twenty-one States Parties have explicitly rejected participation in joint operations with antipersonnel mine use: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Malaysia, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Senegal, Sweden, United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe.

- New Zealand clarified its view on “assist” by stating it cannot “actively assist” with prohibited acts, noting that providing cover for the laying of mines would be active assistance, as would participating in planning or training for use of antipersonnel mines. It also said that “incidental benefit” from mine-laying by others would not constitute active assistance.
- Portugal confirmed that it would not assist, encourage, or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party.
- Switzerland associated itself with the statements of other countries that Article 1 clearly bans joint military operations that may involve use of antipersonnel mines. Switzerland appealed to all States Parties to respect “the words and spirit” of Article 1.
- Tajikistan states that its Armed Forces would refuse orders by Russia to lay mines and said that Tajik forces are under separate command and control structures.
- The United Kingdom in May 2003 extensively elaborated on the activities it finds unacceptable, including: planning with others for the use of antipersonnel mines; training others for the use antipersonnel mines; agreeing rules of engagement permitting the use of antipersonnel mines; agreeing operational plans permitting the use of antipersonnel mines in combined operations; requests to non-States Parties to use antipersonnel mines; and providing security or transport for antipersonnel mines. Furthermore, it is not acceptable for UK forces to accept orders that amount to assistance in the use of antipersonnel mines. UK forces are also instructed not to seek to derive direct military benefits from the deployment of antipersonnel mines in combined operations, recognizing that it is not always possible to say in advance that military benefit will not arise where this results from an act that is not deliberate or pre-planned.

Foreign Stockpiling and Transit of Antipersonnel Mines

Only 21 of the 134 States Parties have explicitly stated that they prohibit transfers through (transit) or stockpiling of foreign antipersonnel mines on their national territory.²⁰ However, several developments during this reporting period are encouraging as more States Parties declare their policy and establish more examples of state practice. Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here; see individual country reports for details.

- Bosnia and Herzegovina announced in April 2003 that it will not allow the storage or transit of antipersonnel mines belonging to another country in or through its territory.
- Cameroon stated in September 2002 that it will not facilitate the transit of antipersonnel mines through its territory.
- Malaysia prohibits the transit of antipersonnel mines that might be carried in vessels through Malaysian territory.
- Norway reports that US antipersonnel mines stockpiled in Norway were removed in November 2002. US stockpiles were removed from Italy and Spain in previous years.

²⁰ Twenty-one States Parties explicitly prohibiting the storage or transit of foreign antipersonnel mines on or across their territory as of 31 July 2003: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Guinea, Hungary, Italy, Malaysia, Namibia, New Zealand, Portugal, Samoa, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

- Qatar stated in May 2003 that it would not support any citizen of Qatar to carry, transport, or store any antipersonnel mines with the US. It also stated that any US stockpiles of antipersonnel mines on their territory are not under Qatari jurisdiction or control.
- Tajikistan is the first State Party to report details on antipersonnel mines stockpiled by a non-State Party on its territory. It reported in February 2003 approximately 18,200 antipersonnel mines of various types are held by Russian Ministry of Defense units deployed in Tajikistan. These stockpiles are not under the jurisdiction or control of Tajikistan. Intergovernmental talks were underway to clarify and complete data collection regarding these Russian mines.
- The United Kingdom confirmed its position that transit of foreign antipersonnel mines through UK territory is contrary to the obligations of the Mine Ban Treaty and in May 2003 equated transit to “assistance” under Article 1. The UK stated that US antipersonnel mines were not transited, stockpiled or maintained on the Diego Garcia bases in British Indian Ocean Territory, during operations in Afghanistan in 2002. It takes the view that the stockpiling or transit of US antipersonnel mines on UK territory, including Diego Garcia, would constitute a breach of the UK's obligations under Mine Ban Treaty. It added that any landmines on US naval ships or military aircraft at Diego Garcia are not under the jurisdiction or control of the UK.

As reported in the past, Canada, Germany, Japan, and Norway believe that the Mine Ban Treaty does not prohibit the transit of antipersonnel mines, at least in certain circumstances.

Landmine Monitor has previously reported that the United States stored antipersonnel mines on the territory of at least 14 countries, including seven States Parties.²¹ US antipersonnel mines have been removed from States Parties Italy, Norway, and Spain, at the request of those countries. Germany, Japan, Qatar, and the UK state that US stockpiles of antipersonnel mines on their territory are not under their jurisdiction or control.

It is not possible to confirm current locations or numbers of US antipersonnel mines in foreign countries following the significant movements of equipment and ammunition during the military build-up in the Persian Gulf region preceding the invasion of Iraq in March 2003. For example, on 5 September 2002, US Secretary of the Army Thomas White disclosed that in July 2002 one set of equipment and ammunition that was identified as containing artillery-delivered antipersonnel mines, was moved from Qatar to Kuwait.

Antivehicle Mines with Antihandling Devices and Sensitive Fuzes

Applying the definitions in Article 2 to all mines that function as antipersonnel mines, including some designated as antivehicle mines, remains a highly contentious issue. The way that States Parties come to a common understanding on this issue may have a significant impact on how the Mine Ban Treaty is implemented and universalized. Perhaps the most discouraging development in the reporting period was the unwillingness of some States Parties to support an initiative by the ICRC to host experts' work in 2004 on “best practices” regarding antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes within the context of

²¹ Apart from the seven States Parties, the countries have included: Bahrain, Greece, Kuwait, Oman, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and Turkey.

the Mine Ban Treaty, with the aim of agreement on language on a common understanding at the 2004 Review Conference. Germany, Denmark, France, Japan, and the United Kingdom opposed the ICRC initiative, stating that CCW was the only appropriate venue to discuss antivehicle mines. The ICBL believes that Germany's "open matrix" approach in the CCW Group of Governmental Experts group is a welcome and complementary development that should help resolve the issue in the context of the Mine Ban Treaty.

Some progress has been made on clarifying what specific types of sensitive fuzes on antivehicle mines pose unacceptable dangers to civilians. Germany and the United Kingdom have made statements in 2003 supporting the view that antivehicle mines equipped with sensitive fuzes like tilt rods, tripwires, and breakwires are inappropriate and cannot be designed in a way to prevent detonation by a person. Hungary has destroyed the last of its tilt rod fuzes. Croatia and Slovenia have stated their willingness to discuss the appropriateness of tilt rod fuzes within the context of the Mine Ban Treaty. Canada, France, Mali, and the United Kingdom have removed tilt rod fuzes from their inventories. Sweden has prohibited its forces from using tripwire fuzes with antivehicle mines if they are removed from storage for use. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom have retired from service one type of antivehicle mine with a breakwire fuze. France is exploring alternative fuzing mechanisms for its antivehicle mines.

However, state practice in this area is not yet universal. The Czech Republic continues to market an antivehicle mine with a tripwire fuze, stating it does not consider the use of tripwires with an antivehicle mine to be a violation of the Mine Ban Treaty.

Many States Parties, the ICRC, and the ICBL believe that an antivehicle mine, regardless of design intent or label, with a fuze or antihandling device (AHD) capable of being activated by the unintentional act of a person meets the definition of an antipersonnel mine and is prohibited by the treaty. Among the States Parties that have publicly expressed this understanding of what was agreed upon during the treaty negotiations in Oslo in 1997 are Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, South Africa, and Switzerland.

Some States Parties disagree and do not believe that the Mine Ban Treaty applies to antivehicle mines at all, and that the CCW is the only appropriate forum to consider any restrictions or prohibitions on antivehicle mines. Denmark, France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom are the only States Parties that have publicly expressed this view.

Unfortunately only a small number of States Parties, 22 of the current 134, have expressed views or shared national practice on the applicability of the Mine Ban Treaty to antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes or AHD.²² Some States Parties made new policy statements or announced concrete steps taken nationally during the reporting period. Only brief summaries of these new developments are included here, see individual country reports for details.

- Bulgaria stated in February 2003 that production of the TM-46, the only antivehicle mine in its stockpile capable of being fitted with an AHD, had been discontinued and existing stocks were decommissioned and in the process of being destroyed.

²² Previous editions of the *Landmine Monitor Report* contain statements or developments on the issue of antivehicle mines with AHD or sensitive fuzes from States Parties Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK. Portugal and Slovenia join this list in this edition of the *Landmine Monitor Report*.

- Croatia stated in May 2003 that it does not stockpile antivehicle mines with AHD that can be accidentally activated. It also declared that the pressure fuzes for its mines function at levels above 120 kilograms, typically 150 to 300 kilograms. Croatia also acknowledged that it possesses tilt rod fuzes that function at the level of 1.3 to 1.7 kilograms and is willing to discuss these within the context of Article 2 of the Mine Ban Treaty.
- The Czech Republic has decided to withdraw from stockpiles “old-fashioned antivehicle mines” and replace them with “newer, less dangerous devices.”
- The German Parliament passed a resolution in June 2002 urging the government to work nationally and internationally toward a ban of all antivehicle mines equipped with sensitive fuzes. At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, the German delegation drew a distinction between antivehicle mines with AHD, and antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes, stating the former are permitted, while the latter is prohibited. Germany asked States Parties to reach a common understanding on this.
- Hungary destroyed its remaining 100,000 tilt rod fuze equipped UKA-63 antivehicle mines.
- The Netherlands disposed of 10,000 DM-31 (the Swedish produced FFV-028) as surplus and declared that it will not use the remaining stockpile of this type of antivehicle mine unless it is assured that the mines cannot function in response to mine detection equipment.
- Portugal appears interested in applying the Mine Ban Treaty’s prohibitions to antivehicle mines with sensitive fuzes that function like antipersonnel mines.
- Slovakia expects the results of its study regarding which of its antivehicle mines are prohibited or permissible by the Mine Ban Treaty later in 2003.
- Slovenia acknowledges possessing 59,500 antivehicle mines, but none with AHD. Within this stockpile are 8,228 TMRP-6 that are equipped with both pressure and tilt rod fuzes. Slovenia has indicated it is willing to discuss the TMRP-6.

Claymore Mines

The Mine Ban Treaty permits Claymore-type mines (directional fragmentation munitions) used in command-detonated mode. However, the treaty prohibits Claymore-type mines used in a victim-activated mode because the weapon then meets the definition of an antipersonnel mine.

Twenty-one States Parties retain stocks of Claymore-type antipersonnel mines.²³ South Africa and Zimbabwe reported that they stockpile Claymore-type mines, but without the types of fuzes necessary for victim-activation. Croatia, Hungary, New Zealand, and Slovenia also declared that measures have been taken to ensure that their Claymore-type mines cannot be used in the victim-activated mode. These declarations bring the number of States Parties who have taken measures to 17, an increase of six countries in this reporting period. *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* incorrectly included Slovakia and Germany on a list of countries retaining Claymore-type mines.

²³ The 21 States Parties include: Australia,* Austria,* Canada,* Colombia, Croatia,* Denmark,* Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary,* Malaysia,* Moldova, Netherlands,* New Zealand,* Norway,* Slovenia,* South Africa,* Sweden,* Switzerland,* Thailand,* United Kingdom,* and Zimbabwe.* (* indicates States Parties that declared that measures have been taken to ensure that their Claymore-type mines cannot be used in the victim-activated mode).

The number of States Parties confirming that they do not possess Claymore-type antipersonnel mines has increased to 24 with the inclusion of Belgium, Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Kenya.²⁴ Additionally, Bangladesh, Mozambique, and Tajikistan have signaled their intent by scheduling their stocks of Claymore-types mines for destruction, aside from those retained under Article 3 for training and research purposes. Another 41 States have declared that they do not possess antipersonnel mine stockpiles and are presumed not to possess Claymore-type mines.

The ICBL urges the remaining 48 States Parties to declare whether they possess Claymore-type mines.²⁵ States Parties that possess Claymore mines should declare the measures that have been taken to ensure that they cannot be used in the victim-activated mode.

²⁴ The 24 States Parties include: Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Czech Republic, El Salvador, France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Yemen.

²⁵ The 48 States Parties that have not declared include: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Central African Republic, Republic of Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, DR Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Liberia, Lithuania, FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & Grenadines, São Tomé e Príncipe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Zambia.

HUMANITARIAN MINE ACTION

Humanitarian Mine Action refers to activities aimed at significantly reducing or completely eliminating the threat and impact of landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) upon civilians and their livelihoods. This is achieved through minefield survey and marking, mine clearance, and mine risk education. To increase efficiency and effectiveness, an increasingly important aspect of mine action is priority setting and planning.

The number of mine-affected countries reporting organized mine clearance operations continued to increase in 2002 and 2003, as did the reported areas of mine-affected land that were cleared of landmines and UXO. Peace agreements and cease-fires in Angola, Sri Lanka, and Sudan enabled the expansion of mine action activities. Two more mine-affected countries joined the Mine Ban Treaty, including Afghanistan, one of the world's most mine and UXO contaminated countries. Transparency reporting by mine-affected States Parties increased, as did participation by these countries in key meetings of the Mine Ban Treaty. Landmine impact surveys continued in key mine-affected countries. More generally, survey and assessments of the problem became more common. These activities helped in the development of clearance priorities and strategic national clearance plans. The number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in mine action increased, both internationally and nationally. Coordination systems for mine action were established in a number of countries during the reporting period.

Massive amounts of mine action funding and assistance in 2002 and 2003 were devoted to Afghanistan and Iraq. Some saw this as a disproportionate amount of resources, to the detriment of other mine-affected countries and areas. In July 2002, mine clearance in Eritrea was set back considerably when the government disbanded its existing coordinating bodies, closed the national mine action NGO, and expelled most international mine action NGOs.

Many States Parties are beginning to approach the mid-point for the ten-year deadline for clearance of all mined areas, as required by Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty. The first deadline will be 1 March 2009, for 14 of the first States Parties to the treaty. Another 11 countries have deadlines later in 2009 and eight have deadlines in 2010.²⁶ Increased attention is being paid to these and other States Parties to assist them in reaching their goal.

Some States Parties have confused the former "2010" demining policy goal of the United States government with the ten-year treaty-mandated deadline. Others have set clearance goals that stretch past their treaty-mandated deadline. Elsewhere, there has not even been an acknowledgment of the problem, let alone the treaty deadline.

It is instructive to look at the status of the 14 States Parties with the first deadlines in March 2009: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, Djibouti, Honduras, FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Peru, Senegal, United Kingdom (Falklands/Malvinas), Yemen and Zimbabwe. Mine clearance is underway in most, but not all of these countries.

²⁶ Those with deadlines later in 2009 include Chad, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jordan, Malawi, Nicaragua, Niger, Swaziland, Thailand, Uganda and Venezuela. Those with 2010 deadlines include Argentina, Cambodia, Czech Republic, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Liberia, and the Philippines.

- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council of Ministers in April 2003 approved a demining strategy for 2002 to 2010, which has the objective of freeing the country from the threat of mines and UXO by 2010.
- In May 2003, Croatia expressed its intention to be mine-free by March 2009.
- The Skallingen peninsula in Denmark was heavily mine-contaminated in World War II. It is now a protected natural reserve, and there are no mine clearance programs at present.
- Djibouti should be “mine-safe” by the end of 2003, according to the US State Department.
- The final clearance operation in Honduras is scheduled for completion by the end of 2003.
- Some mine clearance is occurring in FYR Macedonia, where the mine problem is relatively limited. However, FYR Macedonia’s most recent Article 7 transparency reports provided no information on mined areas or mine clearance.
- Malawi acknowledged suspected mined areas along the border with Mozambique in its initial Article 7 report submitted February 2003 and is seeking funds for survey and demining activities.
- According to Mozambique’s national mine action plan adopted in 2001, the mission of the plan is to create a “mine-impact free” country within ten years.
- Recent fighting in the north has left Namibia with a mine problem. But, Namibia still has not submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report, originally due by 28 August 1999, and its long-term mine action plan remains unknown.
- In 2002, the Organization of American States (OAS) estimated that it will take eight to nine years to complete mine clearance operations in Perú, because of technical issues and extremely difficult conditions, and said the aim is to declare Perú “mine safe” in 2010.
- In Senegal, the director of the military engineers stated that a systematic humanitarian mine clearance program remains impossible as long as there is no peace agreement with rebel forces in Casemance. A mine clearance plan has been developed, which would be carried out in three phases over a five-year period.
- Using the results of a Landmine Impact Survey, Yemen developed a five-year strategic plan to clear the fourteen highly affected communities by 2004; by the end of 2002, six of these communities had been cleared and declared safe.
- In October 2001, the United Kingdom and Argentina agreed on a Memorandum of Understanding on the establishment of a feasibility study on mine clearance in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. No significant progress was made to initiate the feasibility study during 2002 or the first half of 2003.
- In Zimbabwe, a National Authority on Mine Action was established in 2002 to formulate a national mine action plan.

Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty requires “destruction of *all* anti-personnel mines in mined areas...” (emphasis added). The ICBL and many others have for years used the term “mine-free” to describe the central goal of eradication of antipersonnel landmines. Increasingly, other terms are being used to describe the objective, such as “mine-safe,” “risk-free,” and “impact-free.” In the coming years, these

terms need to be discussed more thoroughly, and there needs to be a better articulation of precisely what the objective means, as the international community continues to grapple with a solution to the landmine problem.

Landmine Problem

Landmine Monitor Report 2003 has identified 82 countries that are affected by the presence of uncleared landmines and unexploded ordnance. In addition, Landmine Monitor identifies nine other areas (noted in italics in the chart) that are not internationally recognized states, but which Landmine Monitor researches and reports on because of their particular mine-affected status.²⁷

Landmine/UXO Problem in the World

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

Bold: Non-States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty

²⁷ Northern Iraq is no longer being reported separately from the rest of Iraq.

Landmine Monitor has removed nine countries from last year's total of 90 countries, and added one. Costa Rica declared itself mine-free in December 2002. The Republic of Congo was removed from the list, as no known mined areas were reported in the country, although its border with Angola may be mine-affected. In El Salvador, Estonia, Hungary, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, and Mongolia the problem is predominantly, in some cases exclusively, due to UXO, and very limited in its impact on the civilian population, with very few or no casualties recorded in 2001, 2002 or 2003. There is still a need for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) in these countries.

Venezuela was added to the list of mine-affected countries after it acknowledged in its initial Article 7 report that it has 1,063 antipersonnel mines emplaced in six locations.

Over half (45) of the 82 mine-affected countries are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, including two that joined the treaty in the reporting period (Afghanistan and Cyprus). Bangladesh stated in its Article 7 Report that "No known mined areas exist within the territory of Bangladesh."²⁸ However, landmines are found along a 208-kilometer-long area of the border with Burma, in Chittagong Hill Tracts. The Philippines also indicated in its Article 7 Report that it is not mine-affected, but it has stated that improvised mines, booby-traps, and other explosive devices used by insurgent groups are cleared by army ordnance and demolition teams.²⁹ Landmine Monitor has reported that new mines are laid each year and there are new casualties each year.

Survey and Assessments

There is still a lack of knowledge in many mine-affected countries as to the extent of the landmine problem, including credible, detailed information as to the exact location of mined areas. In a number of non-signatory countries with no humanitarian mine action programs, there is very little publicly available information on the extent of the mine problem. This is the case, for example, in Burma, India, Iran, Pakistan, and Uzbekistan.

The extent of the landmine problem, including the location and impact of mined areas, must be known in order to develop strategic mine action plans. Various forms of landmine surveys or assessments are generally utilized to assess the landmine problem.

A Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) is designed to look at the impact of landmines on communities in order to help authorities develop strategic plans to reduce impact. The Survey Working Group is the coordinating body for most LIS operations, with the Survey Action Center (SAC) as the executing agency.

Landmine Impact Surveys were completed in Cambodia, Chad, Mozambique, Thailand, and Yemen in 2000 and 2001, and a modified survey was carried out in Kosovo. UNOPS reports that it completed an LIS in northern Iraq in 2002. LIS began in Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Lebanon, and Somaliland in 2002. All are due for completion in 2003, except Eritrea, due in 2004. LIS got underway in Afghanistan and Angola in 2003. In Vietnam, the Vietnam Veterans of America

²⁸ Bangladesh, Article 7 Report, Form C, 29 April 2003.

²⁹ Philippines, Article 7 Report, Form C, 14 May 2003.

Foundation (VVAf) plans to start an LIS in 2003. The Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia, Somalia (Puntland), and Sudan are under consideration for LIS.

In 2002 and early 2003, Landmine Monitor recorded other general surveys and assessments of the mine problem in 32 countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, DR Congo, Ecuador, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Vietnam, and Yemen, as well as Abkhazia and Nagorno-Karabakh. In many instances, surveys preceded clearance operations, while others represent an initial assessment or survey to gain a better picture of the problem from which to plan a response.

Among the notable survey and assessment developments in 2002 and 2003 are the following. HALO Trust surveyed three former Soviet army military bases in Georgia in June 2002. In Armenia, deminers conducted a survey in one of the most mine-affected regions in the country. In Iraq, UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS), the Mines Advisory Group (MAG), VVAf, and MineTech are conducting emergency surveys/assessments. In Tunisia, MAG conducted an assessment of the country's landmine problem in December 2002, while UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) undertook an assessment mission there in January 2003. In 2002, UNMAS also conducted an assessment mission to Mauritania and a technical mission to Cyprus. In Vietnam, several local surveys were conducted by the Canadian company Hatfield Consultants, in partnership with an office of Vietnam's Ministry of Health.

The Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) assists mine action programs with data collection and mapping of information collected on affected areas, mine clearance, mine casualties and other relevant information. According to the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), IMSMA has been installed in 29 countries, including Albania, Armenia, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, DR Congo, Guatemala, Honduras, Sudan, and Zambia in 2002. Version 3 of IMSMA became available in 2003.

A total of 38 of the 45 mine-affected States Parties had submitted transparency reports as required under Article 7 of the Mine Ban Treaty, as of 31 July 2002. Angola, Eritrea, Liberia, Namibia, and Sierra Leone are late submitting their initial Article 7 reports. Article 7 reports for Afghanistan and Cyprus are not due yet.

Mine Clearance

Some form of mine clearance was reported to have taken place in 2002 and the first half of 2003 in 63 countries identified as mine-affected.³⁰ There is humanitarian mine clearance underway in at least 35 countries and instances of limited mine clearance in 32 countries. No mine clearance was recorded in 16 mine-affected countries.

Humanitarian Mine Clearance Activities

Humanitarian mine clearance by international, national, and non-governmental actors was underway in at least 35 countries in 2002 and 2003. This includes 24 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Costa Rica, Croatia, Djibouti, DR Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea,

³⁰ This includes Costa Rica, which declared itself mine-free in December 2002.

Guinea-Bissau, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Thailand, and Yemen. It also includes 11 non-States Parties: Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Greece, Iran, Iraq, Laos, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Vietnam. There are also humanitarian mine clearance programs in Abkhazia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Somaliland.

Transparent reporting on developments relating to demining is essential for efficient deployment of resources to high priority areas. Inconsistent reporting makes it difficult to identify the accumulated land cleared and returned to communities. There are often significant differences in the mine clearance figures provided in a country's Article 7 report, provided by the national coordination body, and provided by various demining NGOs. Landmine Monitor had particular difficulty in obtaining comprehensive and consistent figures for clearance in 2002 in Afghanistan, Angola, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique.

In some instances, international non-governmental organizations were primarily responsible for the humanitarian mine clearance, in cooperation with local authorities. In 2002, NGOs increased their demining activities in a number of countries, most notably in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Sri Lanka. Major international demining NGOs include DanChurchAid (DCA), the Danish Demining Group (DDG), the HALO Trust (HALO), Mines Advisory Group (MAG), Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), and Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD).

- In Abkhazia, HALO cleared 858,688 square meters of mine-affected land in 2002.
- In Albania, DCA and FSD conducted impact surveys that resulted in the release of almost six million square meters of suspected dangerous land in 2002, while technical survey released a further 675,000 square meters, and clearance freed up 450,000 square meters of mined land.
- In Angola, mine action NGOs reported the clearance of more than 2.8 million square meters in 2002 and the first quarter of 2003.
- In Chad, the NGO HELP reported that it cleared a total surface area of 1,935,000 square meters in 2002, destroying 2,970 mines and 6,904 UXO.
- In Eritrea, DDG cleared a total of 154,000 square meters of land from January until the July 2002 proclamation expelling mine action NGOs. DCA cleared 250,500 square meters of mine-affected land between 1 June 2001 and July 2002. HALO was asked to cease operations in May 2003, after having been permitted to continue their operations after July 2002.
- In Mozambique, the National Institute for Demining (IND) reports that 8.9 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, a slight increase from 8.7 million square meters cleared in 2001. Conflicting numbers were reported by various demining NGOs, however.
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, HALO cleared 380,386 square meters of land in 2002. In 2003, activities increased dramatically resulting in 810,743 square meters of land cleared between 1 January 2003 and 1 June 2003.
- In Somaliland, three NGOs (DDG, HALO, and the Santa Barbara Foundation) carried out demining activities in 2002, clearing nearly 1.7 million square meters of mined land, and 20 million square meters of battle area.

Indigenous or national non-governmental demining organizations operated in a number of countries in 2002.

- In Afghanistan, demining activities by national and international NGOs expanded dramatically as the mine action budget more than quadrupled. In 2002, mine action agencies cleared 22.5 million square meters of mined land, and 88.6 million square meters of former battlefields, compared to 15.6 million square meters of land cleared in 2001.
- In Azerbaijan, two national mine clearance NGOs cleared a total of 1,118,000 square meters of land in 2002.
- Ethiopia's first humanitarian demining NGO, Ethiopian Mine Action Office (EMAO), began demining operations in mid-2002 and by January 2003, it had cleared 396,555 square meters of land.
- In Guinea-Bissau, the mine action coordination center CAAMI reported in June 2003 that 390,000 square meters of land had been cleared since 2000. According to the UN Development Program (UNDP), the demining NGO HUMAID cleared 333,240 square meters of land between November 2000 and February 2003. A second domestic mine clearance NGO, LUTCAM, started field operations in February 2003.
- In Iraq, mine action programs were initiated for the first time in southern Iraq after the main fighting ceased in April 2003. Before this, four local NGOs operating with UN support, MAG and NPA were conducting mine clearance in Kurdish areas in the north of the country. NGOs DCA, FSD, and MineTech started demining activities in 2003.
- A local NGO Community Motivation and Development Organization (CMDO) launched a new humanitarian pilot mine clearance program in one part of Pakistan in early 2003.
- In Sudan, mine clearance activities expanded in 2002. Those active included DCA and Landmine Action, local NGOs Operation Save Innocent Lives (OSIL), and Sudan Integrated Mine Action Service (SIMAS), and, for a limited period, the US's Quick Reaction Demining Force (QRDF).

In a number of countries, humanitarian mine clearance is carried out by a combination of NGOs and national army or police deminers.

- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Mine Action Center reported in February 2003 that approximately 6 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, compared with 5.5 million square meters in 2001. The total amount cleared in 2002 was still significantly less than planned.
- The Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) reports that approximately 34.7 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, as compared to 21.9 million square meters of land cleared in 2001. The increase was primarily due to expanded clearance by the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces.
- The Croatian Mine Action Center (CROMAC) reported that 60 million square meters of mined land was deemed mine-free in 2002, including approximately 31 million square meters cleared in demining operations. In 2001, 13.6 million square meters of land was cleared, to a large extent using mechanical devices.

- In DR Congo, between June 2001 and April 2003, Handicap International Belgium cleared 25,756 square meters of land in and around Kisangani. In May 2003, it was forced to stop demining activities due to a lack of funds. Limited mine clearance has been also been conducted by militaries and the UN.
- In Laos, a funding crisis led to significantly scaled-back clearance operations in mid-2002 and to the lay-off of nearly half of UXO LAO's operational capacity. Operations have since gradually been resumed and staff re-hired. In 2002, 8.4 million square meters of land was cleared and 98,963 items of UXO destroyed.
- In Lebanon, the Army reported demining 1.7 million square meters of land in 2002. As part of the \$50 million United Arab Emirates "Operation Emirates Solidarity," two commercial companies cleared 3.9 million square meters of land in South Lebanon in 2002.
- In FYR Macedonia, a total of nearly 3.9 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, by various actors including NATO and Macedonian security forces, Handicap International and MineTech.
- The Sri Lankan Army Engineers report that approximately 16.36 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002. The February 2002 cease-fire increased the number of mine action NGOs in the country from none in 2001 to five in 2002 and 2003 (DDG, FSD, HALO, MAG, and NPA).
- The People's Army of Vietnam is the primary agency involved in clearance in that country, but others engaged include border guards, commercial military companies, and five international NGOs.

National armies and police conduct mine clearance in a number of countries. In almost all of the following instances, the clearance could be viewed as humanitarian, but more information is required, especially on quality assurance procedures.

- A unit of the army of Djibouti, together with US commercial contractor RONCO, cleared 4,986 square meters of land in 2002.
- In Guatemala, clearance operations in San Marcos department were completed on 15 December 2002, with 8,342 square meters of land returned to communities.
- In 2002, the Greek Army demined 66,000 square meters of land in its northern regions, as part of an ongoing clearance operation.
- The Royal Jordanian Corps of Engineers cleared 20 minefields in 2002, which allowed a major national irrigation project to proceed.
- The Kosovo Protection Corps operations cleared 203,360 square meters of land in 2002. Fourteen new dangerous areas were discovered.
- In Mauritania, a total of 5,294 mines and 5,098 UXO were cleared and destroyed between April 2000 and April 2003 by the government's National Humanitarian Demining Office.
- In Rwanda, deminers from the National Demining Office, under the Ministry of Defense, cleared a total of 1,220 mines and 27,791 UXO from 1995 to 2002.

- The Thailand Mine Action Center reported the clearance of 368,351 square meters of land in 2002.
- In Yemen, the National Mine Action Committee reports that in 2002 seven mine clearance teams cleared 18 known mine-affected areas covering approximately 1.18 million square meters.

The Mine Action Program (AICMA) of the OAS works with national armies in Central and South America.

- In December 2002, Costa Rica declared itself mine-free. According to an OAS update, a total of 338 landmines were removed from along the Nicaraguan border from 130,000 square meters of land.
- Engineer units of the Ecuadorian Army conducting mine clearance have cleared a total of 4,573 mines since commencing operations.
- In Honduras, the Army and OAS are responsible for demining operations, clearing a total of 16,700 square meters of mine-affected land in 2002.
- The Engineer Corps of the Nicaraguan Army cleared 339,032 square meters of land in 2002, destroying 5,479 antipersonnel mines.
- Peruvian Army Engineers completed mine clearance of the Zarumilla Canal in 2002, as well as its source at La Palma and the area leading to the international bridge at Aguas Verdes. National Police and deminers hired by the Industrial Services of the Navy cleared and destroyed 17,651 mines from around 668 high-tension electrical towers between June 2002 and May 2003.

Other Mine Clearance Activities

Limited mine clearance was underway in at least 32 countries in 2002 and 2003, including ten States Parties (Colombia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Namibia, the Philippines, Serbia and Montenegro, Tajikistan, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) and 22 non-States Parties (Armenia, Belarus, Burma, Burundi, China, Egypt, Georgia, India, Israel, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Morocco, Nepal, North Korea, Oman, Poland, Russia, South Korea, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan), as well as in Chechnya, Taiwan and Western Sahara.

Limited clearance by military and other entities, such as explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) units of national police responding to emergencies necessitating the clearance of landmines or UXO, was recorded in Belarus, Czech Republic, Georgia, Kuwait, Moldova, Oman, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine.

Some countries during this reporting period conducted mine clearance operations to facilitate military operations. Limited military mine clearance for tactical purposes was noted in Burma, Burundi, Russia (Chechnya), Colombia, Nepal, Philippines, Uganda, and Uzbekistan.

Limited mine clearance to maintain minefields was noted in Cyprus and Israel.

- In Burma (Myanmar), the practice of so-called atrocity demining continued as the military forced civilians to walk in front of them in order to detonate mines.

- In December 2002, China reported that new mine clearance activities had started along its border with Vietnam following the signing of a bilateral border agreement, in which the two countries agreed to complete technical surveys of mined areas by 2005.
- The armies of India and Pakistan apparently began systematic clearance along the border in October 2002, following the withdrawal of their troops from the area. Pakistan states that it has cleared most of the minefields, while India states that 85 percent of the mines it laid have been retrieved.
- In 2002, the Kyrgyz military reportedly began clearance in some areas, but, according to the Kyrgyz Border Guard Service, stopped due to disputes about the border.
- Starting in September 2002, North and South Korea both undertook mine clearance in the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) to prepare for a transportation project. This is believed to be the first mine clearance inside the DMZ.
- In southern Serbia, the Army and Ministry of the Interior deactivated or destroyed 6,654 mines and 223,058 items of UXO, including cluster bombs, from May 2001 to December 2002.
- Demining by the Turkish Army of the border with Bulgaria border was completed in mid-2002.
- In Egypt, commercial companies undertook some limited mine clearance for economic development purposes.
- In Namibia, the Namibia Development Corporation funded the clearance in 2002 of dozens of 30-hectare plots in the West Caprivi region.
- In Taiwan, a commercial company (BATEC) removed a total of 5,165 antipersonnel mines from an area of 66,362 square meters on the southern side of the Shang-Yi airport on Kinmen Island in 2002. According to reports the Ministry of National Defense there are no more mined areas left in inland parts of the island.
- The UN reported that in the Western Sahara, the Royal Moroccan Army carried out 36 mine disposal operations and the Polisario Front carried out nine such operations between April 2002 and January 2003. In May 2003, the UN reported that the Royal Moroccan Army had carried out another 16 mine disposal operations in Western Sahara.
- Zambian Army deminers, in consultation with RONCO, began clearance operations in May 2002 clearing roads along Lake Kariba to open up the area for a US\$50 million World Bank development project.

In addition, clearance initiatives conducted or implemented by villagers or mine-affected communities were recorded in countries including Afghanistan, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, and Pakistan. In Cambodia and Laos, governmental mine action agencies requested such initiatives be banned.

No Clearance Activities

No mine clearance of any type was noted in 2002 in 16 mine-affected countries, including 12 States Parties (Algeria, Bangladesh, Chile, Denmark, Liberia, Malawi, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland,

Tunisia, and Venezuela) and four non-States Parties (Cuba, Libya, Somalia, and Syria), as well as Palestine and the Falkland/Malvinas (UK).

Planning for humanitarian mine clearance is underway in States Parties Algeria, Chile, Niger, Tunisia, and Venezuela.

Emergency Clearance

The UN Mine Action Service continued its emergency response programs in Eritrea, FYR Macedonia and South Lebanon in 2002. It also established new emergency coordinating programs in DR Congo and Sudan. UNMAS also took responsibility for coordinating the UN Mine Action Program in Afghanistan, and for coordinating the UN response to the emergency in Iraq. The US Quick Reaction Demining Force, based in Mozambique, was deployed in Afghanistan, Iraq, Sri Lanka, and Sudan during 2002 and 2003.

Planning and Coordination

In 2002 and 2003, increased attention was paid to the development aspect of mine action, instead of viewing it as just an emergency and humanitarian aid activity. Donors and mine-affected countries are acknowledging that mine action activities must be part of other rehabilitation and long-term efforts, and that these activities must dictate much of the priority setting within humanitarian mine clearance.

In this reporting period, there has been increased focus and attention paid to planning and coordination needs. Most donor countries are now emphasizing the need for mine-affected countries to develop a strategic mine action plan focusing on priorities for clearance, and to accurately document overall progress. Without information from surveys, planning systems, and a well-structured coordination body, mine-affected countries and donor countries will continue to experience a lack of accuracy in mine action data. This in turn leads to difficulties in measuring effectiveness and efficiency of mine action activities.

Landmine Monitor 2003 noted some form of coordination and planning body in place in 37 of the 82 mine-affected countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Djibouti, DR Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Macedonia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Tajikistan, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. There are also such bodies in Abkhazia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, and Somaliland.

Some coordination developments in the reporting period include:

- In May 2002, Chile's National Demining Commission was established by an official decree. It was not, however, officially constituted until 19 August 2002.
- In July 2002, Eritrea announced the establishment of the governmental Eritrean Demining Authority to manage and coordinate mine action activities in the country. At the same time, NGOs such as DCA, DDG and the Mine Awareness Trust were expelled from the country and, in June 2003, HALO was also asked to leave.

- In Palestine, a national Mine Action Committee was created in August 2002 consisting of Palestinian Authority agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), UNICEF, UN Relief and Works Agency, and relevant NGOs.
- The Peruvian Center for Mine Action, “Contraminas” (Centro Peruano de Acción contra las Minas Antipersonales) was officially created in December 2002.
- In Sri Lanka, the National Steering Committee on Mine Action (NSCMA) was established in late 2002.
- UNMAS established a National Mine Action Center in Khartoum, Sudan in February 2003.
- In Zimbabwe, a National Authority on Mine Action was established in early 2002, in addition to the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center.

National mine action plans are important planning tools to help meet clearance deadlines for mine-affected States Parties. National mine action plans can also help ensure that clearance benefits the most heavily impacted mine-affected populations and supports the national socio-economic development of the country. A mine action plan also enhances transparency with donors, and provides a base for accountability with the mine-affected communities.

During this reporting period, Landmine Monitor recorded a national mine action plan in 22 countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea Bissau, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Senegal, Sudan, Thailand, Zimbabwe, and Yemen. A number of countries were in the process of drafting and approving plans.

Some planning developments in the reporting period include:

- In Afghanistan, a strategic plan released in early 2003 proposes that with adequate funding all mines in high-priority areas can be removed in five years under an accelerated demining program.
- In Albania, a national mine action plan was developed during 2002, with the assistance of UNDP, with the aim of completing mine clearance by 2006.
- In Angola, joint UN/NGO/government assessment teams conducted the first phase of a Rapid Assessment of Critical Needs process, in which teams visited 28 locations where internally displaced persons (IDPs) had returned to previously inaccessible areas. They found that 26 of the 28 locations were seriously mine-affected.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council of Ministers approved a demining strategy with the objective of freeing the country from mines and UXO by 2010.
- In Cambodia, a mine action activity plan has been prepared for integration into the country’s National Poverty Reduction Strategy and policy guidelines have been developed for a long-term mine action strategy.
- In Chad, a National Strategic Plan for the period 2002-2015 was developed in 2002, using the results of the Landmine Impact Survey completed in May 2001. It forms part of the country’s National Strategy to Reduce Poverty: 2001-2015.

- In 2003, the DR Congo submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report identifying 165 mined or suspected mined areas in 11 provinces.
- In Ecuador, a National Mine Clearance Plan for 2003-2004 was approved in December 2002.
- In March 2003, the Egyptian Cabinet agreed on a national plan to clear mines and develop the country's northwest coast.
- In Iraq, several surveys and assessments were either planned or underway by June 2003 to make up for a lack of contamination data on the south and center of the country prior to March 2003.
- In Mozambique, a Five-Year National Mine Action Plan was developed for the period 2002-2006, using the findings of the Landmine Impact Survey completed in August 2001. Mozambique reports that mine action is integrated into the government's Absolute Poverty Reduction Plan.
- In Tajikistan, the State Mine Clearance Program (SMCP) was formed in 2002 in order to develop a mine action plan.

International Developments – Coordination and Information

The Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Related Technologies met in February and May 2003. Belgium and Kenya acted as co-chairs. Cambodia and Japan were co-rapporteurs; they will become co-chairs in September 2003. During the 2003 meetings, the Committee focused on developments in and activities of mine-affected States Parties. At the February 2003 meeting, seventeen States Parties provided updates on mine action implementation plans and progress. In May 2003, sixteen State Parties made presentations.³¹ Four mine-affected countries that have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty also presented on mine action activities: Iraq (presented by UNMAS), Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Turkey. Documents presented at the Standing Committees are available at www.gichd.ch.

In May 2003, a new "tool" was introduced to assist mine-affected States Parties in reporting on their activities. The "4P" approach, developed by the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), calls for reporting on Problems, Plans, Progress, and Priorities. The Committee co-chairs hope that the 4P approach will improve efforts to measure mine action progress and to identify challenges, especially as the States Parties increasingly focus on the need for compliance with the ten-year deadline for mine clearance.

The ICBL Mine Action Working Group (MAWG), chaired by NPA, presented at both the February and May Standing Committee meetings. The MAWG stressed the importance of participation by mine-affected States Parties in the intersessional work program. In addition, MAWG underlined the continued need for transparency in reporting on mine action results. MAWG highlighted the ten-year timeframe for complete clearance of all mined areas and the importance of effectively measuring progress and assessing remaining challenges.

The Steering Committee on Mine Action (SCMA), chaired by UNMAS with participation from various demining NGOs, the UN, International Committee of the Red Cross, and others, met three times during 2002 to discuss issues of priorities in mine action, country developments (in Afghanistan, Angola,

³¹ Among those presenting at the meetings were: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, DR Congo, Republic of Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, and Zambia.

Sri Lanka, and Vietnam, as well as Chechnya), and the establishment of the Rapid Response initiative. The SCMA formed an ad-hoc task force to investigate growing differences between the UN and mine action NGOs in the field. UNMAS also chaired the UN Inter-Agency Coordination Group on Mine Action, an internal UN group that met monthly during 2002 to coordinate UN mine action response.

The UN Mine Action strategy was updated in July 2003 after consultations within the mine action community, and with mine-affected and donor governments. Among other items, the revised strategy reflects technical and methodological developments, the increased involvement of mine-affected countries in planning, coordinating and executing humanitarian mine action programs, and the important role of mine-affected communities themselves.

A major issue relating to mine action coordination during this reporting period was the importance of integrating a country's mine action plan into a Development Plan or Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan. Landmine Monitor notes that five countries are reporting mine clearance activities and mine action plans as components of the country's Development or Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan: Cambodia, Chad, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe.

According to the United Nations Development Program, it is providing assistance for the management of mine action programs in 23 countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Iran, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mozambique, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Yemen. The UNDP has also continued to develop and expand its Mine Action Exchange program (MAX), which facilitates the exchange of expertise, information, technology and facilities among mine-affected country programs. In 2002, program participants came from Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Croatia and Mozambique, and in 2003, there are plans to expand the program to include Cambodia, Yemen and other countries.

The International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) are guidelines for mine action activities aimed at helping practitioners and authorities monitor and conduct mine action activities in accordance with internationally set standards and safety levels. It is also hoped that the IMAS will constitute the basis for any national mine action standards and standard operating procedures used by mine action operators. The review board on IMAS met in January 2003 to review how the international standards have been adopted and adapted as national standards. Currently, the mine action community has endorsed 27 standards and another five are under discussion. The IMAS can be viewed online at www.mineactionstandards.org.

The Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining issued several mine action studies in 2002 on topics including socio-economic approaches to mine action, Mine Risk Education, mine action and mechanical demining equipment, metal detectors, and Explosive Remnants of War.

In September 2002, UNMAS released an interactive CD-ROM containing numerous important mine action and advocacy-related documents. In 2002, UNMAS strengthened and expanded its Electronic Mine Information Network (E-MINE), available at www.mineaction.org. The stockpile destruction database developed by Canada was integrated into E-MINE.

The Mine Action Support Group (MASG), the New York-based group of mine action donor governments, met almost every month during 2002 and 2003. The Permanent Mission of Belgium to the UN chaired the MASG in 2002, while the Permanent Mission of Germany was chair in 2003. In 2002, the MASG received briefings from mine action teams from countries including Afghanistan, Angola, Eritrea and Sudan, as well as UNICEF, UNDP and UNMAS. It initiated field visits by donors to

programs in Cambodia and Laos in 2002 and the Balkans in 2003. The MASG issues a monthly newsletter detailing minutes of its meetings, donor activities, and highlights from mine action programs.

An informal Resource Mobilization Contact Group was established during the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, with Norway as chair. The group is tasked with exploring all possible avenues for mobilizing resources to achieve the humanitarian aim of the Mine Ban Treaty. The group focuses on resource mobilization among traditional donors, multilateral agencies and development banks, mine-affected States Parties, other mine-affected states and non-traditional state donors, as well as the private sector. In May 2003, the group looked at how mine action can be seen as both a humanitarian and a development activity, providing opportunities for flexible financing. Mine-affected States Parties were encouraged to integrate national mine action plans with the country's Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan.

Demining Technology Research and Development

Landmine Monitor Report 2003 notes various research and development (R&D) projects by donor countries and mine-affected countries. As in previous years, it is often difficult to demonstrate the impact these projects have in the field.

In May 2003, Belgium presented a paper on mine action technologies, problems and recommendations, which identified collaboration between end-users, donors and technology experts as the major need in the R&D field. The paper acknowledges that the R&D community must improve the manner in which real needs are addressed, as opposed to assumed or presumed needs.

In 2002, Croatia established a Test and Evaluation Center and invited interested states and actors to use its services. In cooperation with Sweden and the GICHD, the Croatian Mine Action Center has taken responsibility for establishing standards for testing of demining machines and techniques. In 2002, nine machines and 86 mine detection dogs were tested in Croatia.

In South Africa, a study is being undertaken to establish an integrated regional capability linked to national programs and activities. The study examines mine detection dog capability, electronic and mechanical equipment, and technologies that support mine survivors.

Mine Risk Education

The term Mine Risk Education (MRE) replaces the previously-used term "mine awareness."³² MRE is not normally a stand-alone activity, but an integral part of mine action program planning and implementation. According to the draft international MRE standards, MRE "seeks to reduce the risk of injury from mines/UXO by raising awareness and promoting behavioural change; including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison."³³

Internationally, the principal MRE actors are UNICEF, the ICRC, Handicap International (HI), the International Save the Children Alliance (Save the Children Sweden, UK and US), Mines Advisory

³² For a broader definition of mine risk education, see *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, p.34.

³³ "Guide for the Management of Mine Risk Education," IMAS 12.10 Draft Version 1.1e, UNMAS, 25 February 2003, pp.1-2.

Group, HI Belgium, the OAS and HALO Trust.³⁴ UNICEF is the MRE focal point in the United Nations system. National NGOs and Red Cross/Crescent societies conducted MRE programs in at least 28 countries in 2002 and 2003.³⁵

More than 4.8 million people took part in MRE sessions in 2002. Millions more received MRE through radio and television, as well as through short briefings, such as those scheduled for refugees returning to Afghanistan.

Landmine Monitor recorded MRE programs in 57 of the 82 mine-affected countries. There were significant MRE programs in 36 countries, and basic or limited MRE activities in 21 countries. No MRE activities were recorded in 25 mine-affected countries.

MRE Programs

Landmine Monitor recorded MRE programs in 36 countries in 2002 and 2003. This included 23 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, DR Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, FYR Macedonia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, and Yemen. It also included 13 non-States Parties: Azerbaijan, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, and Vietnam. There were also MRE programs in Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Palestine.

MRE programs were closed in Eritrea in July 2002, and in April/May 2002 Operation Normal Life ended in Kosovo. New programs were initiated in nine countries (Angola, Colombia, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Vietnam, Zambia), as well as in Palestine.

Some positive developments included expanded program activities.

- In Afghanistan, twelve NGOs provided MRE to returning refugees and displaced persons. More than 2 million people reportedly attended short MRE briefings.
- In Angola, MRE programs expanded; in late 2002, the ICRC initiated a community-based MRE capacity-building project with volunteers from the Angolan Red Cross, while HI reinforced its direct MRE activities in 2002.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, MRE became part of the school curriculum, reaching 541,550 students.

³⁴ Other international agencies active in mine risk education include: the Association for Aid and Relief-Japan (AAR), the BBC/Afghan Education Project, Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief (CPAR), CAMEO, CARE, Caritas, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), DCA, DDG, HELP, HMD Response, HUMAID, INTERSOS, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), Islamic Relief Worldwide, the Landmine Survivors Network (LSN), Médecins sans Frontières (MSF), the Mines Awareness Trust, Nonviolence International, NPA, Oxfam, Peace Trees Vietnam, SBF, UNDP, VVAF, World Education, World Learning, World Rehabilitation Fund, World Vision. Some international private companies are also reported to implement MRE programs, including Humanitarian Force and MineTech.

³⁵ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, FYR Macedonia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Sudan, Uganda, Vietnam and Yemen, as well as Chechnya, Kosovo, and Palestine.

- In Cambodia, at least eight organizations are involved in a wide range of MRE activities including community based mine risk reduction, MRE integrated with mine clearance operations, and MRE integrated in primary school curricula.
- In Chechnya, some MRE agencies shifted their focus in 2003 from working with internally displaced people in Ingushetia to supporting local structures in Chechnya.
- In Colombia, a new community-based MRE project began in 14 municipalities in Antioquia and Cauca departments.
- In Croatia, most MRE activities are now being conducted by Croatian governmental and non-governmental agencies.
- In Iraq, a number of agencies, including UNICEF and HI, have been conducting large-scale emergency MRE activities following the coalition occupation. In the northern governorates local NGOs and MAG implemented MRE. MAG distributed MRE materials to displaced persons in the northern regions prior to and during the main hostilities in 2003.
- In Iran, the UNDP signed on 25 July 2002 an agreement with the government to establish multiple aspects of mine action in the country, including MRE and survivor assistance programs.
- In Kyrgyzstan, the Red Crescent initiated an MRE program in the Batken region.
- In Laos, an MRE curriculum was introduced in 911 schools, reaching a total of 86,500 students.
- In FYR Macedonia, the ICRC and the Macedonian Red Cross launched a media campaign aimed at reaching a wider audience.
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, the ICRC launched in 2003 a program to create play spaces for children away from mined areas.
- In Nicaragua, five different agencies provided MRE across the country.
- In Palestine, the NGO Defense for Children continued its MRE work in 2002, primarily in mine-affected areas, military training zones, and areas of confrontation. UNICEF and the Palestinian Red Crescent Society also carried out MRE activities, while ICRC did so in Gaza.
- UN agencies conducted MRE in the Golan areas of Syria; the Syrian government also runs MRE programs.
- In Peru, some mine-affected communities living near mine-affected high-tension electrical towers in Ica, Junín and Huancavelica received MRE for the first time.
- In Serbia and Montenegro, local and state-run media carried out MRE programs.
- In Sri Lanka, UNICEF and NGOs have increased MRE activities following the February 2002 cease-fire, which has led to many families returning to their homes in mine-affected areas.
- In Sudan, at least six NGOs are involved in the provision of MRE across the country.
- In Thailand, three agencies conducted MRE. MRE programs were also conducted in six Burmese refugee camps.
- In Vietnam, the government carries out mine/UXO risk education as part of a national injury prevention program, while NGOs and others also conduct education programs in heavily affected areas.

Other developments included surveys and assessments to better plan and implement MRE activities.

- In Abkhazia, ICRC provided technical assistance to HALO to conduct a survey on the level of MRE awareness and to adapt the MRE program accordingly.
- In Albania, a survey of MRE activities was conducted in August 2002, resulting in a revised MRE strategy.
- In Angola, a comprehensive MRE assessment report was released in 2002.
- In Azerbaijan, an external consultant evaluated the MRE program developed by UNICEF and ANAMA.

Trainings of MRE trainers and workshops are also viewed as positive developments.

- In Burma, Nonviolence International facilitated an advanced MRE program for cross-border medical workers in January 2003. In June 2003, MAG carried out an MRE workshop.
- In Ethiopia, a MRE community liaison training session was held in March-April 2003 for mine action agencies and regional government representatives. RaDO is the only agency conducting MRE in Ethiopia.
- In Jordan, twenty MRE instructors from four countries received training at a three-week course held in October 2002.
- In Senegal, HI and the Ministry of National Education developed a new schoolteacher MRE training program.

Some negative developments include:

- In Eritrea, the July 2002 proclamation disbanding mine action NGOs negatively affected nascent MRE activities.
- In Kosovo, the designated local bodies failed to plan for MRE. MRE was subsequently carried out by UNICEF, ICRC, the German NGO Caritas and the local NGO ARKA.
- In Rwanda, a lack of funds led to the closure of all MRE programs in 2002.
- Funding problems also hampered MRE activities in Sudan, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

Limited MRE Activities

Basic or limited MRE activities were recorded in 21 countries, including 11 States Parties (Bangladesh, Chad, Chile, Djibouti, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, the Philippines, Tunisia, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and 10 non-States Parties (Belarus, Burma, Burundi, China, India, Israel, Nepal, Poland, South Korea, and Ukraine), as well as the Falklands/Malvinas and Somaliland.

No MRE Activities

No MRE activities were recorded in 25 countries, including 11 States Parties (Algeria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Liberia, Moldova, Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, and Venezuela) and 14 non-States Parties (Armenia, Cuba, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iran, North Korea, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Somalia, Turkey, and Uzbekistan), as well as Taiwan and Western Sahara.

A pressing need for MRE, or increased MRE, was apparent in Angola, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Georgia, India, Iran, Nepal and Somalia. Operators reported difficulties in obtaining funding for MRE activities in Angola, Rwanda, Sudan, Uganda, Zimbabwe, and Somaliland.

International MRE developments and evaluations

In 2002 and 2003, some key actors re-focused their community-based MRE programs on highly mine-affected communities, while using the media (radio and television) and the school system to reach the wider community. Emergency MRE was conducted in a number of places, including Iraq where at least four agencies provided MRE. They used different approaches to disseminate MRE messages, such as meetings with local and religious leaders, training of school teachers and Red Crescent volunteers, distribution of leaflets and posters, and production of television spots and newspaper articles.

There were signs of a closer integration of MRE with other components of mine action, as some mine clearance agencies developed MRE activities. Most mine action centers now have an MRE branch. Some MRE agencies developed ways to respond to communities' clearance requests, while also reinforcing the exchange of information between MRE and survey.

UNICEF has been developing international standards (IMAS) for MRE since 2001. In 2002, it worked with Cranfield University and a User Focus Group made up of agencies and individuals recognized in the field of MRE to finalize the standards. A final draft of the standards should be presented during the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty.

At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, States Parties agreed to change the name of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies. In May 2003, mine-affected States Parties reported on MRE programs, in accordance with the "4P approach." At least 24 mine-affected States have mentioned MRE in their Article 7 Reports, under Form I, "measures to provide warning to the population."³⁶

The ICBL's Mine Risk Education Sub-Group of the ICBL Mine Action Working Group continued to serve as a resource on MRE issues for the ICBL and others during 2002 and 2003, with its co-chair, HIB, acting as Landmine Monitor's thematic research coordinator for MRE. The Sub-Group co-organized two meetings together with UNICEF for mine risk education operators on 19 September 2002 and 13-14 March 2003, in Geneva. The Sub-Group delivered statements to the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, as well as to the February and May 2003 intersessional Standing Committee meetings. These are available on the Sub-Group's webpage at www.icbl.org/wg/mre.

In January 2002, UNMAS contracted HI to develop the second phase of the Landmine Safety Project (LSP). The project aims to "provide the UN and NGO staff with safety information, materials and training that will allow them to fulfill their mandates in a safe manner." During its second phase starting in August 2002, LSP provided training to 126 people in Burma, Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Poland, Sri

³⁶ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, DR Congo, Croatia, Djibouti, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, FYR Macedonia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Lanka, Switzerland, Tajikistan, and Vietnam, as well as Chechnya and Western Sahara. A review of the project by UNMAS was scheduled in 2003.

Evaluations of MRE programs and KAP (knowledge, attitudes, practices) surveys were reported in Albania, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Laos, Senegal, Thailand, Uganda, Vietnam and Yemen, as well as in Abkhazia and Somaliland.³⁷

In 2002, HI reinforced its KAP methodology for evaluating the effects of MRE. UNICEF reviewed its MRE work in 12 countries, but the results had not been made public as of July 2003. In Yemen, Rādda Barnen supported a participatory evaluation of its work with the Yemen Mine Awareness Association.

The ICRC commissioned an external evaluation of its MRE pilot programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and then-FR Yugoslavia.³⁸ The evaluation commended the MRE programs for their high level of coverage and noted their effectiveness in changing knowledge, attitudes and behaviors. It stated, "For the same impact, television can be twenty times cheaper than theatre, or five times cheaper than posters and publications." It called on ICRC to develop an ongoing monitoring capacity. The report said there was a "need to continue a more steady but more limited MA programme in each country," advised the ICRC to "proceed with a selective involvement in EOD/clearance, possibly through an external standby mechanism," and recommended a redefinition of the general objective of ICRC's mine awareness as "generating an efficient risk information capacity."³⁹

³⁷ KAP MRE surveys look at knowledge, attitudes and practices of mine-affected communities in order to assess the needs and adapt MRE programs accordingly. For more information, see www.gichd.ch.

³⁸ A summary of the evaluation report is available at www.icrc.org.

³⁹ ICRC, "Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY)/Kosovo. ICRC community-based mine/unexploded ordnance awareness programme," Geneva, 4 November 2002.

LANDMINE CASUALTIES AND SURVIVOR ASSISTANCE

New Casualties in 2002-2003

The number of landmine survivors continues to grow as new casualties are reported in every region of the world.⁴⁰ In 2002 and through June 2003, Landmine Monitor finds that there were new landmine casualties reported in 65 countries; up from 61 countries reported in *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*.⁴¹ Landmine Monitor also registered mine casualties in seven other areas that it monitors because of their significant landmine problem.⁴² In calendar year 2002, new landmine casualties were recorded in 61 countries and all seven areas. In early 2003, mine casualties were recorded in another four countries.⁴³

Landmine Casualties January 2002-June 2003

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

Bold: Non-States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty

⁴⁰ For the purposes of Landmine Monitor research, casualties include the individual killed or injured as a result of an incident involving antipersonnel mines, antivehicle mines, improvised explosive devices, dud cluster munitions, and other unexploded ordnance. From the information available in many countries it is not always possible to determine with certainty the type of weapon that caused the incident. Where this level of detail is available, information is included in the country report.

⁴¹ *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* recorded 61 countries with mine/UXO casualties and nine with UXO casualties.

⁴² These include Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, Somaliland, and Western Sahara. Northern Iraq is no longer being reported separately from the rest of Iraq.

⁴³ Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi and Niger recorded landmine casualties in early 2003. Kenya and Kyrgyzstan also recorded casualties caused by UXO in 2002.

Compared to last year's *Landmine Monitor Report*, there are eight new countries with reported mine casualties: Belarus, China, Indonesia, Malawi, Niger, North Korea, Tunisia, and Zambia. There are four countries that had reported casualties previously, but not in this time period: Armenia, Bangladesh, Cuba, and Poland.

In addition to countries reporting landmine casualties, Landmine Monitor recorded nine countries with new casualties in 2002-2003 that were caused by unexploded ordnance (UXO) left over from earlier conflicts: Republic of Congo, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Nigeria, Poland, and Slovakia.

Scale of the Problem

While acknowledging that it is not possible to know with absolute certainty, it is likely that there are between 15,000 and 20,000 new landmine casualties each year. Progress has been made since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force, nevertheless, landmines continue to claim too many new casualties in too many countries. Based on the information gathered for *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, it is clear that:

- Landmines continue to pose a significant, lasting and non-discriminatory threat;
- Civilians account for the vast majority of new landmine casualties; only 15 percent of reported casualties in 2002 were identified as military personnel;
- Not only mine-affected countries have a problem with landmines; nationals from 39 countries (including 15 mine-free countries) were killed or injured by landmines while outside their own borders.

In 2002-2003, as shown in the table, mine casualties are still occurring in every region of the world: in twenty countries in sub-Saharan Africa, in fifteen Asia-Pacific countries, in fifteen countries in Europe and Central Asia, in ten countries in the Middle East and North Africa, and in five countries in the Americas. Ongoing conflict is a significant problem in some of these countries, but Landmine Monitor finds that 41 of the 65 countries that suffered new mine casualties in 2002-2003 had not experienced any active conflict during the research period. In many cases, the conflict had ended a decade or more ago.

For seven of the eight countries added to the list, the reason for inclusion was that new incidents of mine casualties were reported, rather than the onset of a new or ongoing conflict.

Several mine-affected countries are not on the list reporting new mine casualties. It is possible that there were mine incidents in some of these other countries; however, there was a lack of tangible evidence to confirm new casualties.

In 2002-2003, the following countries had nationals killed or injured by mines/UXO while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, The Gambia, Germany, India, Iraq, Italy, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Perú, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Somalia, South Africa, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, and Zimbabwe.

In 2002 and the first half of 2003, mine accidents during clearance operations or in training exercises caused casualties among deminers and soldiers in Abkhazia, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Belarus,

Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, DR Congo, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, South Korea, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Perú, Philippines, Russia (Chechnya), Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, US, Vietnam, and Yemen. There were also unconfirmed reports of demining casualties in other countries.

Casualty Data Collection

Landmine Monitor identified over 11,700 new landmine/UXO casualties in calendar year 2002.⁴⁴ This included at least 2,649 children (23 percent) and 192 women (2 percent).⁴⁵ Less than 15 percent of reported casualties were identified as military personnel. It is important to remember, however, that the 11,700 figure represents the *reported* casualties and does not take into account the many casualties that are believed to go unreported, as innocent civilians are killed or injured in remote areas away from any form of assistance or means of communication.

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

The reported casualty rate declined in 2002 from 2001 in the majority of mine-affected countries. Where an increase was reported in 2002 this generally appears to be due to population movements within affected areas (Cambodia), or to a new or expanded conflict (India and Palestine). In other mine-affected countries, the increase appears to be largely the result of improved data collection: Burma, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, and Thailand. In Chechnya and Colombia, both factors contributed to significantly higher numbers of reported casualties.

In several mine-affected countries, mine incident and casualty data is collected and stored using the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) or other comparable databases. Of the 65 countries, and seven areas, reporting new mine casualties in 2002-2003, only 25 countries and four areas report using IMSMA, or other databases, to record casualty data. Of those, only 18 countries and two areas provided Landmine Monitor with full year data. Even with a functioning data collection system in place it is believed that not all mine casualties are reported. IMSMA has the capacity to record mine casualty data; however a reported lack of human and financial resources sometimes prevents this facility from being used effectively. The principal collectors of mine casualty data are the mine action centers, the ICRC, UNICEF, and a number of NGOs.

⁴⁴ Landmine Monitor identified 9,405 new mine/UXO casualties in calendar year 2001, including revised statistics obtained from various sources during the course of research for this year's report. The significantly larger number of reported casualties in 2002 is attributable to improved data collection in a few mine-affected countries, rather than an actual increase in the number of casualties. Most notably, the reported number of casualties in Chechnya in 2002 is 5,695, compared to 2,140 in 2001, yet there is no evidence that the number of mine incidents or casualties increased dramatically during 2002. Previously, official data was not available for Chechnya. The 2002 figure was reported by the Chechen Ministry of Health.

⁴⁵ The figures for mine casualties involving women and children should be viewed as a minimum; in many instances this level of detail was not made available to Landmine Monitor.

Although Landmine Monitor considers that in some instances reported casualty figures are incomplete and understated, a sampling of the findings for calendar year 2002 from countries and areas with established mine casualty databases follows:

- In Afghanistan, 1,286 casualties recorded, down from 1,445 in 2001. It is still, however, estimated that there are around 150 new casualties each month;
- In Cambodia, 834 casualties recorded, up from 829 in 2001;
- In Colombia, 530 casualties reported, up 145 percent from the 216 reported in 2001;
- In Iraq, 457 casualties recorded in the northern governorates, up from 360 in 2001;
- In Angola, 287 casualties recorded, down from 673 in 2001, however, NGOs and UN sources report a dramatic increase in mine incidents;
- In Sri Lanka, 142 casualties recorded, down from 207 in 2001, although the data is reportedly incomplete;
- In Pakistan, 111 casualties reported, up from 92 in 2001;
- In Laos, 99 casualties recorded, down from 122 in 2001, however, it is not clear whether the reduction is due to fewer incidents or a reduced capacity to collect data;
- In Eritrea, 78 casualties recorded in the Temporary Security Zone, down from 154 in 2001;
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, 72 casualties recorded, down from 87 in 2001;
- In Ethiopia, 67 casualties reported, down from 71 in 2001 (data is only available for the Tigray and Afar regions);
- In Senegal, 56 casualties reported, the same number as in 2001;
- In Mozambique, 47 casualties recorded, down from 80 in 2001;
- In Lebanon, 42 casualties reported, down from 85 in 2001;
- In Kosovo, 15 casualties recorded, down from 22 in 2001;
- In Croatia, 29 casualties recorded, down from 30 in 2001;
- In Nicaragua, 15 casualties recorded, down from 19 in 2001;
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, 15 casualties recorded, down from 18 in 2001;
- In Albania, 7 casualties recorded, down from 8 in 2001;
- In FYR Macedonia, 4 casualties recorded, down from 38 in 2001.

In other mine-affected countries, limited data on landmine/UXO casualties is collected from government ministries and agencies, international agencies and NGOs, hospitals, media reports, and country campaigns of the ICBL. In some cases, available data is well below the estimates of the number of people killed or injured by landmines each year. For example, in Burma estimates have previously been as high as 1,500 casualties a year. In Chechnya, the Ministry of Health released casualty data for the first time, reporting new mine and UXO casualties that exceeded previously available statistics.

- In Chechnya, 5,695 mine and UXO casualties reported, up from 2,140 in 2001;
- In India, 523 casualties reported, up from 332 in 2001;
- In Chad, 200 casualties reported, up from 10 recorded in IMSMA in 2001;

- In Nepal, 177 civilian mine and improvised explosive device casualties reported, including 46 children;
- In Vietnam, 166 casualties reported, down from 237 in 2001, however, estimates include 1,110 people killed and 1,882 injured every year “on average;”
- In Burundi, 114 civilian casualties, down from 116 in 2001;
- In Burma (Myanmar), 114 casualties reported, up from 57 in 2001;
- In Georgia, 70 casualties reported, down from 98 in 2001;
- In Sudan, 68 casualties reported by a limited number of sources;
- In Palestine, 57 casualties reported, up from 20 in 2001;
- In Somalia, 53 casualties reported by a limited number of sources;
- In Turkey, 40 casualties reported, down from 58 in 2001;
- In Thailand, 36 casualties reported, up from 24 in 2001;
- In Guinea-Bissau, 33 casualties reported, up from 8 in 2001;
- In Iran, 32 civilian casualties reported, up from 18 civilians in 2001;
- In DR Congo, 32 casualties reported, down from 135 in 2001;
- In Yemen, 22 casualties reported, up from 21 in 2001;
- In Namibia, 19 casualties reported, down from 50 in 2001;
- In Jordan, 15 casualties reported, up from 8 in 2001;
- In the Republic of Korea, 15 casualties reported, up from 4 in 2001;
- In Tajikistan, 9 casualties reported, down from 29 in 2001;
- In Uganda, 7 casualties reported, down from 32 in 2001;
- In Serbia and Montenegro, 5 casualties reported, down from 32 in 2001.

Casualties continue to be reported in 2003. For example in Afghanistan, 412 new casualties were reported to 30 June; in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 27 new casualties to 9 May; in Cambodia, 371 new casualties reported to the end of May; and in Sri Lanka, 12 new casualties were reported in January. In Iraq, the mine/UXO casualty rate rose considerably due to the hostilities. During March and April the number of reported mine/UXO casualties increased by 90 percent in the north compared to the same period in 2002. In 2003 through May, 493 new mine/UXO casualties were recorded in the northern region.

Addressing the Needs of Survivors

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

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

However, throughout the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* the term *Survivor Assistance* is used in the country reports to describe activities aimed at the individuals directly affected by a landmine incident. The use of the term *survivor* is intended to emphasize this distinction.

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

The number of landmine/UXO survivors requiring assistance continues to grow every year. The exact number of mine survivors in the world is unknown, although previous estimates suggest there could be more than 300,000. Through Landmine Impact Surveys and increased data collection more information is becoming available. For example, in Afghanistan the database now contains information on 5,405 people injured in mine incidents since 1998, in Bosnia and Herzegovina the database records 3,871 people injured since 1992, and in Cambodia the database records 38,875 people injured since 1979.

In addition to the new casualties registered in 2002-2003, Landmine Monitor has identified 42 other countries with, in medical terms, a “residual caseload” of landmine survivors from previous years. In other words, many countries with no new reported landmine casualties nevertheless have landmine survivors from prior years that continue to require assistance. Consequently, almost two-thirds of the countries in the world – 124 countries including those with nationals injured abroad – are affected to some extent by the landmine/UXO problem and the issue of survivors.

The Mine Ban Treaty sets no time frame for mine victim assistance, as it does for mine clearance and stockpile destruction. The needs of landmine survivors are long-term, in many instances lasting a lifetime. A landmine survivor will require ongoing medical and rehabilitation services, and services assisting their socioeconomic reintegration and psychological well-being. For amputees, prostheses wear-out, and need repairs or replacement. Medical problems can resurface years after the original incident. Similarly, socioeconomic reintegration is not always easily achievable or sustainable. Vocational training programs and other methods to facilitate economic reintegration struggle to succeed in economies facing high levels of unemployment in the general population.

To ensure sustainability, assistance to landmine survivors should be viewed as a part of a country’s overall public health and social services system. Within those general systems, deliberate care must be built in to ensure that landmine survivors and other persons with disability receive the same opportunities in life – for health care, social services, a life-sustaining income, education, and participation in the community – as every other sector of a society. The ultimate goal of survivor assistance programs should be the complete rehabilitation of mine survivors and their reintegration into the wider community. Providing resources to support programs that address the needs of landmine survivors is in effect assisting to build the infrastructure that will benefit all persons with disabilities in a mine-affected country.

Capacities of Affected States to Provide Assistance to Landmine Survivors

The principal actors in landmine victim assistance generally agree that assistance includes the following components:⁴⁶

- Pre-hospital Care (first aid and management of injuries)
- Hospital Care (medical care, surgery, pain management)
- Rehabilitation (physiotherapy, prosthetic appliances and assistive devices, psychological support)
- Social and Economic Reintegration (associations of persons with disabilities, skills and vocational training, income generating projects, sports)
- Disability policy and practice (education and public awareness and disability laws)
- Health and Social Welfare Surveillance and Research capacities (data collection, processing, analysis, and reporting)

A detailed analysis of efforts and capacities of mine-affected States to address the needs of landmine survivors, and persons with disabilities in general, is beyond the scope of the research undertaken for Landmine Monitor.⁴⁷ Based on a purely quantitative analysis of the information available in the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, it would appear that most countries have facilities to address some of the needs of landmine survivors. However, Landmine Monitor has identified 48 mine-affected countries with new mine casualties in 2002 where one or more aspects of survivor assistance are reportedly inadequate. This is also the case for the seven mine-affected areas on which Landmine Monitor reports. Even when services exist, they are often long distances from mine-affected areas, making them inaccessible to many survivors, are too expensive for survivors to afford, or are bureaucratically off-limits to one group or another.

From the research collected in 2002-2003, several general observations can be made:

- Most services are still located in urban centers, but the majority of mine survivors can be found in rural areas where the concentration of mine pollution is greatest;
- The majority of resources continues to be directed towards medical and physical rehabilitation;
- The availability of assistance in psycho-social support and economic reintegration continues to be limited;
- International organizations, NGOs, and UN agencies continue to play a key role in the delivery of services to mine survivors;
- Local NGOs often lack the financial resources to continue programs after international organizations have withdrawn;

⁴⁶ For further information, see ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance, *Guidelines for the Care and Rehabilitation of Survivors*; see also, *Providing assistance to landmine victims: A collection of guidelines, best practices and methodologies*, compiled by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, Socio-Economic Reintegration and Mine Awareness, May 2001.

⁴⁷ More detailed information is compiled by Handicap International in *Landmine Victim Assistance: World Report 2002* which examines a wide range of indicators to determine a State's capacity to adequately address the needs of persons with disabilities, including landmine survivors.

- On-going conflict and the consequent security concerns in some mine-affected countries severely limit the ability of the government and international agencies to provide assistance to landmine survivors;
- The economic situation of many mine-affected countries remains an obstacle to the provision of adequate assistance to landmine survivors;
- The development of programs that address the long-term needs of landmine survivors, and other persons with disability, is hampered by the practice of some donors to only fund programs for a limited period of time. A commitment to long-term funding is needed to ensure sustainability and to build local capacities to continue the programs;
- In a positive development, more mine-affected States are now taking, or have taken, steps to develop a plan of action to address the needs of mine survivors, or more generally to improve rehabilitation services for all persons with disabilities.

Emergency and Continuing Medical Care

In 2002 and the first half of 2003, at least 1,491 landmine casualties were identified in hospital records, including 364 casualties in Africa, 21 in Americas, 954 in Asia/Pacific, 17 in Europe/Central Asia, and 135 in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Albania, the health infrastructure in mine-affected areas is inadequate for the treatment and rehabilitation of mine survivors.
- In Angola, less than 30 percent of the population has access to health care, and few facilities are available for mine survivors and other persons with disabilities.
- In Iraq, some health facilities lack running water and constant electricity supplies, equipment has not been properly maintained, and there is a lack of well-trained and experienced health care workers.
- In Nepal, three of the eight hospitals providing assistance to mine/IED casualties reported difficulties in providing treatment due to financial constraints.
- In Yemen, 132 mine survivors received various forms of medical assistance from government-organized programs.

Physical Rehabilitation

In 2002 and 2003, Landmine Monitor identified a total of 128,348 patients or services in the area of physical rehabilitation, including at least 15,994 services for landmine survivors. This includes 34,647 services in Africa, at least 1,994 for survivors; 320 services in Americas, at least 280 for survivors; 52,000 services in Asia/Pacific, at least 9,619 for survivors; 37,815 services in Europe/Central Asia, at least 3,423 for survivors; and 3,566 services in Middle East/North Africa, at least 678 for survivors.

- In Angola, the Ministry of Health is developing a national policy for physical rehabilitation.
- In Kosovo, the Ministry of Health has appointed an officer for physical medicine and rehabilitation to strengthen the rehabilitation sector.
- In Somaliland, the recent Landmine Impact Survey found that of 184 recent mine survivors, most had received emergency medical care but very few had received rehabilitation.

- In Syria, emergency and rehabilitation services will be improved in the mine-affected area with the opening of a community rehabilitation center, a physiotherapy center, and the construction of a 120-bed hospital.

Prosthetics/Orthotics/Assistive Devices

In 2002, ICRC prosthetic/orthotic centers produced 16,921 prostheses (including 10,098 for landmine survivors), 13,365 orthoses (including 101 for mine survivors), 17,052 pairs of crutches, and 1,598 wheelchairs.⁴⁸ According to data collected by Landmine Monitor, NGOs and other agencies working in mine-affected countries also produced or distributed at least 20,651 prostheses, 9,480 orthoses, 13,705 crutches, 3,019 wheelchairs, 25,206 other assistive devices and components, and repaired 975 prostheses; at least 5,727 devices were for mine survivors.

- In Algeria, the Ben Aknoun prosthetic/orthotic center began production and assisted 61 mine survivors during the year, the majority of which were mine survivors from Western Sahara.
- In Chechnya, the Grozny Prosthetic/Orthotic Center started production.
- In Ethiopia, a physiotherapy unit and gait-training area is being developed to expand and improve the quality of services available at the Dessie orthopedic center.
- In the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the ICRC launched an amputee rehabilitation program in a newly renovated prosthetic center in Songrim.
- In India, civilian mine survivors living in remote border villages have no access to rehabilitation services; however, the government has indicated its support for the rehabilitation of survivors, including their socioeconomic reintegration.
- In Georgia, the Tbilisi Orthopedic Center had 458 amputees on its waiting list for services as at the end of December 2002.
- In Namibia, the ICRC-upgraded Rundu prosthetic/orthotic workshop began production.

Psycho-social Support

Landmine Monitor recorded 10,965 people that received psycho-social support, including at least 3,074 survivors. This included 3,618 people in Africa, at least 1,152 landmine survivors; 183 in Americas, at least 60 survivors; 833 in Asia/Pacific, at least 522 survivors; 5,904 in Europe/Central Asia, at least 1,127 survivors; and 427 in Middle East/North Africa, at least 213 survivors.

- In Perú, a new society, the Association of Victims and Survivors of Landmines, has been created.
- In Russia, the St. Petersburg Elks participated in the first World Standing Amputee Ice Hockey Championships in Helsinki; seven mine survivors are on the team.

Vocational Training and Economic Reintegration

Landmine Monitor recorded 1,975 people assisted with vocational training and/or economic reintegration, including at least 824 survivors. This included 541 people in Africa, at least 417 survivors;

⁴⁸ ICRC Physical Rehabilitation Programs, "Annual Report 2002," Geneva, June 2003.

244 in Americas, at least 154 survivors; 778 in Asia/Pacific, at least 150 survivors; 313 in Europe/Central Asia, at least 99 survivors; and 99 in Middle East/North Africa, at least four mine survivors.

Although many mine survivors and actors in survivor assistance regard vocational training, opportunities for employment, and economic reintegration as a high priority, there is little evidence to show concrete progress in this area.

- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, a survey of around 1,200 mine survivors in Bosnia and Herzegovina revealed that 31 percent of respondents regard the lack of employment opportunities and economic reintegration as their main concern.
- In DR Congo, a social fund for mine survivors was created at the level of the Presidency.
- In Lebanon, more attention is reportedly needed on employment and economic reintegration activities.
- In Nicaragua, the government called for stronger socioeconomic reintegration efforts to assist mine survivors.
- In Sri Lanka, the UNDP Disability Assistance Project was started in Jaffna to promote the economic reintegration of mine survivors and other persons with physical disabilities.
- In Vietnam, 60 percent of survivors in Quang Tri have “poverty cards” identifying them as below the national poverty line.

Capacity Building

At least 4,256 surgeons, nurses, first aid providers, prosthetic/orthotic technicians and physical therapists received training in 2002. This included 3,186 local healthcare providers in Africa, 16 in Americas, 932 in Asia/Pacific, 122 in Europe/Central Asia, and an unknown number in Middle East/North Africa.

- In Eritrea, the UNDP Capacity Building Program in Victim Assistance is working with the government to build national capacity to provide adequate assistance to mine survivors.
- In Jordan, an amputation surgery workshop was held for surgeons from the Ministry of Health and the Hussein Medical Center.

Disability Rights

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

- In Afghanistan, the Transitional Islamic Government established the National Disabled Commission, which will draft a comprehensive law on the rights of persons with disabilities.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the “Development Strategy for BiH: PRSP (poverty reduction strategy policy) and Social Protection of People with Disabilities” includes a proposal for a law on the protection of people with disabilities, without distinction to the cause of disability.

- In Croatia, the Parliament passed a resolution accepting a new national strategy aimed at improving the quality of life of persons with disabilities, without distinction to the cause of disability.

Data Collection

In mine-affected country reports in this *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*, information is provided on the facilities that have been identified as assisting landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities. Many of these facilities were asked to report on how many people were assisted in 2002, and how many were landmine survivors. Landmine Monitor was not always able to get this information and some facilities do not keep records on the cause of injury, as all persons with disabilities are treated equally. Some facilities reported not having the capacity to record any form of data. Nevertheless, while acknowledging that the data is far from complete, it does give an indication of where additional attention may be needed in landmine survivor assistance. It is also recognized that the figures presented in the preceding sections do not represent the total number of individuals assisted, as one person may have accessed several of the services recorded.

- In Cambodia, an external evaluation of the Cambodia Mine/UXO Victim Information System (CMVIS) reported that the system is “unique in the world in terms of coverage and detail.”
- In Colombia, as part of the Comprehensive Action Against Antipersonnel Mines (AIMCA), the OAS Mine Action Program in Colombia supported the implementation of the Antipersonnel Mines Observatory to record and monitor information on mine casualties and mine survivors.
- In El Salvador, a recent census by the Association of War Wounded of El Salvador identified around 3,700 landmine survivors.

Coordination and Planning

Following the results of an UNMAS consultative process undertaken on behalf of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, coordination and planning by mine-affected States was identified as a key priority to ensure adequate assistance for mine survivors. In a positive development, more mine-affected States are now taking, or have taken, steps to develop a plan of action to address the needs of mine survivors, or more generally to improve rehabilitation services for all persons with disabilities.

- In Albania, the Albanian Mines Action Executive (AMAE) has appointed an MRE and victim assistance officer to coordinate activities and develop a plan of action for addressing the needs of mine survivors.
- In Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action (ANAMA) has appointed a victim assistance officer to coordinate activities of the Mine Victim Assistance Working Group and develop a long-term assistance program.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Mine Action Center plans to establish a mine victim assistance coordination group to develop a plan of action.
- In Chile, the government announced that survivor assistance would be an integral part of the new National Demining Commission’s work.

- In Guinea-Bissau, the National Mine Action Center organized its first meeting to elaborate a national plan of action to support mine survivors.
- In Laos, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare held the Second National Workshop on Victim Assistance to follow up on initiatives undertaken in 2001.
- In Mozambique, the National Demining Institute's Five Year National Mine Action Plan (2002-2006) affirms its coordinating role in mine victim assistance.
- In Rwanda, a national plan for the rehabilitation of persons with a physical disability was drafted.
- In Slovenia, the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance facilitated a regional study on mine victim assistance in the Balkans to identify gaps and promote regional cooperation.
- In Somalia, a Minister of Disabled and Rehabilitation was named in the new cabinet of the Transitional National Government.
- In Sudan, the National Mine Action Office has recruited a Victim Assistance Officer to assist in capacity building and develop a plan of action for victim assistance.
- In Thailand, a comprehensive model for victim assistance has been designed; however, the national plan of action recommended in November 2001 has not been completed.
- In Zimbabwe, a Victims Assistance, Rehabilitation, Reintegration, and Resettlement Office was established as part of the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center.

International Developments

The Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration (SC-VA) has been co-chaired by Colombia and France since September 2002 and the co-rapporteurs are Australia and Croatia (who will become co-chairs in September 2003). Two intersessional meetings of the SC-VA were held in February and May 2003. More information on the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, including texts of presentations, is available at www.gichd.ch.

In 2003, the SC-VA continued to identify practical means to assist States Parties in meeting their obligations under the Mine Ban Treaty in relation to mine victim assistance. It placed an increased emphasis on hearing concrete plans of action from mine-affected States for the care and rehabilitation of landmine survivors. The SC-VA focused on the priority areas for victim assistance identified during an UNMAS consultative process in 2002: emergency and continuing medical care; physical rehabilitation / prosthetics; psychological and social support; economic reintegration; and laws, public policies and national planning. Fifteen States Parties presented their plans, progress and priorities for mine victim assistance, and their problems in meeting needs, to the SC-VA during its 2003 meetings (Afghanistan, Albania, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, DR Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan, and Zambia), as well as Turkey, a non-State Party.

Eleven States Parties reported on their policies and initiatives to support mine-affected States in providing funding and other assistance to mine victims (Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom). In February, the SC-VA

welcomed four survivors from Thailand and two survivors from Laos, taking part in the *Raising the Voices* initiative. At the May meetings, ten *Raising the Voices* participants from Afghanistan, Cambodia, India, Nepal and Sri Lanka participated and made focused and substantive interventions.

The ICBL's Working Group on Victim Assistance (WGVA) participated in the SC-VA 2003 meetings. Its co-chair (Landmine Survivors Network) and the Landmine Monitor thematic research coordinator on victim assistance gave presentations on aspects of progress in the implementation of Article 6.3. In May 2003, representatives of the WGVA met with several NGOs working in prosthetics and orthotics to develop a joint strategy and specific plans to strengthen coordination, collaboration, and long-term planning in mine-affected countries. Details on the WGVA are available at www.icbl.org.

Voluntary Form J of the Article 7 transparency report, developed by the SC-VA, allows States Parties to report on victim assistance measures, mine action activities, and any other matters. As of 31 July 2003, a total of 27 States Parties submitted Form J with their Article 7 reports for 2002, including eleven mine-affected States Parties (Albania, Cambodia, Colombia, Ecuador, Malawi, Mozambique, Perú, Philippines, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe) and 16 non-affected States Parties (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, México, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, South Africa, and Sweden).⁴⁹ In addition, three mine-affected States Parties (Guinea-Bissau, Nicaragua, and Yemen) provided casualty and victim assistance information in Form I of their Article 7 reports.

Among the 29 countries where UNICEF is supporting mine action, eleven have survivor assistance components. UNICEF focuses on access of mine survivors and other people with disability to services and programs, rather than on service provision itself. It advocates for and with mine survivors and other people with disabilities to ensure their voices are heard, rights respected, basic needs met and that they are able to fully participate in their societies.

In December 2001, the United Nations General Assembly agreed to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to consider proposals for an international convention to "promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities."⁵⁰ The Ad Hoc Committee first met from 29 July to 9 August 2002 and again from 16-27 June 2003, where it agreed to establish a Working Group to prepare and present a draft text for the "Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities." The Working Group will be comprised of 27 governmental representatives and 12 NGO representatives, particularly organizations of, and for, persons with disabilities. The Working Group is scheduled to meet for ten days in early 2004 to prepare the draft text, which will then be discussed at the Third Session of the Ad Hoc Committee in May/June 2004.⁵¹

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

⁴⁹ In addition, Bulgaria, DR Congo, Denmark, Jamaica, Romania, and Rwanda submitted the Form J to report on other issues.

⁵⁰ UNGA Resolution 56/168.

⁵¹ For more information see www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights/; see also www.rightsforall.com.

MINE ACTION FUNDING

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

Landmine Monitor has identified about US\$1.7 billion in mine action contributions from 1992-2002. Of that total, 70 percent (\$1.2 billion) was provided in the past five years, since the signing of the Mine Ban Treaty.

For 2002, Landmine Monitor has identified \$309 million in mine action funding by more than 23 donors.⁵² This represents a very significant increase of about \$72 million, or 30 percent, from the previous year. The increase is particularly welcome in that last year, Landmine Monitor reported that funding in 2001 had for the first time stagnated rather than grow. It is noteworthy that well over half of the increase is attributable to one donor, Japan, and that more than two-thirds of the increase went to a single country, Afghanistan. Even greater increases in mine action funding will be needed in the future to cope fully with the global landmine problem and to enable Mine Ban Treaty States Parties to meet their ten-year deadlines for mine clearance.

As before, Landmine Monitor has not included funds for research and development into demining technologies and equipment in these totals, instead listing R&D funding separately, when known. While many donors devoted some resources to mine action R&D, only a small number of donors reported precise R&D funding for 2002 (Belgium, Canada, EC, Norway, UK, and US), totaling about \$19.7 million. From 1992-2001, mine action R&D spending totaled at least \$199 million, including at least \$21 million in 2001.

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

The totals also do not reflect mine action funding provided by non-governmental organizations or the private sector. Landmine Monitor has collected detailed information on NGO funding in only a limited number of countries. Landmine Monitor has data for seven countries, indicating NGOs donated about \$6.5 million to mine action in 2002.⁵³

Moreover, these totals do not include the contributions of the mine-affected countries themselves. Following are some examples. Croatia reports that it provided \$33.8 million for mine action in 2002, from its State budget and public companies. Bosnia and Herzegovina reports spending about \$5.1 million. In September 2002, Angola said it has made available \$5.3 million to support mine action activities. The Ethiopian government provided \$3.5 million for mine action in 2002, through a World

⁵² In some cases, donors are not reporting for the calendar year 2002. Among the countries reporting for different fiscal years are the US (October 2001-September 2002), Japan (March 2002-February 2003), Canada (April 2002-March 2003), UK (April 2002- April 2003), and Australia (July 2002-June 2003).

⁵³ The seven countries are Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland, and United Kingdom.

Bank loan. Vietnam states it invests hundreds of billions of dong (tens of millions of US dollars) for mine clearance each year. In Thailand, the government and foundations provided about \$1 million. Perú indicated that it allocated \$371,000 to mine clearance in 2002, through financial loans by public companies. Azerbaijan reports it provided \$259,000 for mine action in 2002. Yemen provided approximately 3 million Yemeni Rials for its national mine action program.

Finally, the totals for this year and past years do not include the UN Oil for Food program funding of mine action in northern Iraq. Between 1998 and 2002, this amounted to approximately \$95 million, including \$27.3 million in 2002.

Contributions in 2002

By far, the biggest increase in mine action funding came from Japan, which went from \$7.2 million in 2001 to \$49.4 million in 2002—an increase of \$42.2 million. Almost half of Japan's 2002 funding went to mine action programs in Afghanistan. The European Commission increased mine action funding by about \$13.4 million, Germany by about \$7.1 million, Norway by about \$5.5 million, Italy by about \$3.7 million, the Netherlands by about \$2.1 million, and Australia by about \$2.1 million. Increases were also registered in Belgium (\$1.2 million), Austria (\$1.1 million), France and Switzerland. Moreover, there were notable increases from two non-traditional donors. Greece, a treaty signatory, provided \$1.5 million in mine action funding in 2002, compared to \$80,000 in 2001. China, a treaty non-signatory, donated \$3 million in demining equipment in 2002, compared to donations valued at \$1.26 million in 2001. It is also notable that Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates have made significant mine action contributions the past two years.

Mine action funding fell for four of the biggest donors: the United States (down \$5.5 million); Denmark (down \$3.8 million); Sweden (down \$2.6 million); and the United Kingdom (down \$1.4 million). For the US, Sweden, and UK, this is the third consecutive year that mine action funding has decreased. Ireland, Canada and Finland also registered decreases in mine action funding in 2002.

Three major five-year (1998-2002) mine action funding commitments came to an end in 2002. Canada exceeded its five-year pledge of C\$100 million, contributing nearly C\$128 million (about US\$83 million). In November 2002, the Canadian Landmine Fund was renewed, with C\$72 million to be spent over the next five years. At the end of 2002, Norway had spent about \$110.5 million of its five-year pledge of \$120 million, and indicated the outstanding \$9.5 million would be spent early in 2003. Norwegian officials have given assurances that Norway intends to maintain the same level of support in the coming years. Japan exceeded its five-year pledge of ¥10 billion, contributing ¥10.34 billion (\$91.3 million). It has not yet made a renewed multiyear commitment.

Mine Action Funding in 2002: \$309 million

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| United States | \$63.7 million |
| Japan | \$49.4 million |
| European Comm. | \$38.7 million |
| Norway | \$25.2 million |
| Germany | \$19.4 million |
| Netherlands | \$16 million |

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Canada | \$15.1 million |
| United Kingdom | \$14 million |
| Denmark | \$10.6 million |
| Switzerland | \$9.1 million |
| Australia | \$8.7 million |
| Italy | \$8.7 million |
| Sweden | \$7.3 million |
| Finland | \$4.6 million |
| France | \$3.6 million |
| Belgium | \$3.1 million |
| China | \$3 million |
| Austria | \$2 million |
| Ireland | \$1.6 million |
| Greece | \$1.5 million |
| New Zealand | \$1.1 million |
| Luxembourg | \$1.1 million |
| Saudi Arabia | \$1 million |
| Others | \$1 million |

Note: Does not include funding for research and development

Mine Action Funding Reported To Date: \$1.7 billion

| | |
|-------------|-----------------|
| USA | \$439.2 million |
| EC | \$242 million |
| Norway | \$152.4 million |
| Japan | \$121.3 million |
| UK | \$108.1 million |
| Sweden | \$91.9 million |
| Netherlands | \$83.2 million |
| Canada | \$82.5 million |
| Germany | \$82.1 million |
| Denmark | \$72.9 million |
| Australia | \$51.9 million |
| Switzerland | \$48.7 million |
| Italy | \$44.7 million |
| Finland | \$32.5 million |
| France | \$20.4 million |
| Belgium | \$14.9 million |
| Austria | \$10 million |
| Ireland | \$9.4 million |
| New Zealand | \$7.6 million |

Others \$12.7 million

Note: Does not include funding for research and development

Reported Mine Action Funding by Year

| | |
|---------|--|
| 2002 | \$309 million |
| 2001 | \$237 million |
| 2000 | \$241 million |
| 1999 | \$220 million |
| 1998 | \$180 million (plus an estimated \$9 million) |
| 1997 | \$105 million (plus an estimated \$35 million) |
| 1996 | \$99 million (plus an estimated \$34 million) |
| 1992-95 | \$218 million (plus an estimated \$41 million) |

Note: Does not include funding for research and development

Mine Action Donors

Unless otherwise noted, figures are in US dollars.⁵⁴ Figures include victim assistance funding, where known. Figures do *not* include funds for mine action research and development, which are identified separately.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -- \$439.2 million

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 2002 | \$63.7 million |
| 2001 | \$69.2 million |
| 2000 | \$82.4 million |
| 1999 | \$63.1 million |
| 1998 | \$44.9 million |
| 1997 | \$30.8 million |
| 1996 | \$29.8 million |
| 1995 | \$29.2 million |
| 1994 | \$15.9 million |
| 1993 | \$10.2 million |

- Figures do not include mine victim assistance funding; however, funding for war victims programs totaled an additional \$10.7 million in FY2002.
- R&D totaled an additional \$13.2 million in FY2002, and \$94.4 million from FY1995-2001.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – \$242 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$38.7 million (€40.7 million)⁵⁵ |
|-------------|--|

⁵⁴ Figures for years prior to 2002 are taken from the Executive Summary of *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, although in a few cases, corrections to earlier years have been received. In most but not all instances, the figures for earlier years are calculated at the exchange rates for those years.

| | |
|-----------|----------------------------------|
| 2001 | \$25.3 million (€28.1 million) |
| 2000 | \$14.3 million (€15.9 million) |
| 1999 | \$15.5 million (€17.3 million) |
| 1998 | \$21.4 million (€23.8 million) |
| 1992-1997 | \$126.8 million (€141.2 million) |

- Figures do not include additional mine action funding by individual EU Member States.
- R&D totaled an additional €1.39 million (\$1.32 million) in 2002, and €48.1 million from 1992-2001.

NORWAY -- \$152.4 million

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 2002 | \$25.2 million (NOK 200.1 million) |
| 2001 | \$19.7 million (NOK 176.9 million) |
| 2000 | \$19.2 million (NOK 178.6 million) |
| 1999 | \$21.7 million (NOK 185 million) |
| 1998 | \$20.8 million |
| 1997 | \$16.7 million (NOK 125 million) |
| 1996 | \$13.5 million (NOK 101 million) |
| 1995 | \$11.6 million (NOK 87 million) |
| 1994 | \$4.0 million (NOK 30 million) |

- R&D totaled an additional NOK 2.83 million (\$353,465) in 2002. R&D totals for previous years are not known.

JAPAN -- \$121.3 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$49.4 million (¥5,499 million) |
| 2001 | \$7.2 million (¥764 million) |
| 2000 | \$12.2 million (¥1,422 billion) |
| 1999 | \$14.7 million (¥1,750 million) |
| 1998 | \$7.8 million (¥900 million) |

- Prior to 1998, Japan contributed approximately \$30 million to mine action.
- Japan has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

UNITED KINGDOM -- \$108.1 million

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2002-2003 | \$14 million (£9.3 million) |
| 2001-2002 | \$15.4 million (£10.7 million) |
| 2000-2001 | \$21.5 million (£15 million) |
| 1999-2000 | \$19.5 million (£13.6 million) |
| 1998-1999 | \$6.5 million (£4.57 million) |

⁵⁵ Landmine Monitor used an exchange rate of €1 = \$0.95 for 2002. It is the average rate for 2002 as identified in US Government, Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Annual)," 6 January 2003. Exchange rates with the US dollar fluctuated greatly for many currencies during the year and some donors used a different rate in their reporting than Landmine Monitor.

| | |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| 1997-1998 | \$6.6 million (£4.6 million) |
| 1996 | \$6.3 million |
| 1995 | \$6.9 million |
| 1994 | \$6.3 million |
| 1993 | \$5.1 million |

- Figures do not include victim assistance funding.
- R&D totaled an additional £1.4 million (\$2.1 million) in 2002-2003, and \$5.3 million from 1997-98 to 2001-2002.

SWEDEN -- \$91.9 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$7.3 million (SEK 71 million) disbursed |
| 2001 | \$9.9 million (SEK 95.9 million) disbursed; SEK 91.6 million allocated |
| 2000 | \$11.1 million (SEK 107.9 million) disbursed; SEK 76.7 million allocated |
| 1999 | \$11.5 million (SEK 94.5 million) allocated |
| 1998 | \$16.6 million (SEK 129.5 million) allocated |
| 1997 | \$11.9 million allocated |
| 1996 | \$10.4 million allocated |
| 1995 | \$5.1 million allocated |
| 1994 | \$2.6 million allocated |
| 1990-93 | \$5.5 million allocated |

- Figures do not include victim assistance funding.
- Sweden has devoted considerable additional funds to R&D, totaling more than \$24 million from 1994-1999; no figures are available for recent years.

THE NETHERLANDS -- \$83.2 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$16 million |
| 2001 | \$13.9 million (Dfl 32 million, €15.5 million) |
| 2000 | \$14.2 million (Dfl 35.4 million) |
| 1999 | \$8.9 million (Dfl 23 million) |
| 1998 | \$9.3 million |
| 1997 | \$10.2 million |
| 1996 | \$10.7 million |

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

CANADA -- \$82.5 million

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 2002 | \$15.1 million (C\$22.3 million) |
| 2001 | \$15.5 million (C\$24 million) |

| | |
|------|----------------------------------|
| 2000 | \$11.9 million (C\$17.7 million) |
| 1999 | \$15.2 million (C\$23.5 million) |
| 1998 | \$9.5 million |
| 1997 | \$3.0 million (C\$4.6 million) |
| 1996 | \$4.0 million (C\$6 million) |
| 1995 | \$1.5 million (C\$2.2 million) |
| 1994 | \$2.9 million (C\$4.4 million) |
| 1993 | \$2.2 million (C\$3.4 million) |
| 1989 | \$1.7 million (C\$2.5 million) |

- R&D totaled an additional C\$1.93 million (US\$1.3 million) in 2002, and US\$7.8 million from 1998-2001.

GERMANY -- \$82.1 million

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 2002 | \$19.4 million (€20.4 million) |
| 2001 | \$12.3 million (DM 26.8 million, €13.7 million) |
| 2000 | \$14.5 million (DM 27.5 million) |
| 1999 | \$11.4 million (DM 21.7 million) |
| 1998 | \$10.1 million |
| 1997 | \$4.9 million |
| 1996 | \$7.9 million |
| 1995 | \$0.8 million |
| 1994 | \$0.5 million |
| 1993 | \$0.3 million |

- Germany has devoted considerable additional funds to R&D, totaling more than \$6 million from 1993-1999; no figures are available for recent years.

DENMARK -- \$72.9 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$10.6 million (DKK 83.5 million) |
| 2001 | \$14.4 million (DKK 119.4 million) |
| 2000 | \$13.4 million (DKK 106.7 million) |
| 1999 | \$7 million (DKK 54.9 million) |
| 1998 | \$6.2 million (DKK 44.3 million) |
| 1997 | \$5.4 million (DKK 38.6 million) |
| 1996 | \$8 million (DKK 57 million) |
| 1995 | \$2.3 million |
| 1994 | \$2.0 million |
| 1993 | \$1.7 million |
| 1992 | \$1.9 million |

- Figures for 1992-1995 do not include bilateral contributions.
- Denmark has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

AUSTRALIA -- \$51.9 million

| | |
|------------------|--|
| 2002-2003 | \$8.7 million (A\$14.5 million) |
| 2001-2002 | \$6.6 million (A\$12.5 million) |
| 2000-2001 | \$6.7 million (A\$12.6 million) |
| 1999-2000 | \$8 million (A\$12.4 million) |
| 1998-1999 | \$7 million (A\$11.1 million) |
| 1997-1998 | \$5.9 million (A\$9.9 million) |
| 1996-1997 | \$4.5 million (A\$7.5 million) |
| 1995-1996 | \$4.5 million (A\$7.5 million) |

- Australia has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

SWITZERLAND -- \$48.7 million

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 2002 | \$9.1 million |
| 2001 | \$8.4 million |
| 2000 | \$8.5 million |
| 1999 | \$5.8 million |
| 1998 | Unknown |
| 1997 | \$4.0 million |
| 1996 | \$2.6 million |
| 1995 | \$4.1 million |
| 1994 | \$3.5 million |
| 1993 | \$2.7 million |

- Funding for victim assistance is not included in these figures because it is integrated into other funding for victims of war, post-conflict reconstruction and long-term development.
- The totals include \$4.35 million for the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining in 2002, \$3.3 million in 2001 and \$2.3 million in 2000; some or all of these funds could be counted as R&D.

ITALY -- \$44.7 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$8.7 million (€9.1 million) |
| 2001 | \$5 million (L 11.2 billion, €5.6 million) |
| 2000 | \$2 million (L 4.3 billion) |
| 1999 | \$6.5 million (L 13.9 billion) |
| 1998 | \$12 million (L 20 billion) |

- Italy contributed 18 billion lire (\$10.5 million) from 1995-1997.
- Italy has funded a number of R&D programs, but the total value is not known.

FINLAND -- \$32.5 million

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2002 | \$4.6 million (€4.8 million) |
| 2001 | \$4.5 million (FIM 30 million, €5 million) |
| 2000 | \$4 million (FIM 26.9 million) |

| | |
|---------|--------------------------------|
| 1999 | \$5 million (FIM 28.7 million) |
| 1998 | \$6.6 million |
| 1997 | \$4.5 million |
| 1996 | \$1.3 million |
| 1995 | \$0.7 million |
| 1991-94 | \$1.3 million |

FRANCE -- \$20.4 million

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2002 | \$3.6 million (€3.8 million) |
| 2001 | \$2.7 million (€ million) |
| 2000 | \$1.2 million |
| 1999 | \$0.9 million |
| 1995-98 | \$12 million |

- France has devoted considerable additional funds to R&D, but the value of R&D relevant to humanitarian mine action is not known.

BELGIUM -- \$14.9 million

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2002 | \$3.1 million (€3.2 million) |
| 2001 | \$1.9 million (€2.2 million) |
| 2000 | \$2.5 million (BEF 111 million) |
| 1999 | \$2.3 million (BEF 93 million) |
| 1994-1998 | \$5.1 million |

- R&D totaled an additional €1.5 million (\$1.4 million) in 2002, and \$6.7 million from 1994-2001.

AUSTRIA -- \$10 million

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2002 | \$2 million (€2.1 million) |
| 2001 | \$0.9 million (ATS 13.7 million) |
| 2000 | \$1.9 million (ATS 30 million) |
| 1999 | \$1 million (ATS 15 million) |
| 1994-1998 | \$4.2 million |

IRELAND -- \$9.4 million

| | |
|-------------|---|
| 2002 | \$1.6 million (€1.7 million) |
| 2001 | \$2 million (Ir£ 1.8 million, €2.2 million) |
| 2000 | \$1.4 million (Ir£ 1.3 million) |
| 1999 | \$1.8 million (Ir£ 1.6 million) |
| 1994-1998 | \$2.6 million |

NEW ZEALAND -- \$7.6 million

| | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| 2002 | \$1.05 (NZ\$1.85 million) |
| 2001 | \$0.95 million (NZ\$2.3 million) |

| | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| 2000 | \$0.7 million (NZ\$1.8 million) |
| 1999 | \$0.9 million (NZ\$1.8 million) |
| 1992-1998 | \$4 million (NZ\$6.9 million) |

Four other countries provided at least \$1 million in mine action funding in 2002:

- China donated \$3 million worth of demining equipment to Eritrea and Lebanon.
- Greece provided \$1.5 million, mostly for demining in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Lebanon.
- Luxembourg provided \$1.1 million for mine action in seven countries. It provided another \$1.1 million for eight health care and disability projects, which include support for landmine survivors.
- Saudi Arabia provided Yemen with \$1 million as the second part of a donation of \$3 million for mine action activities.

Other contributions to mine action in 2002 included:

- The Czech Republic provided about \$71,000 for mine action in Croatia, Albania, and Lebanon.
- Hungary donated \$30,000 for victim assistance in Afghanistan.
- Monaco contributed \$15,000 to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund.
- Slovakia donated demining equipment valued at \$185,000 to the International Trust Fund for use in Croatia.
- Slovenia donated \$362,534 to the International Trust Fund.
- South Africa provided \$50,000 for landmine victims in Angola.
- South Korea contributed \$100,000 to the UN Voluntary Trust Fund, for mine action in Laos, Cambodia and Sri Lanka.
- Spain did not report comprehensive mine action funding for 2002 to Landmine Monitor or the UN. Assistance related to its International Demining Training Center was valued at about \$770,000. Spain provided \$4.2 million in mine action assistance from 1995-2001.
- Turkey contributed \$23,750 for the destruction of stockpiled antipersonnel mines in Ukraine.
- The United Arab Emirates in 2001 pledged up to \$50 million to mine action in South Lebanon. It is not known how much of that total the UAE contributed in 2002, but under the program known as “Operation Emirates Solidarity,” it has funded mine clearance, survey and risk education activities. In 2002, UAE contributed \$10,000 for mine action in Sri Lanka.

States and Victim Assistance

The Mine Ban Treaty obligates, in Article 6.3, that “Each State in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims...” In many mine-affected countries the assistance available to address the needs of survivors is inadequate and it would appear that additional outside assistance is needed to provide for the care and rehabilitation of mine survivors.

The following chart is based on information provided to Landmine Monitor by donors, as reported in the individual country reports in this *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*.

Contributions to Mine Victim Assistance (US \$)

| | 2002 | 2001⁵⁶ |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Australia | \$534,250 | \$1,282,680 |
| Austria | \$912,553 | \$340,427 |
| Belgium | \$316,503 | \$638,555 |
| Canada | \$2,194,063 | \$4,973,485 |
| Croatia | \$0 | \$9,844 |
| Denmark | \$0 | \$251,277 |
| Finland | \$479,335 | \$605,228 |
| France | \$433,777 | \$95,829 |
| Germany | \$2,650,253 | \$964,959 |
| Hungary | \$30,000 | \$0 |
| Ireland | \$240,350 | \$409,381 |
| Italy | \$95,000 | \$1,735,812 |
| Japan | \$2,792,623 | \$668,000 |
| Luxembourg | \$1,444,631 | \$356,788 |
| Netherlands | \$454,000 | \$591,575 |
| New Zealand | \$57,000 | \$109,200 |
| Norway | \$5,372,750 | \$3,978,112 |
| Portugal | \$9,500 | \$56,080 |
| Slovenia | \$0 | \$165,807 |
| South Africa | \$50,000 | \$20,000 |
| Switzerland | \$46,000 | \$0 |
| United States of America | \$10,738,873 | \$11,414,576 |
| Total | \$28,851,461 | \$28,667,615 |

Although some States reported significant increases in 2002 – Austria, France, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg and Norway – in 12 out of 22 donor countries victim assistance funding decreased. It should also be noted that while the US contribution appears to be the largest, this includes the total contribution of the Leahy War Victims Fund, which supports programs for all victims of war; the percentage of funding that goes to support programs assisting landmine victims is not available.

Precise, comprehensive and comparable figures on resources available for mine victim assistance are difficult to obtain. Some governments do not provide specific funding for victim assistance, but rather consider victim assistance as an integrated part of humanitarian mine action. In other instances, some countries, for example Sweden and the United Kingdom, do not provide specific funding for victim

⁵⁶ Figures for 2001 taken from “Reflections on Funding Sustainability,” presentation by Sheree Bailey, Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Research Coordinator, to the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, Geneva, 4 February 2003, available at www.gichd.ch.

assistance at all with the view that landmine victims are reached through bilateral development cooperation and other contributions.

Equally, if not more important, are the activities of mine-affected states in providing resources for facilities and services within the public health system to address the needs of landmine victims. Information on this area is not readily available. In addition, many if not the majority of victim assistance programs are carried out by NGOs who receive funding from various sources including governments, private donors and charitable foundations. Therefore, the information obtained for the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* cannot be taken as fully representative of the total resources available to provide assistance to mine victims and other persons with disabilities.

An analysis prepared for the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration indicated that there had been no significant increase in victim assistance funding since 1999. Victim assistance as a percentage of total mine action funding had remained relatively constant at around 11.6 percent. In 1999, identifiable victim assistance funding amounted to \$28.5 million or 11.9 percent of total mine action funding. In 2000, the figure rose to \$29.7 million but the percentage dropped slightly to 11.5 percent of mine action funding. In 2001, victim assistance funding dropped to \$28.7 million but the percentage rose marginally to 11.6 percent of total mine action funding.⁵⁷ In 2002, victim assistance funding increased to \$28.9 million but the percentage of total mine action funding decreased to around 9 percent.

In 2002, the ICRC Special Appeal for Mine Action expended CHF 20.3 million (\$13 million), or 85 percent of its total expenditure, on victim assistance activities including emergency care, continuing medical care, and physical rehabilitation in 34 mine-affected countries. This compares with CHF 19.1 million (\$11.4 million), or 83 percent, in 2001.⁵⁸ In 2002, nine countries and the European Commission contributed CHF 8,154,587 (\$5.2 million) as compared to eleven countries contributing CHF 8.6 million (\$5.1 million) in 2001.⁵⁹ National Red Cross Societies from Australia, Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Norway and Portugal provided an additional CHF 2,648,548 (\$1.7 million), together with CHF 1,264,935 (\$810,856) from other organizations including Rotary, UEFA, Sorooptimist International, and other donors. An additional CHF 11,546,333 (\$740,495) was funded out of contributions to the ICRC Emergency Appeals 2002 and CHF 642,686 (\$411,978) from the ICRC Headquarters Appeal 2002. Total

⁵⁷ See, "Reflections on Funding Sustainability," presentation by Sheree Bailey, Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Research Coordinator, to the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, Geneva, 4 February 2003, available at www.gichd.ch. The sources of information used to compile the figures were annual *Landmine Monitor Reports* for 2000, 2001 and 2002, the Mine Action Investment database, the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance to Mine Action, reports of the Slovenian International Trust Fund for Mine Clearance and Mine Victims Assistance, ICRC Mine Action Special Reports, the Leahy War Victims Fund, and other relevant documents available to Landmine Monitor.

⁵⁸ ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2002," Geneva, August 2003; see also ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2001," Geneva, July 2002, p. 51. Exchange rates used are US\$1 = CHF1.56 for 2002, and US\$1 = CHF1.67 for 2001.

⁵⁹ In 2002, total funding received from States as reported in the ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2002," Geneva, August 2003, was: Australia (\$463,160), Austria (\$755,897), Canada (\$203,019), Finland (\$540,315), Italy (\$472,436), Japan (\$234,173), Netherlands (\$429,055), Norway (\$1,969,116), South Africa (\$19,744) and the European Commission (\$140,385). In some instances country contributions differ from those reported by States in the *Landmine Monitor Report 2003*. In the amounts listed for each State only 85 percent of total contributions to the ICRC Special Appeal are for mine victim assistance with the balance being allocated to mine awareness and humanitarian diplomacy activities. See also ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2001," Geneva, July 2002, p. 51.

expenditure in 2002, including victim assistance, mine awareness and humanitarian diplomacy, amounted to CHF 24 million (\$15.4 million).⁶⁰

The ICRC Special Fund for the Disabled expended CHF 2.6 million (\$1.8 million) on physical rehabilitation programs for persons with disabilities, including landmine survivors in 2002. This compares with CHF 2.8 million (\$1.7 million) in 2001.⁶¹ In 2002, three countries contributed CHF 2,263,760 (\$1.45 million) as compared to three countries contributing CHF 2.6 million (\$1.5 million) in 2001.⁶² National Societies in Germany, Liechtenstein, Monaco, New Zealand, and Norway provided an additional CHF 254,871 (\$163,379), together with CHF 14,365 (\$9,208) from other organizations.

In 2002, of the \$25,418,121 expended by the Slovenian International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF) only \$1,118,539 (4.4 percent) was for victim assistance programs, well below the ITF's target of 15 percent. This compares to \$1.3 million in 2001 (5 percent) and \$1.4 million in 2000 (6.4 percent).⁶³ Nine countries contributed to mine victim assistance programs through the ITF: Austria, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovenia, and the United States of America. The ITF describes mine victim assistance programs as "still grossly underfunded."⁶⁴

Although support for landmine victim assistance is included in the Mine Action Policy of the European Commission, no funding was provided for programs from the mine action budget in 2002. However, funding has been provided from other budget lines, including those of the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), to support programs that assist all persons with disabilities in mine-affected countries. The total value of these contributions is not available.

Major Mine Action Recipients

Accurate, complete, and comparable figures for major mine action recipients are even more elusive than those for mine action donors. According to the information available to Landmine Monitor, the biggest mine action funding recipients, cumulatively since the early 1990s, are Afghanistan (\$254 million), Mozambique (\$177 million), Cambodia (\$173 million), Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$119 million), northern Iraq (\$111 million), Angola (\$92 million), Kosovo (\$86 million), and Laos (\$50 million).

Vietnam (\$31 million), Croatia (\$29.8 million), Eritrea (\$25 million), and Lebanon (more than \$24 million) have emerged as major recipients in the past few years.

In 2002, the top recipients were Afghanistan (\$64.3 million), northern Iraq (\$30.6 million), Cambodia (\$27.3 million), Angola (\$21.2 million), Vietnam (\$17.7 million), Mozambique (\$16.9 million), Bosnia and Herzegovina (\$15.8 million), Eritrea (\$11.1 million), Croatia (\$10.3 million), and Laos (\$8 million).

⁶⁰ ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2002," Geneva, August 2003.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*; see also ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2001," Geneva, July 2002, p. 51.

⁶² In 2002, total funding received from States as reported in the ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2002," August 2003, was: Australia (\$106,327); Norway (\$1,182,471); and the United States of America (\$162,330). See also, ICRC Special Report, "Mine Action 2001," Geneva, July 2002, p. 51.

⁶³ Not all funds received by the ITF are expended in the year of receipt. Victim assistance expenditure in 2002 was provided by Austria (\$34), Canada (\$122,583), Croatia (\$11,717), Denmark (\$48,663), France (\$21,562), Luxembourg (\$16,941), Norway (\$12,080), Slovenia (\$140,143), United States of America (\$738,873), and private donors (\$5,934). Email to Landmine Monitor (HIB) from Sabina Beber, ITF, 4 August 2003.

⁶⁴ International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance, "Annual Report 2002," p. 19.

Other notable recipients included Sri Lanka (\$6 million), Nicaragua (\$5.9 million), Yemen (\$5.6 million), Somaliland (\$5.6 million), Lebanon (more than \$5.1 million), and Sudan (\$5.1 million).

The biggest increases in mine action funding in 2002 were registered in Afghanistan (\$50 million), Vietnam (\$12 million), Angola (\$7.7 million), Cambodia (\$6.3 million), and Sri Lanka (about \$5.5 million).

Among the major recipients, no significant decreases were reported except in Kosovo (\$7 million) and Lebanon (\$7.5 million). The decline was expected in Kosovo, following the UN's December 2001 declaration that clearance was successfully completed. The total for Lebanon does not include figures from the United Arab Emirates, which is now likely to be the major donor for Lebanon.

Afghanistan

Since the ouster of the Taliban in late 2001, mine action funding for Afghanistan has skyrocketed. Mine action funding for 2002 totaled approximately \$64.3 million, more than four times the 2001 total of \$14.1 million. The 2001 total had represented the smallest amount of mine action funding since 1992. Afghanistan received more than 20 percent of global mine action funding in 2002, and the \$50 million increase in funding for Afghanistan accounts for more than two-thirds of the large global increase in mine action funding for 2002. There were 15 identified donors in 2002, compared to nine in 2001. Funding for mine action in Afghanistan from 1991 through 2002 amounted to some \$254 million.

Mozambique

According to the National Demining Institute, seventeen donors contributed \$16.9 million for mine action in 2002. In 2001, thirteen donors reported to Landmine Monitor a total of about \$15.1 million in mine action contributions to Mozambique. It is estimated that mine action funding for Mozambique totaled about \$177 million from 1993 to 2002.

Cambodia

In 2002, fifteen donors reported providing approximately \$27.3 million in mine action funding for Cambodia, a significant increase from \$21 million in 2001. Total funding for mine action in Cambodia is estimated to exceed \$173 million from 1994 through 2002.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Twelve donors reported contributions of about \$15.8 million to mine action in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2002. That is thought to be an incomplete tally, with donations from others not yet recorded. The government reports that it provided national mine action funding of \$5.06 million in 2002. Donor funding amounted to about \$16.6 million in 2001 and \$16.2 million in 2000. Mine action funding for Bosnia and Herzegovina totaled approximately \$119 million from 1995 to 2002.

Northern Iraq

Prior to the occupation of Iraq by the Coalition Provisional Authority in 2003, mine action only took place in northern Iraq (Iraqi Kurdistan). The Iraq Mine Action Program (MAP), under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, has been funded entirely through the UN Oil for Food Program. The MAP expended

\$27.3 million in 2002, and over \$28 million in 2001. Two key mine action NGOs, Mines Advisory Group and Norwegian People's Aid, received funds apart from the UN program, totaling about \$3.3 million in 2002 and \$2.4 million in 2001. It is estimated that funding for mine action in northern Iraq totaled about \$111 million from 1993 to 2002.

In 2003, mine action is spreading to the rest of the country. Oil for Food funding is expected to be about \$35 million in 2003. In addition to that, by July 2003, donors had provided or pledged more than \$20 million in mine action funding for all of Iraq.

Angola

In 2002, fifteen donors reported contributions to mine action in Angola totaling approximately \$21.2 million. That is a very significant increase over the estimated \$13.5 million in mine action funding in 2001. It is estimated that mine action funding for Angola totaled about \$92 million from 1993 to 2002.

Additionally, the government of Angola allocates funds for mine action from its national budget. In September 2002, the government said it has made available \$5.3 million to support mine action activities.

Kosovo (Serbia and Montenegro)

With the UN declaration in December 2001 that Kosovo was mine-free, the previous high levels of international mine action funding fell dramatically. Total funding for mine action in Kosovo in 2002 was \$1.4 million. Landmine Monitor recorded about \$8.4 million in mine action funding in 2001. According to an independent study by the Praxis Group carried out on behalf of UN Mine Action Service, mine action funding for Kosovo totaled about \$85 million from mid-1999 when operations began until to the end of 2001.

Laos

Fifteen donors reported contributions of more than \$8 million to mine action in Laos in 2002. In mid-2002, a funding crisis led to significantly scaled-back clearance operations and to the lay-off of nearly half of UXO LAO's operational capacity. According to UXO LAO, mine action funding for Laos in 2001 amounted to an estimated \$7.5 million. Mine action funding for Laos totaled an estimated \$50 million from 1994 to 2002.

Vietnam

Four donors contributed about \$17.7 million for mine clearance and victim assistance in Vietnam in 2002, more than three times the previous year. This included \$11.9 million from Japan. In 2001, some \$5.7 million in mine action funding was provided. According to reports from donors, more than \$31 million has been provided for mine action in Vietnam in recent years. In addition, the government maintains that it invests hundreds of billions of dong (tens of millions of US dollars) for mine clearance each year.

Central America -- Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua

Funding for the Organization of American States (OAS) Assistance Program for Demining in Central America (PADCA), which involves mine and UXO clearance in Costa Rica, Guatemala,

Honduras, and Nicaragua, totaled \$3.95 million in 2002, a decrease from \$4.7 million in 2001. Funding totaled \$31.3 million from 1992 to 2002.

Croatia

Croatia has paid for most of its mine clearance from domestic financial resources, but has also received substantial international support. Croatia reports that in 2002, mine clearance activities cost \$44.2 million, a 48 percent increase from 2001 (\$29.8 million), which in turn was a large increase from the previous year. Of the 2002 total, \$24.3 million came from the Croatian State budget, \$9.5 million from public companies and \$10.4 million from foreign and domestic donations.

According to Croatia, foreign donations totaled \$8.7 million in 2002, mostly from the International Trust Fund (ITF), and \$5.8 million in 2001. The ITF reports that it provided \$10.3 million to Croatia for mine action in 2002, a significant increase from \$5.7 million in 2001. Total foreign contributions to mine action in Croatia from 1994 to 2002 are estimated to be \$29.8 million.

Lebanon

Since the Israeli withdrawal from South Lebanon in May 2000, mine action funding and activities have increased greatly. Seven donors reported contributions totaling \$5.1 million for mine action in Lebanon in 2002. Landmine Monitor estimates that \$12.6 million was provided by 13 donors in 2001, and nearly \$6 million in 2000. In addition, in 2001 the United Arab Emirates pledged up to \$50 million for mine action in South Lebanon. It is not known how much of that total the UAE contributed in 2001 or 2002, but under the program known as "Operation Emirates Solidarity," it has funded mine clearance, survey and risk education activities. Thus, in the past three years, mine action contributions have totaled about \$24 million, not including funds from the UAE.

Eritrea

Since the end of its border conflict with Ethiopia in June 2000, and its accession to the Mine Ban Treaty in August 2001, Eritrea has received significant amounts of mine action assistance. Eleven donors have reported providing \$11.1 million to mine action in Eritrea in 2002. In addition, China donated a significant amount of demining equipment. For 2001, ten donors reported contributions totaling \$8.4 million. Total mine action funding for Eritrea from 1994-2002 is estimated at \$25 million.

Other Mine Action Recipients in 2002

- **Sri Lanka:** Since the cease-fire took effect in February 2002, significant amounts of mine action funding have been provided. Eleven donors reported contributions to mine action in Sri Lanka in 2002 totaling about \$6 million. Mine action projects were mostly suspended in 2000 and 2001.
- **Nicaragua:** Eight donors reported providing about \$5.9 million.
- **Yemen:** Twelve donors reported providing about \$5.6 million, up from about \$4 million in 2001. In 2002, the government of Yemen provided approximately 3 million Yemeni Rials for the national mine action program.

- **Somaliland:** Eight donors reported providing about \$5.6 million. Funding in 2001 was about \$4.3 million.
- **Sudan:** In the wake of the January 2002 Nuba Mountains cease-fire, mine action assistance has increased. Twelve donors reported providing about \$5.1 million in mine action support in 2002. This compares to six donors providing some \$2.2 million in 2001.
- **Ethiopia:** Eight donors reported providing about \$4.9 million. In addition, the Ethiopian government provided \$3.5 million, through a World Bank loan. Ethiopia received about \$2 million in 2001.
- **Azerbaijan:** Five donors reported providing about \$4.5 million in mine action assistance to Azerbaijan in 2002. In addition, the government reports it provided \$259,000 for mine action in 2002. In 2001, Landmine Monitor recorded mine action funding totaling \$5.5 million for Azerbaijan.
- **Armenia:** The United States provided \$4.5 million, including a one-time donation of \$1.8 million from the US Embassy. In 2001, the US provided \$850,000.
- **FYR Macedonia:** About \$3 million was provided by the EC and ITF. Funding in 2001 was about \$530,000.
- **Albania:** The government reports mine action funding totaled \$2.8 million. In 2001, about \$2.2 million was donated.
- **Georgia:** Four donors reported providing about \$2.1 million, mostly for HALO Trust clearance in Abkhazia. Funding in 2001 totaled about \$1.8 million.
- **Thailand:** Foreign donors provided about \$1.7 million, compared to \$2.6 million in 2001. In 2002, the Thai government and Thai foundations provided about \$1 million.
- **DR Congo:** Handicap International Belgium received about \$1.5 million for its mine action work in the DRC.
- **Chad:** Five donors reported providing about \$1.3 million, the same amount as in 2001.
- **Jordan:** Three donors reported providing about \$1.1 million
- **Ecuador:** The US and OAS provided about \$1.1 million.
- **Perú:** The US and OAS provided about \$1.1 million. The government provided \$371,000.

Funding for mine action in each of the following countries totaled less than \$1 million in 2002: Benin, Burma, Burundi, Colombia, Djibouti, Estonia, Guinea-Bissau, Namibia, Oman, Pakistan, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, and Zambia.

REGIONAL OVERVIEWS

AFRICA

Mine Ban Policy

Every one of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa is a State Party or signatory to the Mine Ban Treaty, except Somalia, which does not have a functioning government. During the reporting period, Africa accounted for five of the nine countries that became States Parties. Three African nations ratified: Cameroon (19 September 2002), The Gambia (23 September 2002) and São Tomé e Príncipe (31 March 2003). Two acceded: Comoros (19 September 2002) and Central African Republic (8 November 2002).

Burundi, Ethiopia and Sudan have signed, but not yet ratified the treaty. In Burundi, a draft law for ratification of the Mine Ban Treaty was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 25 March 2003 and then by the Senate on 18 June 2003. The Council of Ministers of Sudan officially endorsed the Mine Ban Treaty in May 2003 and transmitted it to the Parliament for ratification. Ethiopian officials reaffirmed their support for the Mine Ban Treaty, but no steps toward ratification were undertaken. Somalia has remained without a central government since 1991, but on 12 November 2002, representatives of 16 Somali factions meeting in Eldoret, Kenya, signed the Geneva Call's Deed of Commitment banning antipersonnel mines.

No country completed domestic legislation to implement the Mine Ban Treaty. Eleven African States Parties have indicated that implementation legislation is in the process of being enacted, including three which initiated the process in this reporting period (Benin, Republic of Congo, and Togo). Others include Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Uganda, and Zambia. The South African Parliament passed implementation legislation in April 2003. Only four African States have domestic legislation in place: Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritius and Zimbabwe. Senegal and Tanzania have joined Lesotho, Namibia, and Rwanda as countries that deem existing law as sufficient.

Compliance with the Mine Ban Treaty's transparency reporting requirement continued to improve. During the reporting period, 12 of the 21 States Parties that submitted initial Article 7 reports were from Africa: Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Niger, Seychelles, Tanzania, and Togo. At the same time, 10 of the 15 States Parties that still had not submitted an initial Article 7 reports were from Africa: Angola, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone. The report was due as long ago as 1999 for Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, and Namibia.

No African country voted against or abstained from voting on UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74 on 22 November 2002, supporting implementation and universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty.

Delegations from 32 African governments attended the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in Geneva, in September 2002, including non-States Parties Burundi, Ethiopia, The Gambia (which ratified later in September), Sudan and Central African Republic (which acceded in November). Fourteen African States Parties did not attend. At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, Kenya became co-chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies.

Representatives of 35 African governments attended at least one of the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in Geneva in February and May 2003, including signatories Burundi, Ethiopia and Sudan. Twenty-seven of the governments attended both meetings.

In November 2002, seven African governments (Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, DR Congo, Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Tanzania) participated in a Seminar on Implementation of Article 7 of the Ottawa Treaty, organized by Belgium, President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, and held in Brussels. In December 2002, an Ethiopian NGO, RaDO, hosted the ICBL/Landmine Monitor's annual Africa-wide researchers' meeting in Addis Ababa.

Pending formal approval in September 2003, Kenya will host the First Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty at UN facilities in Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December 2004.

Use

In this reporting period, Landmine Monitor has found no concrete evidence of use of antipersonnel mines by any African State Party, but there were ever-more compelling reports of use of antipersonnel mines by government forces in Burundi, a treaty signatory, as well as by rebels. In Sudan, another treaty signatory, there were numerous reports of use of antipersonnel mines by government and rebel forces. Officials in Burundi and Sudan deny any use of antipersonnel mines. Several rebel groups used antipersonnel mines in DR Congo, as did various factions in Somalia.

Production and Transfer

No country in sub-Saharan Africa is known to produce antipersonnel mines. Past and present use of antipersonnel mines in the region raises concerns about illicit cross-border transfers of mines, but Landmine Monitor has not been able to document specific cases.

Stockpiling and Destruction

Four African States Parties completed destruction of their antipersonnel mine stockpiles in this reporting period: Chad, Djibouti, Mozambique and Uganda. This brings the total of African countries to have done so to ten. Gabon revealed for the first time that it had previously destroyed its stockpile, thus joining Mali, Mauritania, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

Chad completed destruction of its 4,490 stockpiled antipersonnel landmines in January 2003. Djibouti destroyed its stockpile of 1,118 antipersonnel mines on 2 March 2003. Mozambique completed destruction of its stockpile of 37,318 antipersonnel mines on 28 February 2003. Uganda completed destruction of its stockpile of antipersonnel mines in July 2003.

Three African States Parties initiated their stockpile destruction during the reporting period: DR Congo, Guinea-Bissau, and Tanzania. In the DR Congo, the NGO Handicap International Belgium reported destroying 1,660 antipersonnel mines from rebel stockpiles in 2002 and 2003. Guinea-Bissau destroyed 1,000 mines in September 2002. Tanzania destroyed its first 9,837 antipersonnel mines in March 2003.

Two African States Parties--the Republic of Congo and Kenya--have not begun the destruction process, but each has developed a plan to destroy their stockpiles in advance of the treaty-mandated deadline.

Ten States Parties have not officially declared the presence or absence of antipersonnel mine stockpiles because of their failure to submit transparency measures reports on time: Angola, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone. The stockpile destruction deadline for Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, and Namibia was 1 March 2003.

Eighteen States Parties in Africa have declared that they have no stockpile of antipersonnel mines, except, in some instances, those retained for training purposes: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Comoros, The Gambia, Ghana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Swaziland, Togo, and Zambia.

Of the three signatories, Burundi has stated it has a stockpile of only 1,200 antipersonnel mines, solely for training purposes, but allegations of ongoing use by the Burundi Army cast doubts on that claim. For Ethiopia, stockpile details are unknown. Sudan's assertions that it has no stockpile conflicts with allegations of recent and past use of antipersonnel mines. In Somalia, which remains outside of the Mine Ban Treaty, militias and private individuals are believed to possess large stocks of landmines.

Nineteen African States Parties have exercised, or intend to exercise, the option, under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty, to retain antipersonnel mines for training and development purposes: Botswana ("few"), Burkina Faso ("very few"), Cameroon (500), Central African Republic ("very limited quantity"), Djibouti (2,996), Kenya (3,000), Mali (2,000), Mauritania (843), Mauritius (93), Mozambique (1,427), Namibia (unknown number), Republic of Congo (372), Rwanda (101), South Africa (4,400) Tanzania (1,147), Togo (436), Uganda (1,764), Zambia (6,691), and Zimbabwe (700).

Several are retaining their entire stockpile of antipersonnel mines for research and training purposes: Togo (436), Mauritius (93 mines), and Botswana (unknown number). Zambia originally proposed retaining its entire stockpile of 6,691 antipersonnel mines under Article 3, but it has reconsidered its position and announced that this total will be reduced.

During this reporting period, two African States Parties heeded the ICBL's call to reduce their retained stockpile number: Mauritania decided to reduce from 5,728 to 843 and Uganda reportedly decided to reduce from 2,400 to 1,764.

Mine Action Funding

The primary donors to mine action programs in sub-Saharan Africa during the reporting period were Canada, Denmark, the European Commission, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States.

According to the information available to Landmine Monitor, the largest cumulative mine action funding recipients in Africa are Mozambique (\$177 million), Angola (\$92 million), and Eritrea (\$25 million).

In 2002, donors provided \$21.2 million in mine action funding for Angola, \$16.9 million for Mozambique, and \$11.1 million for Eritrea, ranking them the fourth, sixth, and eighth biggest recipients globally for the year.

Mine action funding was also provided for Somaliland (\$5.6 million), Sudan (\$5.1 million, Ethiopia (\$4.9 million), DR Congo (\$1.5 million), and Chad (\$1.3 million), as well as smaller amounts for Benin, Burundi, Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Namibia, Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia. Total funding for sub-Saharan Africa in the reporting period amounted to about \$70 million.

Landmine Problem

There are 23 mine-affected countries in sub-Saharan Africa, including all four non-States Parties: Angola, Burundi, Chad, DR Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, plus Somaliland. Republic of Congo and Kenya are no longer listed as mine-affected by Landmine Monitor.

Six African States Parties are among the group of 14 mine-affected States Parties facing the March 2009 deadline for clearance of all mined areas, as required by Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty: Djibouti, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal and Zimbabwe.

Djibouti should be “mine-safe” by the end of 2003, according to the US State Department. Malawi acknowledged suspected mined areas along the border with Mozambique in its initial Article 7 report submitted February 2003 and is seeking funds for survey and demining activities. According to Mozambique’s national mine action plan adopted in 2001, the objective is to create a “mine-impact free” country within ten years. Recent fighting in the north has left Namibia with a mine problem. In Zimbabwe, a National Authority on Mine Action was established in 2002 to formulate a national mine action plan.

Recent fighting has left Namibia with a mine problem, but its long-term mine action plan is unknown. In Senegal, the director of the military engineers stated that a systematic humanitarian mine clearance program remains impossible as long as there is no peace agreement with rebel forces in Casamance. A mine clearance plan has been developed, which would be carried out in three phases over a five-year period.

Landmine Impact Surveys (LIS) were completed in Chad and Mozambique in 2001. LIS are scheduled for completion in Ethiopia and Somaliland in 2003 and in Eritrea in 2004. A LIS got underway Angola in this reporting period. The DR Congo, Somalia (Puntland), and Sudan are under consideration for LIS.

Landmine Monitor recorded other general surveys and assessments of the mine problem in Angola, Chad, DR Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sudan, and Uganda in 2002 and early 2003.

In 2002, the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), which assists mine action programs with data collection and mapping of information, was installed in DR Congo, Sudan, and Zambia. Others that have the system include Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and Somaliland.

Mine Clearance

Humanitarian mine clearance by international, national, and non-governmental actors was underway in at least eleven countries of the region in 2002 and 2003. This includes nine States Parties (Angola, Chad, Djibouti, DR Congo, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Rwanda) and two signatories (Ethiopia and Sudan). There are also humanitarian mine clearance programs in Somaliland.

- In Angola, mine action NGOs reported the clearance of more than 2.6 million square meters in 2002 and the first quarter of 2003.

- In Chad, the NGO HELP reported that it cleared a total surface area of 1,935,000 square meters in 2002, destroying 2,970 mines and 6,904 UXO.
- A unit of the army of Djibouti, together with US commercial contractor RONCO, cleared 4,986 square meters of land in 2002.
- In DR Congo, between June 2001 and April 2003, Handicap International Belgium cleared 25,756 square meters of land in and around Kisangani. In May 2003, it was forced to stop demining activities due to a lack of funds. Limited mine clearance has been also been conducted by militaries and the UN.
- In Eritrea, DDG cleared a total of 154,000 square meters of land from January until the July 2002 proclamation expelling most mine action NGOs. DCA cleared 250,500 square meters of mine-affected land between 1 June 2001 and July 2002. HALO was asked to leave the country in June 2003, after having been permitted to continue their operations after July 2002.
- Ethiopia's first humanitarian NGO, Ethiopian Mine Action Office (EMAO), began demining operations in mid-2002 and by January 2003, it had cleared 396,555 square meters of land.
- In Guinea-Bissau, the mine action coordination center CAAMI reported in June 2003 that 390,000 square meters of land had been cleared since 2000. A second domestic mine clearance NGO, LUTCAM, started field operations in February 2003. According to the UN Development Program (UNDP), the demining NGO HUMAID cleared 333,240 square meters of land between November 2000 and February 2003.
- In Mauritania, a total of 5,294 mines and 5,098 UXO were cleared and destroyed between April 2000 and April 2003 by the government's National Humanitarian Demining Office.
- In Mozambique, the National Institute for Demining (IND) reports that 8.9 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, a slight increase from 8.7 million square meters cleared in 2001. Conflicting numbers were reported by various demining NGOs, however.
- In Rwanda, deminers from the National Demining Office, under the Ministry of Defense, cleared a total of 1,220 mines and 27,791 UXO from 1995 to 2002.
- In Sudan, mine clearance activities expanded in 2002. Those active included DCA and Landmine Action, local NGOs Operation Save Innocent Lives (OSIL) and Sudan Integrated Mine Action Service (SIMAS), and, for a limited period, the US's Quick Reaction Demining Force (QRDF).
- In Somaliland, three NGOs (DDG, HALO, and the Santa Barbara Foundation) carried out demining activities in 2002, clearing 1.5 million square meters of mined land, and 20 million square meters of battle area.

In addition, limited mine clearance was underway in at least five African countries in 2002 and 2003, including four States Parties (Namibia, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) and one signatory (Burundi). The Namibia Development Corporation funded the clearance in 2002 of dozens of 30-hectare plots in the West Caprivi region. Zambian Army deminers, in consultation with RONCO, began clearance operations in May 2002 clearing roads along Lake Kariba to open up the area for a US\$50 million World Bank development project. In Zimbabwe, 85 kilometers of the Victoria Falls minefield were cleared,

destroying 16,000 mines. Limited military mine clearance for tactical purposes took place in Burundi and Uganda.

No mine clearance of any type was noted in 2002 in seven mine-affected countries, including six States Parties (Liberia, Malawi, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Swaziland) and Somalia. Malawi and Niger are planning to conduct humanitarian mine clearance, but no information is available in the other countries.

Mine Action Coordination and Planning

Landmine Monitor noted some form of coordination and planning body in place in 13 of Africa's 23 mine-affected countries (Angola, Chad, Djibouti, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sudan, Zambia, and Zimbabwe), as well as Somaliland.

In July 2002, the Eritrean government announced the establishment of the Eritrean Demining Authority to manage and coordinate mine action in Eritrea. The previous government coordinating bodies were disbanded, the national mine action NGO closed, and most international mine action NGOs were expelled from the country. In Somalia, the UN abandoned efforts to set up mine action offices due to insecurity there. During 2002, Somaliland mine action agencies underwent reorganization, and UN and other international agencies expressed concern regarding possible negative consequences of a lack of a clear coordination mechanism there.

In September 2002, a memorandum of understanding was agreed to by the government of Sudan, the SPLA and UNMAS regarding UN mine action support to Sudan. UNMAS set up a Mine Action Center in Khartoum in September and established a southern Mine Action Coordination Office in February 2003. In Zimbabwe, a National Authority on Mine Action was established in early 2002, in addition to the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center.

During this reporting period, Landmine Monitor noted the existence of a national mine action plan in just six of Africa's 23 mine-affected countries (Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Senegal, Sudan, and Zimbabwe). A number of countries were in the process of drafting and approving plans.

In Angola, joint UN/NGO/government assessment teams conducted the first phase of a Rapid Assessment of Critical Needs process, in which teams visited 28 locations where internally displaced persons (IDPs) had returned to previously inaccessible areas. They found that 26 of the 28 locations were seriously mine-affected. In Chad, a National Strategic Plan for the period 2002-2015 was developed in 2002, using the results of the Landmine Impact Survey completed in 2001. It forms part of the country's National Strategy to Reduce Poverty: 2001-2015. In 2003, the DR Congo submitted its initial Article 7 transparency report identifying 165 mined or suspected mined areas in 11 provinces. In Mozambique, a Five-Year National Mine Action Plan was developed for the period 2002-2006, using the findings of the Landmine Impact Survey completed in August 2001. Mozambique reports that mine action is integrated into the government's Absolute Poverty Reduction Plan.

During the February and May 2003 meetings of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Related Technologies, mine-affected States Parties provided updates on their developments, activities and needs in mine action, including eight from Africa (Chad, DR Congo, Republic of Congo, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, and Zambia).

Mine Risk Education

MRE programs were conducted in 10 countries (Angola, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, Sudan, and Uganda) and Somaliland. Basic or minimal MRE activities took place in seven countries (Burundi, Chad, Djibouti, Malawi, Mauritania, Zambia and Zimbabwe). No MRE activities were recorded in six mine-affected countries (Liberia, Niger, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Swaziland). A pressing need for MRE, or increased MRE, was apparent in Angola, Burundi, Chad, Mozambique, and Somalia.

In Angola, a comprehensive report assessing MRE activities was produced in 2002, and MRE programs expanded during the year. The July 2002 proclamation disbanding mine action NGOs in Eritrea negatively impacted MRE programs there. In Mauritania, UNICEF plans MRE programs for 2003 to 2005, pending funding. Lack of funds caused all MRE programs in Rwanda to cease in 2002, and hampered MRE activities in Zimbabwe. Meanwhile, a new school-teacher MRE training program was undertaken in 2002 as part of Senegal's large MRE program.

Mine Casualties

In 2002 and 2003, new landmine casualties were reported in 20 of the 24 mine-affected countries in the sub-Saharan Africa region: Angola, Burundi, Chad, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. New mine casualties were also reported in Somaliland. The Republic of Congo and Nigeria reported new UXO-related casualties in 2002. It is possible that mine incidents occurred in the other mine-affected countries in the region, but there was a lack of tangible evidence to indicate new casualties.

New mine/UXO casualties were reported in: Angola, with 287 casualties recorded (the real total is thought to be much higher); Burundi, with 114 new casualties; Chad, where one military hospital registered 200 mine casualties; DR Congo, where at least 32 casualties were reported; Eritrea, with 78 casualties reported in the Temporary Security Zone; Ethiopia, with 67 new casualties; Guinea-Bissau, with at least 33 casualties; Mozambique, with at least 47 new casualties; Senegal, where 56 casualties were reported; Somalia, with at least 53 casualties; and Sudan, with at least 68 new casualties.

In 2002-2003, mine/UXO casualties also included nationals from African countries killed or injured while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities: Burundi, The Gambia, Mozambique, Namibia, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

Survivor Assistance

In many of the mine-affected countries in the region, medical facilities and rehabilitation services are in poor condition, mostly due to a lack of financial resources, and a lack of equipment, medicine, and skilled personnel. Armed conflict, whether ongoing or in the past, has also taken a heavy toll on the health infrastructure in several countries. Consequently, in many instances the assistance available to landmine survivors is inadequate.

In Angola, less than 30 percent of the population has access to health care, and few facilities are available for mine survivors and other persons with disabilities; however, the Ministry of Health is developing a national policy for physical rehabilitation. In DR Congo, a social fund for mine survivors

was created at the level of the Presidency. In Eritrea, the UNDP Capacity Building Program in Victim Assistance is working with the government to build national capacity to provide adequate assistance to mine survivors. In Ethiopia, a physiotherapy unit and gait-training area is being developed to expand and improve the quality of services available at the Dessie orthopedic center. In Guinea-Bissau, CAAMI organized its first meeting to elaborate a national plan of action to support mine survivors.

In Mozambique, the IND's Five Year National Mine Action Plan (2002-2006) affirms its coordinating role in mine victim assistance. In Namibia, the ICRC-upgraded Rundu prosthetic/orthotic workshop began production. In Rwanda, a national plan for the rehabilitation of persons with a physical disability was drafted. In Somalia, a Minister of Disabled and Rehabilitation was named in the new cabinet of the Transitional National Government. In Somaliland, the recent Landmine Impact Survey found that of 184 recent mine survivors most had received emergency medical care but very few had received rehabilitation. In Sudan, the National Mine Action Office has recruited a Victim Assistance Officer to assist in capacity building and develop a plan of action for victim assistance. In Zimbabwe, a Victims Assistance, Rehabilitation, Reintegration, and Resettlement Office was established as part of the Zimbabwe Mine Action Center.

In the Africa region, the voluntary Form J reporting attachment to the Article 7 report was submitted by Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe to report on victim assistance and other mine action activities. The DR Congo and Rwanda used Form J to report on other issues.

AMERICAS

Mine Ban Policy

Thirty-one of the 35 countries in the Americas region are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty. Guyana and Haiti have signed but not yet ratified the treaty. Guyana's National Assembly approved ratification of the treaty in April 2003. According to a Haitian official in June 2002, the ratification procedure was on a "fast track."

Cuba and the United States remain the only two countries in the region completely outside the Mine Ban Treaty.

During the reporting period no States Party passed domestic legislation to implement the provisions of the Mine Ban Treaty. Eight States Parties in the region have domestic legislation in place: Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Trinidad and Tobago. Honduras enacted national implementation legislation through Decree No.60-2000 in June 2000. Landmine Monitor knows of only two State Parties, El Salvador and Jamaica, reporting that steps to enact legislation are underway. Paraguay reported that legislation was in the process of being adopted in previous years, but now deems existing law sufficient.

In this reporting period, three States Parties from the region—Barbados, Dominica, and Trinidad and Tobago—submitted their initial Article 7 transparency reports, while fourteen others submitted annual updates. The initial Article 7 reports were past due for Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname; annual updates were overdue for eleven other States Parties: Antigua and Barbuda, the

Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Uruguay.

Seventeen countries of the region attended the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in Geneva, Switzerland in September 2002, including non-signatory Cuba. Fifteen countries, including Cuba, attended at least one of the intersessional Standing Committee meetings held in February and May 2003.

Beginning in September 2002, Perú became co-chair and México became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention, Colombia became co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, and Guatemala became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction.

Twenty-nine countries in the region voted in favor of UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74 on 22 November 2002, supporting implementation and universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. Regionally, Cuba and the United States were the only countries from the region to abstain.

As in previous years, members of the Organization of American States (OAS) adopted three landmine resolutions at the General Assembly in Bridgetown, Barbados on 2 June 2002: one in support of mine action in Perú and Ecuador, one in support of the program for mine action in Central America, and one reaffirming the objective of an antipersonnel landmine-free Western Hemisphere.

The ICBL participated for the first time in a Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas, in Santiago, Chile in November 2002. The final declaration of the meeting expressed support for mine clearance efforts and the social reintegration of landmine survivors. Language supporting mine action efforts was included in the declaration of the XII Iberoamerican Summit of Heads of State and Government in Bavaro, Dominican Republic, also in November 2002.

Nicaragua hosted a regional mine action conference from 27-28 August 2002. In January 2003, the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) organized an Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) seminar in Antigua, Guatemala, for participants from the region.

Use

Colombia remains the only country in the region where antipersonnel mines are being newly laid. Hostilities in Colombia intensified throughout 2002 and in the first half of 2003, with a corresponding increase in use of mines. The FARC and ELN guerrilla groups, as well as AUC paramilitaries, continued to use antipersonnel mines. A United Nations report released in February 2003 contains a serious allegation of use of antipersonnel landmines by the Colombian Army. The Colombian government has indicated only command-detonated Claymore mines, permissible under the Mine Ban Treaty, were used. In its Article 7 report, Venezuela revealed that it laid antipersonnel mines in May 1998, five months after signing the Mine Ban Treaty, but prior to entry-into-force. The United States apparently did not use antipersonnel mines in Iraq in 2003.

Production and Transfer

Cuba and the United States are among the fifteen remaining producers of antipersonnel mines in the world. It is not known if Cuba's production lines were active in 2001 and 2002. Cuba states that it does not export mines, but has not yet adopted a formal export moratorium. The US has not produced

antipersonnel mines since 1997 but reserves the right to do so. The US has had a legislative prohibition on export since 1992, which has been extended to October 2008. Colombian guerrilla groups continue to produce homemade antipersonnel mines and other improvised explosive devices.

Stockpiling and Destruction

Eight States Parties from the region have completed destruction of their stockpiled antipersonnel mines. Brazil, El Salvador and Nicaragua completed destruction during the reporting period, joining the ranks of Canada, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Perú, who had done so in previous years.

Brazil completed destruction of its stockpiled mines, destroying 27,397 antipersonnel mines between December 2001 and January 2003. El Salvador completed destruction of its 6,539 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 20 February 2003. Nicaragua completed destruction of its 133,435 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 28 August 2002.

Stockpile destruction is underway in five States Parties (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, and Venezuela).

In June 2003, Argentina and the OAS signed an agreement for cooperation and technical assistance in the destruction of the country's 90,109 stockpiled antipersonnel mines. As of May 2003, Chile had destroyed 201,446 stockpiled antipersonnel mines and was on track to complete destruction by August 2003. In April 2003, Colombia announced that its stockpile of 23,451 antipersonnel mines would be destroyed by February 2005; it commenced stockpile destruction in June 2003. Uruguay destroyed another 400 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in June and October 2002. Venezuela began destruction in May 2003 of its 46,136 stockpiled antipersonnel mines, destroying 35,360 mines between 7 and 14 May 2003.

Aside from the eight that have completed destruction, 15 States Parties in the region have officially declared not stockpiling antipersonnel mines (Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, México, Panama, Paraguay, St. Kitts and Nevis, and Trinidad and Tobago). In the reporting period, Barbados, Dominica, and Trinidad and Tobago officially confirmed that they do not possess stockpiles of antipersonnel mines.

Three States Parties (Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname) have not officially declared the presence or absence of antipersonnel mine stockpiles because of their failure to submit transparency measures reports on time. Only Suriname is believed to stockpile antipersonnel mines.

Of the four non-States Parties, the US stockpiles 10.4 million antipersonnel mines, the third largest stockpile in the world. As a mine producer, Cuba is believed to have a substantial stockpile of antipersonnel mines, but detailed information is not available. Landmine Monitor estimates that Guyana has a stockpile of approximately 20,000 antipersonnel mines. Haiti has stated that it does not stockpile antipersonnel mines.

Of the 31 States Parties in the region, twelve have declared their intent to retain antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty: Brazil (16,545), Chile (6,245), Venezuela (4,614), Perú (4,024), Ecuador (3,970), Nicaragua (1,971), Canada (1,935), Argentina (1,000), Colombia (986), Honduras (826), Uruguay (500), and El Salvador (96).

Brazil is retaining 16,545 mines, the second highest of any State Party in the world. Venezuela, in modifying the number of mines in its stockpile, increased the number of mines retained from 2,214 to 4,614.

Chile decided to reduce the number of mines it would retain from 28,647 to 6,245 during the reporting period. In previous years, Ecuador and Perú both decided to reduce the number of mines retained from the high levels originally proposed.

Landmine Problem

Costa Rica declared itself mine-free in December 2002.

Nine countries in the region are known to be mine-affected. All are States Parties (Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Perú and Venezuela) except Cuba. The Malvinas/Falkland Islands is also mine-affected.

Venezuela was added to the list of mine-affected countries after it acknowledged in its initial Article 7 report that it has 1,063 antipersonnel mines emplaced in six locations. El Salvador's problem is predominately due to UXO and limited in its impact on the civilian population, with the last casualty recorded in April 2002, but there is still a need for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD).

Mine Action Funding

The United States remained the largest single donor country to global mine action in 2002. The United States provided \$76.9 million in fiscal year 2002 to international mine action programs in 37 countries, a decline of nearly \$5 million from the previous year's total. The US in fiscal year 2002 contributed \$1.85 million to the OAS/IADB program for mine action in Central America, and also contributed \$1 million to Ecuador and \$700,000 to Perú. Canada was the largest per capita donor in the region, providing US\$16.4 million to mine action activities during its 2002/2003 fiscal year.

The OAS Mine Action Program (AICMA) received \$7.2 million in 2002 and the first quarter of 2003. Eight donors reported providing \$5.9 million in mine action assistance for Nicaragua in 2002. In March 2003, Colombia and the OAS signed an Agreement on Cooperation and Technical Assistance for mine action.

Mine Clearance

During the reporting period, humanitarian mine clearance was underway in six of the region's States Parties: Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Perú. In all of these countries, national armies implemented mine clearance activities under the umbrella of the Mine Action Program (AICMA) of the Organization of American States.

- In December 2002, Costa Rica declared itself mine-free. According to an OAS update, a total of 338 landmines were removed from along the Nicaraguan border from 130,000 square meters of land.
- Engineer units of the Ecuadorian Army conducting mine clearance have cleared a total of 4,573 mines.

- In 2002, Guatemala reported it had cleared 8,342 square meters of UXO-contaminated land in San Marcos department, and destroyed 56 items of UXO. Clearance of all thirteen high-risk departments in Guatemala is scheduled for completion by 2004.
- In Honduras, the Army and OAS are responsible for demining operations, clearing a total of 16,700 square meters of mine-affected land in 2002.
- The Engineer Corps of the Nicaraguan Army cleared 339,032 square meters of land in 2002, destroying 5,479 antipersonnel mines.
- Peruvian Army Engineers completed mine clearance of the Zarumilla Canal in 2002, as well as its source at La Palma and the area leading to the international bridge at Aguas Verdes. National Police and deminers hired by the Industrial Services of the Navy cleared and destroyed 17,651 mines from around 668 high-tension electrical towers between June 2002 and May 2003.

Chile expects to start demining in 2004. No systematic humanitarian demining took place in Colombia, but the Army's "Mars Group" reportedly destroyed 1,054 minefields in the two years leading to April 2003, and the Colombian Armed Forces cleared 877 mines in 25 departments in 2002.

Honduras, Perú, and the United Kingdom (for Falklands/Malvinas), are among the group of 14 mine-affected States Parties facing the March 2009 deadline for clearance of all mined areas, as required by Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty.

The final clearance operation in Honduras is scheduled for completion by the end of 2003. In 2002, the OAS estimated that it will take eight to nine years to complete mine clearance operations in Perú, because of technical issues and extremely difficult conditions, and said the aim is to declare Perú "mine safe" in 2010.

In October 2001, the United Kingdom and Argentina agreed on the establishment of a feasibility study on mine clearance in the Falkland/Malvinas Islands. No significant progress was made to initiate the feasibility study during 2002 or the first half of 2003.

The date for completion of the clearance program in Guatemala has been moved up from 2005 to 2004. Nicaragua has stated that it will complete its mine clearance program during 2005.

Mine Risk Education

MRE programs were conducted in seven countries (Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Perú), while basic or limited MRE activities took place in Chile, El Salvador and the Falklands/Malvinas. No MRE activities were recorded in Cuba or Venezuela.

National armies and government agencies conducted MRE in Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Falklands/Malvinas, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Perú, while local organizations reportedly conducted MRE in Colombia, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. A UXO risk education program is being carried out in Panamá.

Mine/UXO Casualties

In 2002-2003, landmine casualties were reported in five countries in the Americas region: Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Perú. In addition, El Salvador reported new casualties caused by unexploded ordnance.

Mine casualties increased significantly in Colombia, with 530 casualties reported in 2002, up from 216 in 2001. In Nicaragua, 15 new casualties were recorded, down from 19 in 2001. In Perú, 19 people were injured in mine and UXO incidents, including five deminers, up from two casualties on Peruvian territory reported in 2001. Chile and Ecuador each reported one mine casualty.

In 2002-2003, mine/UXO casualties also included nationals from other countries in the region—Canada, Perú, and the United States—who were killed or injured while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, or other activities.

Survivor Assistance

Facilities for civilian landmine survivors are often inadequate, while, for the most part, limited resources are available to military and police personnel injured in mine incidents. A marked urban bias in health care resources exacerbates the problems.

In Chile, the government announced that survivor assistance will be an integral part of CNAD's work. The OAS Mine Action Program in Colombia supported the implementation of the Antipersonnel Mines Observatory to record and monitor information on mine casualties and mine survivors. A Directory of Rehabilitation Services that covers fifteen seriously mine-affected departments and 66 municipalities in Colombia was published. In El Salvador, a recent census by the Association of War Wounded of El Salvador identified around 3,700 landmine survivors. The government of Nicaragua called for stronger socioeconomic reintegration efforts to assist mine survivors. In Perú, a new society, the Association of Victims and Survivors of Landmines AVISCAM, was formed.

The Canada/PAHO/México tripartite victim assistance project in Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador ended in March/April 2003.

In the Americas region, the voluntary Form J reporting attachment to the Article 7 report was submitted by Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, México, and Perú to report on victim assistance and other mine action activities in 2002-2003.

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Mine Ban Policy

Seventeen of the 40 countries in the Asia Pacific region are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Fiji, Japan, Kiribati, Malaysia, Maldives, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, the Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Thailand and Timor-Leste. Two countries acceded to the treaty in this reporting period: Afghanistan on 11 September 2002 and Timor-Leste on 7 May 2003. Five signatory countries have not yet ratified the Mine Ban Treaty: Brunei, Cook Islands, Indonesia, Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu.

Eighteen states in the region have not yet joined the treaty. Non-signatories include major antipersonnel mines producers and stockpilers such as China, India, Pakistan, South Korea and Singapore, and highly mine-affected countries including Burma (Myanmar), Laos, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. Others non-signatories are Bhutan, North Korea, Micronesia, Mongolia, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, and Tuvalu.

Laos and Sri Lanka have been reviewing their position regarding the Mine Ban Treaty and are considering accession. Internal procedures are in progress to ratify in Indonesia and the Cook Islands, and to accede in Papua New Guinea.

Seven non-signatory countries from the region voted in favor of UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74 in November 2002, which called for universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty. This group included: Bhutan, Mongolia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Tonga. Among the signatories, Brunei and Indonesia voted for the resolution, while others were absent for the vote. Among the 23 states abstaining from voting were China, India, FS Micronesia, Pakistan, South Korea and Vietnam.

During the reporting period no States Parties passed domestic legislation to implement the provisions of the Mine Ban Treaty. Only five Asia-Pacific States Parties have domestic legislation in place: Australia, Cambodia, Japan, New Zealand and Malaysia. Bangladesh reported that national implementation legislation was in its final stage of preparation, and the Philippines has legislation pending.

All States Parties, except Nauru and Solomon Islands, have submitted their initial Article 7 transparency report. Only Fiji, Kiribati, Maldives, Niue and Samoa have not yet submitted required annual updates.

Fourteen countries from the region attended the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, including five non-signatory countries: Mongolia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Singapore and Sri Lanka. At the meeting, Thailand's offer to host the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in Bangkok in September 2003 was approved. Also, Australia became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, and Cambodia became co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance. Fifteen countries, including China, attended at least one of the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in February and May 2003.

Nine States Parties from the Asia-Pacific region (Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, and Timor-Leste), as well as Indonesia, Canada, and Norway, formed the Bangkok Regional Action Group (BRAG) with the aim of promoting landmine initiatives in the region in the lead up to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties.

From 26-28 March 2003, Cambodia hosted a regional seminar on "Building a Co-operative Future for Mine Action in South East Asia" in Phnom Penh.

The final declaration of the XIII Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) meeting, held on 25-27 February 2003 in Kuala Lumpur, condemned antipersonnel mine use; NAM States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty urged non-States Parties to join the treaty.

The Inter Religious Peace Foundation hosted the Asia-Pacific Landmine Monitor researchers' meeting in Colombo from 27 to 31 January 2003.

Use

Use of antipersonnel mines and improvised explosive devices (IEDs) has been reported in five Asian countries in the reporting period. In Nepal, government and military officials have for the first time officially acknowledged use of antipersonnel mines by security forces. Both Nepalese government and

Maoist rebels expanded their use of antipersonnel mines and IEDs in 2002, including use in all 75 districts; however, there has been little or no use since the January 2003 cease-fire.

In mid- 2002, Indian and Pakistani forces ceased their massive mine-laying operations, during which several million mines were likely planted near their border. In addition, militant groups in India continued to use landmines and IEDs in Jammu and Kashmir, and at least five other non-state groups in other Indian states have used landmines in the reporting period.

Myanmar's military has continued laying landmines and at least fifteen rebel groups also used mines—two more than last year. In the Philippines, three rebel groups used antipersonnel mines and improvised explosive devices, including the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF), despite its having signed the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment prohibiting all use.

In addition to those five countries, there were a small number of incidents of reported use of IEDs in Indonesia in the conflicts in Ambon and Aceh, and reports of sporadic landmine use by resistance elements in Afghanistan.

In Sri Lanka there have been no reports of mine use by either the government or the LTTE since the December 2001 cease-fires.

Production and Transfer

Nine of the fifteen current producers are in the Asia/Pacific region: China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, North Korea, South Korea, Pakistan, Singapore and Vietnam. This year, Landmine Monitor is adding Nepal to the list, reflecting the open admission by government officials that production has taken place.

India and Pakistan are actively engaged in new production of antipersonnel mines that are compliant with Amended Protocol II of the CCW. State-owned Pakistan Ordnance Factories is producing both new detectable hand-emplaced antipersonnel mines and new remote-delivered mines with self-destruct and self-deactivating mechanisms. India indicated that it has met all necessary technical and financial requirements for production of new detectable antipersonnel mines. China declared that since 1997, it has ceased the production of antipersonnel mines that lack self-destruct mechanisms. South Korea reported that in 2002 it did not produce any antipersonnel mines, including Claymore mines. Singapore, however, confirmed that it continues to manufacture antipersonnel mines. In the reporting period, it appears that rebel groups produced and used significant numbers of homemade antipersonnel mines in Burma, India, Nepal, and the Philippines.

All producers, except Myanmar and North Korea, have export moratoria in place or have stated that they no longer export antipersonnel mines. China reaffirmed its limited moratorium in December 2002. South Korea announced the indefinite extension of its moratorium in December 2002.

Stockpiling and Destruction

Landmine Monitor estimates that China possesses the world's largest mine stockpile, with some 110 million antipersonnel mines. Landmine Monitor has in the past identified Pakistan and India as having the fourth and fifth largest stockpiles, with an estimated 6 million and 4-5 million mines, respectively. These estimates may no longer be accurate after the massive mines-laying operations in December 2001 and early 2002. The South Korean government confirmed a stockpile of two million antipersonnel mines.

Other countries holding stockpiles include non-signatories Burma (Myanmar), North Korea, Laos, Mongolia, Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Vietnam, as well as signatories Brunei and Indonesia.

Bangladesh is the only State Party in the Asia/Pacific region with a stockpile still to destroy. It reported for the first time a stockpile of 204,227 antipersonnel mines, and indicated it will retain 15,000 antipersonnel mines for training (one of the highest totals of any State Party). Bangladesh is expected to become co-rapporteur of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction in September 2003.

Japan completed destruction of its 1,000,089 stockpiled antipersonnel mines on 8 February 2003. Thailand completed the destruction of its 337,725 stockpiled antipersonnel mines in April 2003. In 2002, Taiwan transferred 42,175 antipersonnel mines to Germany for destruction, as permitted under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty.

Landmine Problem

In the Asia/Pacific region, fifteen countries, as well as Taiwan, are mine- and UXO-affected. Afghanistan remained one of the world's most mine-impacted countries with over 780 million square meters of contaminated land. Of this, over 404 million square meters were assessed as high priority residential areas, commercial land, transport roads, and agricultural irrigation systems. In Sri Lanka, the extent of the landmine problem is the object of ongoing surveys. A survey in government-controlled areas identified minefields in 14.49 million square meters of land, and identified another 8.3 million square meters as dangerous, requiring further survey. In LTTE-dominated areas, 156 minefields and 48 other dangerous areas were identified.

Cambodia is another of the most severely landmine- and UXO-affected countries in the world. According to the Level One Survey completed in May 2002, 2.5 percent of the country's surface area could be contaminated by mines or UXO. However, many feel this overstates the problem, and the government is using as a planning figure 10 percent of the LIS estimates, indicating some 425 million square meters of land likely require clearance.

In Nepal, landmine and IED incidents were reported in 72 of 75 districts. In India, minefields are being cleared all along the 1800-mile border with Pakistan, crossing the Indian states of Gujarat, Rajasthan, Punjab and Indian-administrated Kashmir. In Pakistan, mines are being cleared on the border with India, and the most serious landmine problem, as a result of the Soviet war in Afghanistan in the 1980s, is in the Federally Administrated Tribal Area.

In Vietnam, according to the Ministry of Defense, approximately seven to eight percent of the country is mine- and UXO-affected. All 61 provinces are affected, as are major cities. In Laos, fifteen of the country's eighteen provinces are impacted by UXO. Nine out of fourteen states and divisions in Burma are mine-affected, with a heavy concentration in East Burma. In Thailand, most of the 934 mined areas identified in 27 provinces are no longer marked, except where active demining is occurring.

A Landmine Impact Survey began in Afghanistan in 2003. General surveys and assessments were underway in the reporting period in Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Thailand.

Mine Action Funding

Japan's financial contribution to mine action rose to \$49.4 million in 2002, almost seven times that of the previous year, and the second highest total globally. Mine action programs in Afghanistan

received almost half of these funds. Between 1998 and 2002, Japan contributed \$91.3 million to mine action. In fiscal year (FY) 2002/2003, Australia committed US\$8.7 million toward mine action activities, its largest total ever. In FY 2001/2002, New Zealand provided NZ\$1.85 million (US\$1.05 million) in financial and in-kind support to mine action programs, down from NZ\$2.3 million in 2000/2001. China donated \$3 million in demining equipment to Eritrea and Lebanon. South Korea contributed \$100,000 to mine action in 2002.

Mine action funding for Afghanistan skyrocketed in 2002, following the ouster of the Taliban. It was one of the biggest mine action funding recipient globally in 2002. Funding totaled approximately \$64.3 million, more than four times the 2001 total of \$14.1 million. Mine action funding from 1991 through 2002 amounted to some \$254 million, also the highest total globally.

In Cambodia, donations to mine action totaled \$27.3 million, a significant increase from \$21 million in 2001. In Laos, in mid-2002, a funding crisis led to significantly scaled-back clearance operations and to the lay-off of nearly half of UXO LAO's operational capacity. By year's end, according to information gathered by Landmine Monitor, fifteen donors contributed more than \$8 million to mine action in Laos.

Mine action funding for Vietnam more than tripled in 2002, to \$17.7 million, including \$11.9 million from Japan. This was the fifth highest total globally. Nearly all mine action operations had ceased in Sri Lanka in 2000 and 2001 due to fighting, but after the February 2002 cease-fire, mine action funding totaled about \$6 million. In Thailand, foreign donors provided about \$1.7 million to mine action, compared to \$2.6 million in 2001. The Thai government and Thai foundations provided about \$1 million.

Mine Clearance

Humanitarian mine clearance by international, national, and non-governmental actors was underway in States Parties Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Thailand, as well as non-States Parties Laos, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam. In 2002, NGOs increased their demining activities, particularly in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka.

In Afghanistan, demining activities by national and international NGOs expanded dramatically as the mine action budget more than quadrupled. In 2002, mine action agencies cleared 22.5 million square meters of mined land, and 88.6 million square meters of former battlefields, compared to 15.6 million square meters of land cleared in 2001. The UN temporarily halted demining operations in eastern and southern provinces due to a series of attacks on demining staff and other humanitarian aid workers that began in April 2003. The Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) reports that approximately 34.7 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, as compared to 21.9 million square meters of land cleared in 2001. The increase was primarily due to expanded clearance by the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces.

In Sri Lanka, the February 2002 cease-fire has enabled a significant expansion of mine action activities: a total of 16,356,485 square meters of land were cleared in 2002, including 36,880 mines and 10,198 UXO. In Laos, 8.4 million square meters of land were cleared and 98,963 items of UXO destroyed. From 1975 to 2002, Vietnam reported that 1,200 million square meters have been cleared of 4 million landmines and 8 million UXO. The Thailand Mine Action Center cleared 368,351 square meters of land in 2002.

After the October 2002 withdrawal of Pakistani and Indian troops from the border areas, both countries began clearance operations. Pakistan states that it has cleared most of the minefields, while

India states that 85 percent of the mines it laid have been retrieved so far. In September 2002, North Korea and South Korea simultaneously commenced mine clearing inside the Demilitarized Zone for inter-Korean transportation projects. In addition, the South Korea military cleared over 6,000 landmines around seven military camps and bases. China reported that new mine clearance activities began along its border with Vietnam.

Limited mine clearance for military purposes occurred in Nepal and the Philippines. In 2002, village demining and “bomb hunters” searches occurred in Cambodia, Burma, Laos, Pakistan, and Vietnam. In Taiwan, a commercial company removed 5,165 antipersonnel mines from an area of 66,362 square meters on Kinmen Island.

Military units in Burma have repeatedly been accused of forcing people, compelled to serve as porters, to walk in front of patrols in areas suspected of mine contamination in order to detonate mines, in so-called “atrocious demining.”

Mine Action Coordination and Planning

Landmine Monitor noted some form of coordination and planning body in place in five of the 15 mine-affected countries in the Asia-Pacific region: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, Sri Lanka, and Thailand. In Sri Lanka, the National Steering Committee on Mine Action (NSCMA) was established in late 2002.

In 2002, Landmine Monitor noted a national mine action plan in place in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. In Afghanistan, a strategic plan was released in early 2003 which proposes that, with adequate funding, all mines in high-priority areas can be removed in five years under an accelerated demining program. In Cambodia, a mine action activity plan has been prepared for integration into the country’s National Poverty Reduction Strategy, and policy guidelines have been developed for a long-term mine action strategy.

According to the United Nations Development Program, it is providing assistance for the management of mine action programs in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, and Sri Lanka.

Mine Risk Education (MRE)

Significant MRE programs continued in seven countries: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam. New programs were initiated in Sri Lanka and Vietnam. National mine ban campaigns have undertaken basic MRE initiatives in India, Nepal and South Korea. Other limited MRE was recorded in Bangladesh, Burma, China, and the Philippines. No MRE activities were recorded in North Korea or Taiwan.

More than 2.4 million civilians in Afghanistan, including returning refugees and displaced persons, received mine risk education in 2002. In Cambodia at least eight organizations were involved in a wide range of MRE activities including community-based mine risk reduction, MRE integrated in primary school curricula, and MRE associated with mine clearance operations. Community Awareness teams visited 683 villages in Laos, reaching 160,053 people; MRE curricula were introduced in 911 schools reaching a total of 86,500 students. The Thailand Mine Action Center and two NGOs conducted MRE activities, reaching at least 52,312 persons; MRE programs were also conducted in six Burmese refugee camps. In Sri Lanka, UNICEF and NGOs have increased mine risk education activities. The cease-fire

there has greatly increased the need for MRE activities, as many families are returning to their homes despite possibly heavy mine contamination. The Vietnamese government conducts mine and UXO risk education as part of a national injury prevention program. NGOs and certain mass media organizations also hold mine/UXO risk education programs of their own in heavily affected areas.

Mine/UXO Casualties

In 2002, mine/UXO casualties were reported in 14 of the 15 mine-affected countries in the Asia/Pacific region: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, China, India, North Korea, South Korea, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam. Casualties were also reported in Indonesia in connection with improvised booby-traps and other explosive devices. No new mine casualties were reported in Bangladesh. There had not been reports of casualties from China, Indonesia, and North Korea in the previous reporting period. In 2002-2003, the following countries had nationals killed or injured by mines/UXO while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities: Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, India, New Zealand, and Pakistan.

In Afghanistan, 1,286 casualties were recorded; an estimated 150 new casualties occur there each month. In Burma, there were at least 114 new landmine casualties. In Cambodia, 834 new mine and UXO casualties were reported, up from 829 in 2001, while in India, there were at least 523 mine casualties, up from 332 in 2001. In Laos, 99 mine/UXO casualties were reported in nine provinces, 23 fewer than in 2001; however, the reduction may result from a reduced capacity to collect data. In Nepal, 177 civilian casualties were reported, including 46 children. In Pakistan, 111 new landmine and UXO casualties were reported, nineteen more than in 2001. In Sri Lanka, there were at least 142 new mine casualties; however, this figure is believed incomplete. In Thailand, 36 casualties were reported, up from 24 in 2001, while in South Korea there were 15 casualties reported, up from 4 in 2001.

In 2002 and the first half of 2003, mine accidents during clearance operations or in training exercises caused casualties among deminers and soldiers in Afghanistan, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, South Korea, Laos, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Survivor Assistance

In Afghanistan, the Transitional Islamic Government established a National Disabled Commission, which will draft a comprehensive law on the rights of persons with disabilities. In Cambodia, an external evaluation of the Cambodia Mine/UXO Victim Information System (CMVIS) reported that the system is "unique in the world in terms of coverage and detail." The ICRC launched an amputee rehabilitation program in a newly renovated prosthetic center in Songrim, North Korea. In India, civilian mine survivors living in remote border villages have no access to rehabilitation services; however, the government has expressed support for the rehabilitation of survivors, including their socioeconomic reintegration. In Laos, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare held the Second National Workshop on Victim Assistance to follow up on initiatives undertaken in 2001. Three of Nepal's eight hospitals providing assistance to mine/IED casualties reported difficulties in providing treatment due to financial constraints. In Sri Lanka, the UNDP Disability Assistance Project began, in the Jaffna district, promoting the economic reintegration of mine survivors and other persons with physical disabilities. In Thailand, a comprehensive model for victim assistance has been designed, but the national plan of action

recommended in November 2001 has not been completed. In Vietnam, in an illustration of the plight of many mine survivors, 60 percent of survivors in Quang Tri have “poverty cards” identifying them as below the national poverty line.

In the Asia-Pacific region, the voluntary Form J reporting attachment to the Article 7 report was submitted by Australia, Cambodia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand to report on victim assistance and other mine action activities in 2002-2003.

EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

Mine Ban Policy

Thirty-seven of the 53 countries in the region of Europe and Central Asia are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, with two new ratifications during the reporting period: Cyprus (17 January 2003) and Lithuania (12 May 2003). Greece, Poland and Ukraine have signed, but not ratified the treaty.

Thirteen countries of the region remain outside the treaty; most are successor states of the former Soviet Union, now known as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The 13 include: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey, and Uzbekistan.

Belarus, which has one of the largest antipersonnel mine stockpiles in the world, completed all domestic measures necessary for its accession on 30 July 2003. The parliament of Serbia and Montenegro passed legislation to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty on 20 June 2003. The foreign ministers of Greece and Turkey affirmed that their countries will submit simultaneously their respective instruments of adherence; both countries have now completed all the domestic procedures to join the treaty.

In July 2003, Estonia’s Prime Minister stated that the government is seriously considering joining the Mine Ban Treaty and has started the process of internal deliberations for joining. In April 2003, the Latvian Ambassador to the UN in Geneva said the country would probably join the Mine Ban Treaty in 2004. Tajik officials, intent on dispelling past confusion regarding Tajikistan’s status under the Mine Ban Treaty, stressed that their country is taking all necessary steps to comply with the treaty’s terms. While Poland’s position remains unchanged— that ratification is dependent on the development of alternatives to antipersonnel mines—it voluntarily submitted an Article 7 transparency report in March 2003, disclosing details of its antipersonnel mine stockpile.

During the reporting period no country completed domestic legislation to implement the Mine Ban Treaty. Nineteen States Parties have in the past enacted implementation legislation. Implementing legislation is being developed in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia. The Netherlands had previously reported that legislation was in the process of being adopted, but now deems existing law sufficient. Other countries that have adopted this position, whose views were previously unknown to Landmine Monitor, include the Holy See, San Marino, and Tajikistan.

Every State Party in Europe and Central Asia has now submitted an initial Article 7 transparency report, including Tajikistan during the reporting period. Thirty of the 34 States Parties provided an annual update in 2003, due by 30 April. According to the UN, four States Parties had not submitted their update

as of 31 July 2003: Andorra, Portugal, San Marino, and Spain. Three non-States Parties have submitted voluntary Article 7 reports: Lithuania in 2002 when it was a signatory, and Latvia and Poland in 2003.

All States Parties and signatories in Europe and Central Asia, except Tajikistan, voted in favor of UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74 on 22 November 2002, calling for implementation and universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. State Party Tajikistan claimed it abstained by "mistake." Eight countries from the region that are not part of the Mine Ban Treaty voted in support of the resolution: Armenia, Belarus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Serbia and Montenegro (still named Yugoslavia at that time) and Turkey. Five were among the 23 countries that abstained from voting: Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Uzbekistan.

During the 2002-2003 reporting period, European States Parties accounted for half of the sixteen co-chairs and co-rapporteurs of the Mine Ban Treaty's intersessional Standing Committees: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Romania, and Switzerland. Every non-signatory from the region attended the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September 2002, and several participated in the 2003 meetings of the treaty's intersessional Standing Committee.

In November 2002, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) hosted a regional conference on landmines and Explosive Remnants of War in Moscow, attended by all countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States. There were also regional landmine meetings in Armenia and Croatia in October 2002, and in Ukraine in February 2003. In November 2002, the Azerbaijan Campaign to Ban Landmines hosted the annual ICBL/Landmine Monitor regional meeting for CIS countries in Baku.

ICBL members participated in events held in Oslo, Norway in September 2002 to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the Mine Ban Treaty's adoption. The Italian Campaign to Ban Landmines hosted the global meeting needed to prepare *Landmine Monitor Report 2003* in Rome from 7-9 April 2003, with support provided by the Italian government. The ICBL held events for the first time to at a meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Warsaw, Poland and at the Brussels headquarters of NATO.

Use

Antipersonnel mine use continued in Chechnya, by both Russian forces and Chechen fighters. The top military official in Abkhazia stated that in mid-2002 both Abkhazian and Georgian troops mined areas around the Marukh mountain pass. There were other reports that Georgian forces used antipersonnel mines in the Kodori Gorge in July 2002. Georgian officials deny any use of antipersonnel mines.

There were reports of sporadic instances of landmine use in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia and Montenegro, but these were not sustained or substantial.

Production and Transfer

All signatories and non-signatories in the region have export moratoria in place or have stated that they no longer allow the export of antipersonnel mines. Russia is the sole remaining producer in the region, although in November 2002 a senior military official revealed that for the past eight years Russia has neither produced nor supplied to its troops antipersonnel mines of the PFM-1, PMN, PMN-2, or PMN-4 types.

In May 2003, at an arms fair in Brno, the Czech company Policske Strojirny reportedly displayed and offered for sale Horizont PD-Mi-PK antivehicle mines in tripwire-activation mode. The ICBL believes such mines are prohibited by the Mine Ban Treaty.

Stockpiling and Destruction

Since *Landmine Monitor Report 2002* was published, eight States Parties—Croatia, Italy, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, and Turkmenistan—reported completion of destruction of their stockpiled antipersonnel mines, destroying a combined total of approximately 8.5 million mines.

They join seventeen other States Parties in the region that had already completed stockpile destruction: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Norway reported that the US antipersonnel mines stockpiled on its territory were removed from the country during 2002. Bilateral negotiations are ongoing regarding the disposition of some 18,200 mines under Russian jurisdiction that remain on Tajik territory.

Three States Parties in Europe and Central Asia have stockpiles left to destroy. Tajikistan initiated its destruction process during the reporting period, while Romania continued with its program. Cyprus has reported possessing 48,615 antipersonnel mines and is investigating destruction options.

Ten State Parties in Europe have declared that they have no stockpile of antipersonnel mines, except, in some instances, those retained for training purposes: Andorra, Grenada, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, and San Marino. In July 2002, Lithuania declared a stockpile of 8,091 antipersonnel mines.

Stockpile developments occurred in the three remaining treaty signatories during the reporting period. Ukraine destroyed 404,903 mines in 2002 from its total stockpile of 6.35 million mines. Greece stated that it has 1,078,557 mines stockpiled, while Poland voluntarily reported a stockpile of 1,055,971 mines.

There were also some notable developments during the reporting period by countries that remain outside the Mine Ban Treaty. Russia revealed for the first time that it destroyed more than 16.8 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines between 1996 and 2002, including 638,427 in 2002. As a signal of its support for the Mine Ban Treaty, non-signatory Belarus destroyed 22,963 PMN-2 antipersonnel mines in 2002 and has plans to destroy another 100,000 during 2003. It has a total stockpile of 4.5 million antipersonnel mines. Serbia and Montenegro revealed that it possesses 1,320,621 antipersonnel mines.

Twenty-five States Parties from Europe and Central Asia have exercised, or intend to exercise, the option, under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty, to retain antipersonnel mines for training and development purposes. Eleven States Parties have decided not to retain any antipersonnel mines, including four countries that once stockpiled mines: Albania, Austria, Norway, and Switzerland.

Other States Parties previously possessing antipersonnel mines have opted to retain a quantity under Article 3, typically between 1,000 and 5,000 mines, with only a few exceptions. Turkmenistan's decision to retain 69,200 mines has been roundly criticized as a possible violation of Mine Ban Treaty obligations. It is more than four times that retained by the country with the next largest retained stockpile. The ICBL

believes that 69,200 mines is an unacceptable, and likely illegal, number, as it is obviously not the “minimum number absolutely necessary,” as required by the treaty.

Lithuania intends to retain its entire stockpile of 8,091 antipersonnel mines, despite the fact that it conducts only small scale demining training in cooperation with other Baltic countries. This would be the seventh largest total of retained mines among States Parties. Latvia appears poised to follow Lithuania’s lead, keeping all 2,980 mines, based on its voluntary Article 7 submission of 1 May 2003.

During this reporting period Italy reduced the number of mines retained from 8,000 to 811, and the United Kingdom reduced from 4,949 to 1,783. Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Spain have taken this step in previous years.

Against the trend of reducing the numbers of mines retained, a handful of countries have actually increased their holdings. FYR Macedonia is now retaining 4,000 antipersonnel mines, a vastly greater amount than the 50 originally declared. Sweden increased its antipersonnel mines retained from 11,120 in 2002 to 16,015, following the discovery of a large additional quantity held by the Bofors Defence company. Bosnia and Herzegovina is now holding 2,525 antipersonnel mines, 120 more than previously reported.

An increasing number of States Parties have declared the number of antipersonnel mines actually consumed each year, and for what precise training and research purposes. Ten of the fifteen States Parties reporting consumption of antipersonnel mines for permitted purposes in 2002 came from Europe: Sweden (1,002), Netherlands (314), Belgium (293), Croatia (200), Denmark (33), Germany (19), France (17), Slovakia (14), Luxembourg (10), and Ireland (9).

Landmine Problem

Twenty-one of the world’s 82 mine-affected countries are located in Europe and Central Asia. Nine are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, and Tajikistan) and twelve are non-States Parties (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Poland, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan). Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, and Nagorno-Karabakh are also affected.

Landmine Monitor has removed Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, and Lithuania from its list of mine-affected countries as the problem in these countries is predominantly, in some cases exclusively, due to UXO, and very limited in its impact on the civilian population, with very few or no casualties recorded in 2001, 2002 or 2003.

Five European States Parties are among the group of 14 mine-affected States Parties facing the March 2009 deadline for clearance of all mined areas, as required by Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, FYR Macedonia, and the UK for the Falkland Islands.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council of Ministers approved a demining strategy in April 2003, which has the objective of freeing the country from the threat of mines by 2010. In May 2003, Croatia expressed its intention to be mine-free by March 2009. Some mine clearance is occurring in FYR Macedonia, where the mine problem is relatively limited. However, FYR Macedonia’s most recent Article 7 transparency reports provided no information on mined areas or mine clearance. In October 2001, the United Kingdom and Argentina agreed on the establishment of a feasibility study on mine

clearance in the Falkland/Malvinas Islands. No significant progress was made to initiate the feasibility study during 2002 or the first half of 2003. The Skallingen peninsula in Denmark was heavily mine-contaminated in World War II. It is now a protected natural reserve, and there are no mine clearance programs at present.

Mine Action Funding

The major European mine action donors in 2002 were the European Commission (\$40 million), Norway (\$25.5 million), Germany (\$19.4 million), the Netherlands (\$16 million), the UK (\$16 million), Denmark (\$10.6 million), Switzerland (\$9 million), Italy (\$8.7 million), Sweden (\$7.3 million), Belgium (\$4.5 million), France (\$3.5 million), Austria (\$2 million), and Ireland (\$1.6 million), Greece (\$1.5 million), and Luxembourg (\$1.1 million). These figures include funding for research and development. The totals represent large increases for the EC, Norway, Italy and the Netherlands. Also registering increases were Greece, Belgium, Austria, France and Switzerland. Mine action funding fell substantially for Denmark, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. For Sweden and the UK, this was the third consecutive year that mine action funding has decreased. Ireland and Finland also registered decreases in mine action funding in 2002.

The major recipients of mine action funding in Europe remain Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia. Twelve donors reported contributions of about \$15.8 million to mine action in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2002. The government reports that it provided national mine action funding of \$5.06 million in 2002. In Croatia, mine action is funded largely by the state (\$24.3 million in 2002), plus donations by public companies (\$9.5 million), and other domestic and international donations (\$10.5 million).

In 2002, FYR Macedonia received increased funding of \$3 million. Albania, with a significant mine/UXO problem, received little funding (\$2.8 million). Kosovo received much reduced funding (\$1.4 million) with the cessation of major UN mine action clearance there at the end of 2001. Serbia and Montenegro received \$300,000 from the ITF for mine action in 2002.

Five donors reported providing about \$4.5 million in mine action assistance to Azerbaijan in 2002; in addition, the government reports providing \$259,000 for mine action. In Armenia, the United States provided \$4.5 million, including a one-time donation of \$1.8 million from the US Embassy. In Georgia, four donors reported providing about \$2.1 million, mostly for HALO Trust clearance in Abkhazia.

Mine Clearance and Survey

Humanitarian mine clearance by international, national, and non-governmental actors was underway in at least six countries of the region in 2002 and 2003. This includes four States Parties (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and FYR Macedonia) and two non-States Parties (Azerbaijan and Greece). There are also humanitarian mine clearance programs in Abkhazia, Kosovo, and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Most of the major international, non-governmental mine action organizations are based in Europe and active in a number of countries around the world, including DanChurchAid (DCA), the Danish Demining Group (DDG), the HALO Trust (HALO), Mines Advisory Group (MAG), Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), and Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD).

- In Abkhazia, HALO cleared 858,688 square meters of mine-affected land in 2002.

- In Albania, DCA and FSD conducted impact surveys that resulted in the release of almost six million square meters of suspected dangerous land in 2002, while technical survey released a further 675,000 square meters, and clearance freed up 450,000 square meters of mined land.
- In Azerbaijan, two national mine clearance NGOs cleared a total of 1,118,000 square meters of land in 2002.
- In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Mine Action Center reported in February 2003 that approximately 6 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, compared with 5.5 million square meters in 2001. The total amount cleared in 2002 was still significantly less than planned.
- The Croatian Mine Action Center (CROMAC) reported that 60 million square meters of mined land was deemed mine-free in 2002, including approximately 31 million square meters cleared in demining operations. In 2001, 13.6 million square meters of land was cleared, to a large extent using mechanical devices.
- In 2002, the Greek Army demined 66,000 square meters of land in its northern regions, as part of an ongoing clearance operation.
- The Kosovo Protection Corps operations cleared 203,360 square meters of land in 2002. Fourteen new dangerous areas were discovered.
- In FYR Macedonia, a total of nearly 3.9 million square meters of land was cleared in 2002, by various actors including NATO and Macedonian security forces, Handicap International and MineTech.
- In Nagorno-Karabakh, HALO cleared 380,386 square meters of land in 2002. In 2003, activities increased greatly resulting in 810,743 square meters of land cleared between 1 January 2003 and 1 June 2003.

Limited mine clearance was underway in at least 13 countries in 2002 and 2003, including four States Parties (Cyprus, Czech Republic, Serbia and Montenegro, and Tajikistan) and nine non-States Parties (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Poland, Russia, Turkey, and Uzbekistan), as well as in Chechnya.

Limited clearance by military and other entities, such as explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) units of national police responding to emergencies necessitating the clearance of landmines or UXO, was recorded in Belarus, Czech Republic, Georgia, Moldova, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine. Limited military mine clearance for tactical purposes was noted in Russia (Chechnya) and Uzbekistan. Limited mine clearance to maintain minefields was noted in Cyprus.

In 2002, the Kyrgyz military reportedly began clearance in some areas, but, according to the Kyrgyz Border Guard Service, stopped due to disputes about the border. In southern Serbia, the Army and Ministry of the Interior deactivated or destroyed 6,654 mines and 223,058 items of UXO, including cluster bombs, from May 2001 to December 2002. Demining by the Turkish Army of the border with Bulgaria was completed in mid-2002.

No mine clearance of any type was noted in 2002 in Denmark or the Falklands/Malvinas (UK).

Mine Action Coordination and Planning

Landmine Monitor noted some form of coordination and planning body in place in seven of Europe and Central Asia's 21 mine-affected countries (Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, and Tajikistan), as well as in Abkhazia, Kosovo, and Nagorno-Karabakh.

During this reporting period, Landmine Monitor noted a national mine action plan in four of the region's mine-affected countries (Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia), but more countries are in the process of drafting and approving plans.

Mine Risk Education (MRE)

In 2002, MRE programs were carried out in nine countries (Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, and Tajikistan), and four areas (Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, and Nagorno-Karabakh). Basic or limited MRE activities took place in four countries (Belarus, Georgia, Poland and Ukraine). No MRE activities were recorded in nine mine-affected countries (Armenia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Turkey, and Uzbekistan).

UNICEF and ICRC, along with local Red Cross or Red Crescent societies, were important MRE implementers in most of these countries or regions. In Croatia, the mine action center also carries out MRE. The HALO Trust conducted MRE in Abkhazia.

In Kosovo, the designated local bodies failed to plan for MRE, which was then carried out by UNICEF, ICRC, the German NGO Caritas and the local NGO ARKA. In Albania, a survey of MRE activities was conducted in August 2002, resulting in a revised MRE strategy. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, MRE became part of the school curriculum and 541,550 pupils received mine risk education as a result. In FYR Macedonia, the ICRC and the Macedonian Red Cross launched a media campaign aimed at reaching a wider audience. In Serbia and Montenegro, local and state-run media carried out MRE programs. In Kyrgyzstan the local Red Crescent Society, in coordination with the Ministry of Emergency Situations, initiated a community-based MRE program in Batken Oblast.

No systematic MRE programs were reported in Georgia, Moldova, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, or Uzbekistan.

Mine/UXO Casualties

In 2002-2003, landmine casualties were reported in fifteen countries: Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, FYR Macedonia, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. Mine casualties were also reported in the regions of Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo, and Nagorno-Karabakh. In addition, six countries reported new casualties caused by unexploded ordnance, remnants of earlier conflicts: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia.

The level of new mine casualties reported in 2002 was similar to, or in some cases significantly less than, that reported in 2001: Albania, seven casualties recorded, down from eight in 2001; Bosnia and Herzegovina, 72 casualties recorded, down from 87; Croatia, 29 casualties recorded, down from 30; Kosovo, fifteen casualties recorded, down from 22 (most of the casualties were caused by UXO and

cluster bombs); FYR Macedonia, four casualties recorded, down from 38; Nagorno-Karabakh, fifteen casualties recorded, down from eighteen; Georgia, 70 casualties reported, down from 98; Serbia and Montenegro, five casualties reported, down from 32; Tajikistan, nine casualties reported, down from 29; and Turkey, 40 casualties reported, down from 58 in 2001.

The Ministry of Health in Chechnya reported a total of 5,695 mine and UXO casualties in 2002, a much higher number than it reported in 2001 (2,140).

In 2002-2003, mine/UXO casualties also included nationals from countries in the region killed or injured while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

Survivor Assistance

In Albania, the health infrastructure in mine-affected areas is inadequate for the treatment and rehabilitation of mine survivors; however, the AMAE has appointed an MRE and victim assistance officer to coordinate activities and develop a plan of action for addressing the needs of mine survivors. In Armenia, the Yerevan Prosthetic-Orthopedic Enterprise received funding and resumed activities as of March 2003, after ceasing operations during 2002. In Azerbaijan, ANAMA has appointed a victim assistance officer to coordinate activities of the Mine Victim Assistance Working Group and develop a long-term assistance program. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the BHMACE plans to establish a mine victim assistance coordination group to develop a plan of action; in a separate initiative, the "Development Strategy for BiH: PRSP (poverty reduction strategy policy) and Social Protection of People with Disabilities" includes a proposal for a law on the protection of people with disabilities without question on the cause of disability. In Chechnya, the Grozny Prosthetic/Orthotic Center started production. In Croatia, the Parliament passed a resolution accepting a new national strategy aimed at improving the quality of life of persons with disabilities, without distinction to the cause of their disability. In Georgia, the Tbilisi Orthopedic Center had 458 amputees on its waiting list for services as at the end of December 2002. In Kosovo, the Ministry of Health has appointed an officer for physical medicine and rehabilitation to strengthen the rehabilitation sector. In Slovenia, the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance facilitated a regional study on mine victim assistance in the Balkans.

France has served as co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration since September 2002.

In the Europe and Central Asia region, the voluntary Form J reporting attachment to the Article 7 report was submitted by Albania, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, and Tajikistan to report on victim assistance and other mine action activities in 2002-2003. Bulgaria, Denmark, and Romania used the Form J to report on other issues.

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

Mine Ban Policy

In the Middle East and North Africa region, just five countries are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty: Algeria, Jordan, Qatar, Tunisia, and Yemen. All except Qatar are mine-affected.

Thirteen countries have not joined the treaty: Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and United Arab Emirates. Little or no progress toward accession was noted in any of these states during the reporting period. A meeting on landmines was held in the United Arab Emirates for the first time ever in January 2003. The meeting included a call for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty in its final report. In February 2003, the Arab Network of Researchers on Landmines and Explosive Remnants of War hosted a regional symposium in Damascus, Syria.

In Yemen, legislation to implement the treaty is apparently under discussion. Tunisia reported that legislation was in the process of being adopted in previous years, but now deems existing law sufficient. Jordan and Algeria also view existing legislation as sufficient. Qatar does not see an immediate need to formulate legislation because it does not use landmines and is not mine-affected.

All States Parties from the region have submitted initial Article 7 transparency reports and provided updates to these reports in 2002 and 2003.

Three non-signatories from the region--Bahrain, Oman, and the United Arab Emirates--voted in favor of UN General Assembly Resolution 57/74 on 22 November 2002, supporting universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty. All five States Parties from the region also supported the resolution. Eight of the 23 governments abstaining from voting came from the Middle East and North Africa: Egypt, Iran, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, and Syria. Saudi Arabia was absent for the vote.

Eight non-States Parties attended the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in Geneva in September 2002 as observers: Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. Delegations participated from all five States Parties.

Every State Party attended intersessional Standing Committee meetings in February and May 2003. Seven non-States Parties also participated: Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman and Saudi Arabia and Syria.

Use

Saddam Hussein's forces used antipersonnel mines in the lead-up to and during the conflict in Iraq in early 2003. Iraqi forces planted mines extensively, and also abandoned caches of weapons, including landmines, in many parts of the country. There were no reports of coalition use of antipersonnel landmines in Iraq.

There were reports of use of mines, improvised explosive devices or booby-traps by non-state actors in Algeria and Palestine during the reporting period.

Production and Transfer

Three of the fifteen mine producers remaining in the world are in the Middle East/North Africa: Egypt, Iran, and Iraq. Egypt has unofficially stated that it ceased production in 1988, but Landmine Monitor still regards Egypt as a producer state as it has still not made a formal proclamation.

In September 2002, Iran said it has not produced antipersonnel mines since the end of its war with Iraq in 1988. However, last year Landmine Monitor reported that hundreds of Iran-manufactured antipersonnel mines with production stamps of 1999 and 2000 were encountered by demining organizations in Afghanistan.

Since the coalition occupation of Iraq, any industrial production of antipersonnel mines that may have been taking place has, presumably, ceased. Landmine Monitor will keep Iraq on the list of producers until a new government officially renounces antipersonnel mine production.

In August 2002, Israel renewed its antipersonnel mine export ban to July 2005.

Stockpiling and Destruction

Jordan completed destruction of its antipersonnel landmine stockpile on 23 April 2003, while Yemen completed its stockpile destruction in April 2002. Tunisia has destroyed another 13,684 stockpiled antipersonnel mines, and plans to complete destruction in September 2003. In May 2003, Algeria reported that it has a stockpile of 165,080 antipersonnel mines and plans to destroy the stock before 2006. Qatar reports that it has no stockpiled antipersonnel landmines.

Algeria plans to retain 15,030 antipersonnel landmines for training and research purposes, as permitted under Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty. This is the fourth highest number retained by any State Party. The other States Parties from the region plan to retain mines, except for Qatar: Tunisia (5,000), Yemen (4,000), and Jordan (1,000).

It is likely that non-signatories Egypt, Iran, Israel, and Syria have large stockpiles of antipersonnel mines. Iraq likely possessed a substantial stockpile prior to coalition occupation. Israel revealed that its military has an annual program to destroy outdated mines, and destroyed 12 tons of mines in 2002. Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates remain among the very few countries for which Landmine Monitor does not have a clear indication whether antipersonnel mines are stockpiled.

The United States stockpiled a combined total of about 90,000 antipersonnel mines in State Party Qatar and non-signatories Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Saudi Arabia before the combat operations in Iraq beginning in March 2003. It is unclear if these stocks have been subsequently removed.

Qatar stated in May 2003 that it would not support any citizen of Qatar to carry, transport, or store any antipersonnel mines with the US. It also stated that any US stockpiles of antipersonnel mines on Qatari territory are not under Qatari jurisdiction or control. Saudi officials have told Landmine Monitor that the US is not permitted to use antipersonnel mines on Saudi territory.

Landmine Problem

Fourteen of the eighteen countries in the Middle East and North Africa are affected by the presence of uncleared landmines and unexploded ordnance, including four of the five States Parties (Algeria, Jordan, Tunisia, and Yemen). Only Bahrain, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates are free of the landmine problem. Mines and UXO also affect the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and Western Sahara.

There is still a lack of knowledge in many mine-affected countries as to the extent of the landmine problem, including credible, detailed information as to the exact location of mined areas.

In Tunisia, assessment missions were conducted in December 2002 and January 2003 by Mines Advisory Group (MAG) and UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS), respectively. In Iraq, several survey and assessment projects were planned or underway as of June 2003. Lebanon's first national Landmine Impact Survey was carried out from September 2002 to April 2003. Preliminary results indicated that 22 of 24 districts were affected by mines/UXO.

Mine Action Funding

The United Arab Emirates in 2001 pledged up to \$50 million to mine action in South Lebanon. It is not known how much of that total the UAE contributed in 2002, but under the program known as "Operation Emirates Solidarity," it has funded mine clearance, survey and risk education activities. In 2002, UAE also contributed \$10,000 for mine action in Sri Lanka.

Apart from the UAE, seven donors reported contributions totaling \$5.1 million for mine action in Lebanon in 2002.

Saudi Arabia provided Yemen with \$1 million as the second part of a donation of \$3 million for mine action activities. Overall, in 2002, twelve donors reported providing about \$5.6 million, up from about \$4 million in 2001. In 2002, the government of Yemen provided approximately 3 million Yemeni Rials for the national mine action program.

Prior to the occupation of Iraq by the Coalition Provisional Authority in 2003, mine action only took place in northern Iraq (Iraqi Kurdistan). The Iraq Mine Action Program (MAP), under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, has been funded entirely through the UN Oil for Food Program. The MAP expended \$27.3 million in 2002, and over \$28 million in 2001. MAG and Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) received funds apart from the UN program, totaling about \$3.3 million in 2002 and \$2.4 million in 2001. In 2003, mine action is spreading to the rest of the country. Oil for Food funding is expected to be about \$35 million in 2003. In addition to that, by July 2003, donors had provided or pledged more than \$20 million in mine action funding for all of Iraq.

Mine Clearance

In 2002 and 2003, humanitarian mine clearance was underway in States Parties Jordan and Yemen, as well as non-States Parties Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon.

The Royal Jordanian Corps of Engineers cleared 20 minefields in 2002, which allowed a major national irrigation project to proceed. Thirteen Jordanian army deminers were deployed to work in Afghanistan from December 2002 into 2003. In Yemen, the National Mine Action Committee reports that in 2002 seven demining teams cleared 18 known mine-affected areas covering approximately 1.18 million square meters.

In Iraq, mine action programs were initiated for the first time in southern Iraq after the main fighting ceased in April 2003. In 2002, local Kurdish demining NGOs were established in northern Iraq, and were carrying out demining activities with UN support. In addition, MAG and NPA cleared more than 455,000 square meters of land in 2002 in northern Iraq.

In Lebanon, the Army reported demining 1.7 million square meters of land in 2002. As part of "Operation Emirates Solidarity," two commercial companies cleared 3.9 million square meters of land in

South Lebanon in 2002. Syrian Army deminers working in Lebanon in 2002 cleared some 842,000 square meters by October.

No information was available to Landmine Monitor regarding Iranian Army demining accomplishments for 2002/2003, though they have been extensive in past years. NPA is advising the Iranian Army on demining, and has assisted with the surveying of nearly 600 square kilometers. The UN Development Program signed an agreement with Iran in July 2002 to help develop a mine action strategy and provide training in various aspects of mine action.

Limited mine clearance was underway in five other countries of the region in 2002 and 2003, all non-States Parties (Egypt, Israel, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman), as well as in the Western Sahara.

Limited clearance by the military was recorded in Kuwait and Oman. Limited mine clearance to maintain minefields was noted in Israel. In Egypt, commercial companies undertook some limited mine clearance for economic development purposes.

In the Western Sahara, the UN reported that the Royal Moroccan Army carried out 36 mine disposal operations and the Polisario Front carried out nine such operations between April 2002 and January 2003. In May 2003, the UN reported that the Morocco carried out another 16 mine disposal operations in Western Sahara.

No mine clearance of any type was noted in 2002 in Algeria, Libya, Syria and Tunisia, as well as Palestine. Planning for humanitarian mine clearance is, however, underway in States Parties Algeria and Tunisia. A National Mine Action Committee was established in Palestine in August 2002, to coordinate and plan mine action programs of government agencies, UN agencies, and NGOs.

Mine Risk Education

In 2002, MRE programs continued in four countries (Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen) as well as Palestine. Basic MRE activities took place in three countries (Israel, Jordan and Tunisia). No MRE programs were reported in seven countries (Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, and Oman) and the Western Sahara.

A number of agencies, including UNICEF and Handicap International, have been conducting large-scale emergency MRE activities in Iraq following the coalition occupation, while in the northern governorates UN-supported local NGOs and MAG implemented MRE programs. MAG made particular effort to distribute MRE materials to displaced persons in the northern regions prior to and during the main hostilities in 2003.

In Lebanon, between 1 May 2002 and 1 June 2003, mine risk education activities reached about 95,000 out of 180,000 students in South Lebanon, and as many as 500,000 people total. In 2002, the Yemen Mine Awareness Association and the mine risk education department at the Regional Mine Action Center in Aden carried out joint activities in Aden, Lahej, Abyan, Ebb, and Aldhala, reaching 84 villages and schools with a total population of 95,044 persons. The organizations made 49 field visits and distributed 19,582 posters and educational games.

In Palestine, the NGO Defense for Children continued its MRE work in 2002, primarily in mine-affected areas, military training zones, and areas of confrontation. UNICEF and the Palestinian Red Crescent Society also carried out MRE activities, while ICRC did so in Gaza. UN agencies conducted

MRE in the Golan areas of Syria; the Syrian government also runs MRE programs. Twenty MRE instructors from four countries received training at a three-week course held in Jordan in October 2002.

Mine Casualties

In 2002, new mine/UXO casualties were reported in ten countries in the region: Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Syria, Tunisia, and Yemen. Mine casualties were also reported in Palestine and Western Sahara. It is possible that there were mine incidents in Libya; however, there was a lack of tangible evidence to confirm new casualties.

In northern Iraq, 457 mine/UXO casualties were reported in 2002, up from 360 in 2001. The mine/UXO casualty rate rose considerably due to the hostilities in Iraq: during March and April 2003 the number of reported casualties increased by 90 percent in the north of Iraq compared to the same period in 2002. In 2003, through May, 493 new mine/UXO casualties were recorded in the northern region.

The number of casualties continued to decline in Lebanon with 42 casualties reported in 2002, down from 85 in 2001 and 113 in 2000.

In this reporting period, landmine/UXO casualties also included nationals from the region who were killed or injured while abroad engaged in military or demining operations, peacekeeping, or other activities; these casualties were from Algeria, Iraq, Morocco, Syria, and the United Arab Emirates.

In 2002 and the first half of 2003, there were confirmed reports of accidents during clearance operations or training exercises that caused casualties among deminers in Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, and Yemen.

Survivor Assistance

The availability of services to mine casualties and survivors varies greatly across the region. In Algeria, the Ben Aknoun prosthetic/orthotic center began production and assisted 61 mine survivors during the year; the majority of which were mine survivors from Western Sahara. In Iraq, some health facilities lack running water and constant electricity, equipment has not been properly maintained, and there is a lack of well-trained and experienced health care workers. In Jordan, an amputation surgery workshop was held for surgeons from the Ministry of Health and the Hussein Medical Center. In Lebanon, more attention is reportedly needed on employment and economic reintegration activities. In Yemen, 132 mine survivors received various forms of medical assistance from government-organized programs.

18 September 1997

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

Preamble

The States Parties,

Determined to put an end to the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, that kill or maim hundreds of people every week, mostly innocent and defenceless civilians and especially children, obstruct economic development and reconstruction, inhibit the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons, and have other severe consequences for years after emplacement,

Believing it necessary to do their utmost to contribute in an efficient and coordinated manner to face the challenge of removing anti-personnel mines placed throughout the world, and to assure their destruction,

Wishing to do their utmost in providing assistance for the care and rehabilitation, including the social and economic reintegration of mine victims,

Recognizing that a total ban of anti-personnel mines would also be an important confidence-building measure,

Welcoming the adoption of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and calling for the early ratification of this Protocol by all States which have not yet done so,

Welcoming also United Nations General Assembly Resolution 51/45 S of 10 December 1996 urging all States to pursue vigorously an effective, legally-binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines,

Welcoming furthermore the measures taken over the past years, both unilaterally and multilaterally, aiming at prohibiting, restricting or suspending the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines,

Stressing the role of public conscience in furthering the principles of humanity as evidenced by the call for a total ban of anti-personnel mines and recognizing the efforts to that end undertaken by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and numerous other non-governmental organizations around the world,

Recalling the Ottawa Declaration of 5 October 1996 and the Brussels Declaration of 27 June 1997 urging the international community to negotiate an international and legally binding agreement prohibiting the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines,

Emphasizing the desirability of attracting the adherence of all States to this Convention, and determined to work strenuously towards the promotion of its universalization in all relevant fora including, inter alia, the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament, regional organizations, and groupings, and review conferences of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects,

Basing themselves on the principle of international humanitarian law that the right of the parties to an armed conflict to choose methods or means of warfare is not unlimited, on the principle that prohibits the employment in armed conflicts of weapons, projectiles and materials and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering and on the principle that a distinction must be made between civilians and combatants,

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1

General obligations

1. Each State Party undertakes never under any circumstances:
 - a. To use anti-personnel mines;
 - b. To develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain or transfer to anyone, directly or indirectly, anti-personnel mines;
 - c. To assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention.
2. Each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

Article 2

Definitions

1. "Anti-personnel mine" means a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons. Mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.

2. "Mine" means a munition designed to be placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area and to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person or a vehicle.
3. "Anti-handling device" means a device intended to protect a mine and which is part of, linked to, attached to or placed under the mine and which activates when an attempt is made to tamper with or otherwise intentionally disturb the mine.
4. "Transfer" involves, in addition to the physical movement of anti-personnel mines into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the mines, but does not involve the transfer of territory containing emplaced anti-personnel mines.
5. "Mined area" means an area which is dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines.

Article 3

Exceptions

1. Notwithstanding the general obligations under Article 1, the retention or transfer of a number of anti-personnel mines for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques is permitted. The amount of such mines shall not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for the above-mentioned purposes.
2. The transfer of anti-personnel mines for the purpose of destruction is permitted.

Article 4

Destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines

Except as provided for in Article 3, each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines it owns or possesses, or that are under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than four years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.

Article 5

Destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas

1. Each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.

2. Each State Party shall make every effort to identify all areas under its jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced and shall ensure as soon as possible that all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means, to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians, until all anti-personnel mines contained therein have been destroyed. The marking shall at least be to the standards set out in the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.
3. If a State Party believes that it will be unable to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines referred to in paragraph 1 within that time period, it may submit a request to a Meeting of the States Parties or a Review Conference for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of such anti-personnel mines, for a period of up to ten years.
4. Each request shall contain:
 - a) The duration of the proposed extension;
 - b) A detailed explanation of the reasons for the proposed extension, including:
 - i. The preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programs;
 - ii. The financial and technical means available to the State Party for the destruction of all the anti-personnel mines; and
 - iii. Circumstances which impede the ability of the State Party to destroy all the anti-personnel mines in mined areas;
 - c) The humanitarian, social, economic, and environmental implications of the extension; and
 - d) Any other information relevant to the request for the proposed extension.
5. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Review Conference shall, taking into consideration the factors contained in paragraph 4, assess the request and decide by a majority of votes of States Parties present and voting whether to grant the request for an extension period.
6. Such an extension may be renewed upon the submission of a new request in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of this Article. In requesting a further extension period a State Party shall submit relevant additional information on what has been undertaken in the previous extension period pursuant to this Article.

Article 6

International cooperation and assistance

1. In fulfilling its obligations under this Convention each State Party has the right to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible.
2. Each State Party undertakes to facilitate and shall have the right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of this Convention. The States Parties shall not impose undue restrictions on the provision of mine clearance equipment and related technological information for humanitarian purposes.
3. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims and for mine awareness programs. Such assistance may be provided, inter alia, through the United Nations system, international, regional or national organizations or institutions, the International Committee of the Red Cross, national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies and their International Federation, non-governmental organizations, or on a bilateral basis.
4. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for mine clearance and related activities. Such assistance may be provided, inter alia, through the United Nations system, international or regional organizations or institutions, non-governmental organizations or institutions, or on a bilateral basis, or by contributing to the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance, or other regional funds that deal with demining.
5. Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines.
6. Each State Party undertakes to provide information to the database on mine clearance established within the United Nations system, especially information concerning various means and technologies of mine clearance, and lists of experts, expert agencies or national points of contact on mine clearance.
7. States Parties may request the United Nations, regional organizations, other States Parties or other competent intergovernmental or non-governmental fora to assist its authorities in the elaboration of a national demining program to determine, inter alia:
 - a) The extent and scope of the anti-personnel mine problem;
 - b) The financial, technological and human resources that are required for the implementation of the program;
 - c) The estimated number of years necessary to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under the jurisdiction or control of the concerned State Party;

- d) Mine awareness activities to reduce the incidence of mine-related injuries or deaths;
 - e) Assistance to mine victims;
 - f) The relationship between the Government of the concerned State Party and the relevant governmental, inter-governmental or non-governmental entities that will work in the implementation of the program.
8. Each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of this Article shall cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs.

Article 7

Transparency measures

1. Each State Party shall report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party on:
- a) The national implementation measures referred to in Article 9;
 - b) The total of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed by it, or under its jurisdiction or control, to include a breakdown of the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine stockpiled;
 - c) To the extent possible, the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under its jurisdiction or control, to include as much detail as possible regarding the type and quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine in each mined area and when they were emplaced;
 - d) The types, quantities and, if possible, lot numbers of all anti-personnel mines retained or transferred for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques, or transferred for the purpose of destruction, as well as the institutions authorized by a State Party to retain or transfer anti-personnel mines, in accordance with Article 3;
 - e) The status of programs for the conversion or de-commissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities;
 - f) The status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, including details of the methods which will be used in destruction, the location of all destruction sites and the applicable safety and environmental standards to be observed;
 - g) The types and quantities of all anti-personnel mines destroyed after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party, to include a breakdown of the quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine destroyed, in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, respectively, along with, if possible, the lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine in the case of destruction in accordance with Article 4;

- h) The technical characteristics of each type of anti-personnel mine produced, to the extent known, and those currently owned or possessed by a State Party, giving, where reasonably possible, such categories of information as may facilitate identification and clearance of anti-personnel mines; at a minimum, this information shall include the dimensions, fusing, explosive content, metallic content, colour photographs and other information which may facilitate mine clearance; and
 - i) The measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5.
- 2. The information provided in accordance with this Article shall be updated by the States Parties annually, covering the last calendar year, and reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations not later than 30 April of each year.
- 3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit all such reports received to the States Parties.

Article 8

Facilitation and clarification of compliance

- 1. The States Parties agree to consult and cooperate with each other regarding the implementation of the provisions of this Convention, and to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance by States Parties with their obligations under this Convention.
- 2. If one or more States Parties wish to clarify and seek to resolve questions relating to compliance with the provisions of this Convention by another State Party, it may submit, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a Request for Clarification of that matter to that State Party. Such a request shall be accompanied by all appropriate information. Each State Party shall refrain from unfounded Requests for Clarification, care being taken to avoid abuse. A State Party that receives a Request for Clarification shall provide, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, within 28 days to the requesting State Party all information which would assist in clarifying this matter.
- 3. If the requesting State Party does not receive a response through the Secretary-General of the United Nations within that time period, or deems the response to the Request for Clarification to be unsatisfactory, it may submit the matter through the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the next Meeting of the States Parties. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit the submission, accompanied by all appropriate information pertaining to the Request for Clarification, to all States Parties. All such information shall be presented to the requested State Party which shall have the right to respond.

4. Pending the convening of any meeting of the States Parties, any of the States Parties concerned may request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to exercise his or her good offices to facilitate the clarification requested.
5. The requesting State Party may propose through the Secretary-General of the United Nations the convening of a Special Meeting of the States Parties to consider the matter. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall thereupon communicate this proposal and all information submitted by the States Parties concerned, to all States Parties with a request that they indicate whether they favour a Special Meeting of the States Parties, for the purpose of considering the matter. In the event that within 14 days from the date of such communication, at least one-third of the States Parties favours such a Special Meeting, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene this Special Meeting of the States Parties within a further 14 days. A quorum for this Meeting shall consist of a majority of States Parties.
6. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties, as the case may be, shall first determine whether to consider the matter further, taking into account all information submitted by the States Parties concerned. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall make every effort to reach a decision by consensus. If despite all efforts to that end no agreement has been reached, it shall take this decision by a majority of States Parties present and voting.
7. All States Parties shall cooperate fully with the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties in the fulfillment of its review of the matter, including any fact-finding missions that are authorized in accordance with paragraph 8.
8. If further clarification is required, the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall authorize a fact-finding mission and decide on its mandate by a majority of States Parties present and voting. At any time the requested State Party may invite a fact-finding mission to its territory. Such a mission shall take place without a decision by a Meeting of the States Parties or a Special Meeting of the States Parties to authorize such a mission. The mission, consisting of up to 9 experts, designated and approved in accordance with paragraphs 9 and 10, may collect additional information on the spot or in other places directly related to the alleged compliance issue under the jurisdiction or control of the requested State Party.
9. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall prepare and update a list of the names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts provided by States Parties and communicate it to all States Parties. Any expert included on this list shall be regarded as designated for all fact-finding missions unless a State Party declares its non-acceptance in writing. In the event of non-acceptance, the expert shall not participate in fact-finding missions on the territory or any other place under the jurisdiction or control of the objecting State Party, if the non-acceptance was declared prior to the appointment of the expert to such missions.

10. Upon receiving a request from the Meeting of the States Parties or a Special Meeting of the States Parties, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall, after consultations with the requested State Party, appoint the members of the mission, including its leader. Nationals of States Parties requesting the fact-finding mission or directly affected by it shall not be appointed to the mission. The members of the fact-finding mission shall enjoy privileges and immunities under Article VI of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted on 13 February 1946.
 11. Upon at least 72 hours notice, the members of the fact-finding mission shall arrive in the territory of the requested State Party at the earliest opportunity. The requested State Party shall take the necessary administrative measures to receive, transport and accommodate the mission, and shall be responsible for ensuring the security of the mission to the maximum extent possible while they are on territory under its control.
 12. Without prejudice to the sovereignty of the requested State Party, the fact-finding mission may bring into the territory of the requested State Party the necessary equipment which shall be used exclusively for gathering information on the alleged compliance issue. Prior to its arrival, the mission will advise the requested State Party of the equipment that it intends to utilize in the course of its fact-finding mission.
 13. The requested State Party shall make all efforts to ensure that the fact-finding mission is given the opportunity to speak with all relevant persons who may be able to provide information related to the alleged compliance issue.
 14. The requested State Party shall grant access for the fact-finding mission to all areas and installations under its control where facts relevant to the compliance issue could be expected to be collected. This shall be subject to any arrangements that the requested State Party considers necessary for:
 - a) The protection of sensitive equipment, information and areas;
 - b) The protection of any constitutional obligations the requested State Party may have with regard to proprietary rights, searches and seizures, or other constitutional rights; or
 - c) The physical protection and safety of the members of the fact-finding mission.
- In the event that the requested State Party makes such arrangements, it shall make every reasonable effort to demonstrate through alternative means its compliance with this Convention.
15. The fact-finding mission may remain in the territory of the State Party concerned for no more than 14 days, and at any particular site no more than 7 days, unless otherwise agreed.
 16. All information provided in confidence and not related to the subject matter of the fact-finding mission shall be treated on a confidential basis.

17. The fact-finding mission shall report, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties the results of its findings.
18. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall consider all relevant information, including the report submitted by the fact-finding mission, and may request the requested State Party to take measures to address the compliance issue within a specified period of time. The requested State Party shall report on all measures taken in response to this request.
19. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties may suggest to the States Parties concerned ways and means to further clarify or resolve the matter under consideration, including the initiation of appropriate procedures in conformity with international law. In circumstances where the issue at hand is determined to be due to circumstances beyond the control of the requested State Party, the Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties may recommend appropriate measures, including the use of cooperative measures referred to in Article 6.
20. The Meeting of the States Parties or the Special Meeting of the States Parties shall make every effort to reach its decisions referred to in paragraphs 18 and 19 by consensus, otherwise by a two-thirds majority of States Parties present and voting.

Article 9

National implementation measures

Each State Party shall take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention undertaken by persons or on territory under its jurisdiction or control.

Article 10

Settlement of disputes

1. The States Parties shall consult and cooperate with each other to settle any dispute that may arise with regard to the application or the interpretation of this Convention. Each State Party may bring any such dispute before the Meeting of the States Parties.
2. The Meeting of the States Parties may contribute to the settlement of the dispute by whatever means it deems appropriate, including offering its good offices, calling upon the States parties to

a dispute to start the settlement procedure of their choice and recommending a time-limit for any agreed procedure.

3. This Article is without prejudice to the provisions of this Convention on facilitation and clarification of compliance.

Article 11

Meetings of the States Parties

1. The States Parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention, including:
 - a) The operation and status of this Convention;
 - b) Matters arising from the reports submitted under the provisions of this Convention;
 - c) International cooperation and assistance in accordance with Article 6;
 - d) The development of technologies to clear anti-personnel mines;
 - e) Submissions of States Parties under Article 8; and
 - f) Decisions relating to submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5.
2. The First Meeting of the States Parties shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations within one year after the entry into force of this Convention. The subsequent meetings shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations annually until the first Review Conference.
3. Under the conditions set out in Article 8, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene a Special Meeting of the States Parties.
4. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend these meetings as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.

Article 12

Review Conferences

1. A Review Conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations five years after the entry into force of this Convention. Further Review Conferences shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations if so requested by one or more States Parties, provided that the interval between Review Conferences shall in no case be less than five years. All States Parties to this Convention shall be invited to each Review Conference.

2. The purpose of the Review Conference shall be:
 - a) To review the operation and status of this Convention;
 - b) To consider the need for and the interval between further Meetings of the States Parties referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 11;
 - c) To take decisions on submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5; and
 - d) To adopt, if necessary, in its final report conclusions related to the implementation of this Convention.

3. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend each Review Conference as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.

Article 13 *Amendments*

1. At any time after the entry into force of this Convention any State Party may propose amendments to this Convention. Any proposal for an amendment shall be communicated to the Depositary, who shall circulate it to all States Parties and shall seek their views on whether an Amendment Conference should be convened to consider the proposal. If a majority of the States Parties notify the Depositary no later than 30 days after its circulation that they support further consideration of the proposal, the Depositary shall convene an Amendment Conference to which all States Parties shall be invited.

2. States not parties to this Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations may be invited to attend each Amendment Conference as observers in accordance with the agreed Rules of Procedure.

3. The Amendment Conference shall be held immediately following a Meeting of the States Parties or a Review Conference unless a majority of the States Parties request that it be held earlier.

4. Any amendment to this Convention shall be adopted by a majority of two-thirds of the States Parties present and voting at the Amendment Conference. The Depositary shall communicate any amendment so adopted to the States Parties.

5. An amendment to this Convention shall enter into force for all States Parties to this Convention which have accepted it, upon the deposit with the Depositary of instruments of acceptance by a majority of States Parties. Thereafter it shall enter into force for any remaining State Party on the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance.

Article 14

Costs

1. The costs of the Meetings of the States Parties, the Special Meetings of the States Parties, the Review Conferences and the Amendment Conferences shall be borne by the States Parties and States not parties to this Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately.
2. The costs incurred by the Secretary-General of the United Nations under Articles 7 and 8 and the costs of any fact-finding mission shall be borne by the States Parties in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment adjusted appropriately.

Article 15

Signature

This Convention, done at Oslo, Norway, on 18 September 1997, shall be open for signature at Ottawa, Canada, by all States from 3 December 1997 until 4 December 1997, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 5 December 1997 until its entry into force.

Article 16

Ratification, acceptance, approval or accession

1. This Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval of the Signatories.
2. It shall be open for accession by any State which has not signed the Convention.
3. The instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession shall be deposited with the Depositary.

Article 17

Entry into force

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the sixth month after the month in which the 40th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited.
2. For any State which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession after the date of the deposit of the 40th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession,

this Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the sixth month after the date on which that State has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

Article 18
Provisional application

Any State may at the time of its ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, declare that it will apply provisionally paragraph 1 of Article 1 of this Convention pending its entry into force.

Article 19
Reservations

The Articles of this Convention shall not be subject to reservations.

Article 20
Duration and withdrawal

1. This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.
2. Each State Party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this Convention. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other States Parties, to the Depositary and to the United Nations Security Council. Such instrument of withdrawal shall include a full explanation of the reasons motivating this withdrawal.
3. Such withdrawal shall only take effect six months after the receipt of the instrument of withdrawal by the Depositary. If, however, on the expiry of that six- month period, the withdrawing State Party is engaged in an armed conflict, the withdrawal shall not take effect before the end of the armed conflict.
4. The withdrawal of a State Party from this Convention shall not in any way affect the duty of States to continue fulfilling the obligations assumed under any relevant rules of international law.

Article 21

Depositary

The Secretary-General of the United Nations is hereby designated as the Depositary of this Convention.

Article 22

Authentic texts

The original of this Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

MINE BAN TREATY STATES PARTIES AND SIGNATORIES

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

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

As of 6 August 2003, 147 signatories/accessions and 135 ratifications/accessions (a).

| | |
|---|---|
| Afghanistan 11 Sep 2002 (a) | Chile 3 Dec 1997; 10 Sep 2001 |
| Albania 8 Sep 1998; 29 Feb 2000 | Colombia 3 Dec 1997; 6 Sep 2000 |
| Algeria 3 Dec 1997; 9 Oct 2001 | Comoros 19 Sep 2002 (a) |
| Andorra 3 Dec 1997; 29 Jun 1998 | Cook Islands 3 Dec 1997 |
| Angola 4 Dec 1997; 5 July 2002 | Republic of Congo 4 May 2001 (a) |
| Antigua and Barbuda 3 Dec 1997; 3 May 1999 | Democratic Republic of the Congo 2 May 2002 (a) |
| Argentina 4 Dec 1997; 14 Sep 1999 | Costa Rica 3 Dec 1997; 17 Mar 1999 |
| Australia 3 Dec 1997; 14 Jan 1999 | Côte d'Ivoire 3 Dec 1997; 30 June 2000 |
| Austria 3 Dec 1997; 29 Jun 1998 | Croatia 4 Dec 1997; 20 May 1998 |
| Bahamas 3 Dec 1997; 31 Jul 1998 | Cyprus 4 Dec 1997; 17 Jan 2003 |
| Bangladesh 7 May 1998; 6 Sep 2000 | Czech Republic 3 Dec 1997; 26 Oct. 1999 |
| Barbados 3 Dec 1997; 26 Jan 1999 | Denmark 4 Dec 1997; 8 Jun 1998 |
| Belgium 3 Dec 1997; 4 Sep 1998 | Djibouti 3 Dec 1997; 18 May 1998 |
| Belize 27 Feb 1998; 23 Apr 1998 | Dominica 3 Dec 1997; 26 March 1999 |
| Benin 3 Dec 1997; 25 Sept 1998 | Dominican Republic 3 Dec 1997; 30 June 2000 |
| Bolivia 3 Dec 1997; 9 Jun 1998 | Ecuador 4 Dec 1997; 29 Apr 1999 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina 3 Dec 1997; 8 Sep 1998 | El Salvador 4 Dec 1997; 27 Jan 1999 |
| Botswana 3 Dec 1997; 1 Mar 2000 | Equatorial Guinea 16 Sep 1998 (a) |
| Brazil 3 Dec 1997; 30 Apr 1999 | Eritrea 27 Aug 2001 (a) |
| Brunei Darussalam 4 Dec 1997 | Ethiopia 3 Dec 1997 |
| Bulgaria 3 Dec 1997; 4 Sep 1998 | Fiji 3 Dec 1997; 10 Jun 1998 |
| Burkina Faso 3 Dec 1997; 16 Sep 1998 | France 3 Dec 1997; 23 Jul 1998 |
| Burundi 3 Dec 1997 | Gabon 3 Dec 1997; 8 Sep 2000 |
| Cambodia 3 Dec 1997; 28 July 1999 | The Gambia 4 Dec 1997; 23 Sep 2002 |
| Cameroon 3 Dec 1997; 19 Sep 2002 | Germany 3 Dec 1997; 23 Jul 1998 |
| Canada 3 Dec 1997; 3 Dec 1997 | Ghana 4 Dec 1997; 30 June 2000 |
| Cape Verde 4 Dec 1997; 14 May 2001 | Greece 3 Dec 1997 |
| Central African Republic 8 Nov 2002 (a) | Grenada 3 Dec 1997; 19 Aug 1998 |
| Chad 6 Jul 1998; 6 May 1999 | Guatemala 3 Dec 1997; 26 March 1999 |

Guinea 4 Dec 1997; 8 Oct 1998
Guinea-Bissau 3 Dec 1997; 22 May 2001
Guyana 4 Dec 1997
Haiti 3 Dec 1997
Holy See 4 Dec 1997; 17 Feb 1998
Honduras 3 Dec 1997; 24 Sept 1998
Hungary 3 Dec 1997; 6 Apr 1998
Iceland 4 Dec 1997; 5 May 1999
Indonesia 4 Dec 1997
Ireland 3 Dec 1997; 3 Dec 1997
Italy 3 Dec 1997; 23 Apr 1999
Jamaica 3 Dec 1997; 17 Jul 1998
Japan 3 Dec 1997; 30 Sept 1998
Jordan 11 Aug 1998; 13 Nov 1998
Kenya 5 Dec 1997; 23 Jan 2001
Kiribati 7 Sep 2000 (a)
Lesotho 4 Dec 1997; 2 Dec 1998
Liberia 23 December 1999 (a)
Liechtenstein 3 Dec 1997; 5 Oct 1999
Lithuania 26 Feb 1999; 12 May 2003
Luxembourg 4 Dec 1997; 14 June 1999
Macedonia, FYR 9 Sep 1998 (a)
Madagascar 4 Dec 1997; 16 Sept. 1999
Maldives, 1 Oct 1998; 7 Sep 2000
Malaysia 3 Dec 1997; 22 April 1999
Malawi 4 Dec 1997; 13 Aug 1998
Mali 3 Dec 1997; 2 Jun 1998
Malta 4 Dec 1997; 7 May 2001
Marshall Islands 4 Dec 1997
Mauritania 3 Dec 1997; 21 July 2000
Mauritius 3 Dec 1997; 3 Dec 1997
México 3 Dec 1997; 9 Jun 1998
Moldova, Republic of 3 Dec 1997; 8 Sep 2000
Monaco 4 Dec 1997; 17 Nov 1998
Mozambique 3 Dec 1997; 25 Aug 1998
Nauru 7 August 2000 (a)
Namibia 3 Dec 1997; 21 Sep 1998
Netherlands 3 Dec 1997; 12 April 1999
New Zealand 3 Dec 1997; 27 Jan 1999
Nicaragua 4 Dec 1997; 30 Nov 1998
Niger 4 Dec 1997; 23 March 1999
Nigeria 27 Sep 2001 (a)
Niue 3 Dec 1997; 15 Apr 1998
Norway 3 Dec 1997; 9 Jul 1998
Panamá 4 Dec 1997; 7 Oct 1998
Paraguay 3 Dec 1997; 13 Nov 1998
Perú 3 Dec 1997; 17 Jun 1998
Philippines 3 Dec 1997; 15 February 2000
Poland 4 Dec 1997
Portugal 3 Dec 1997; 19 Feb 1999
Qatar 4 Dec 1997; 13 Oct 1998
Romania 3 Dec 1997; 30 Nov 2000
Rwanda 3 Dec 1997; 8 June 2000
Saint Kitts and Nevis 3 Dec 1997; 2 Dec 1998
Saint Lucia 3 Dec 1997; 13 April 1999
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 3 Dec 1997; 1 Aug 2001
Samoa 3 Dec 1997; 23 Jul 1998
San Marino 3 Dec 1997; 18 Mar 1998
São Tomé e Príncipe 30 Apr 1998; 31 March 2003
Senegal 3 Dec 1997; 24 Sept 1998
Seychelles 4 Dec 1997; 2 June 2000
Sierra Leone 29 Jul 1998; 25 April 2001
Slovakia 3 Dec 1997; 25 Feb 1999 AA
Slovenia 3 Dec 1997; 27 Oct 1998
Solomon Islands 4 Dec 1997; 26 Jan 1999
South Africa 3 Dec 1997; 26 Jun 1998
Spain 3 Dec 1997; 19 Jan 1999
Sudan 4 Dec 1997
Suriname 4 Dec 1997; 23 May 2002
Swaziland 4 Dec 1997; 22 Dec 1998
Sweden 4 Dec 1997; 30 Nov 1998
Switzerland 3 Dec 1997; 24 Mar 1998
Tajikistan 12 October 1999 (a)
Tanzania 3 Dec 1997; 13 Nov 2000
Timor Leste (East Timor) 7 May 2003 (a)
Thailand 3 Dec 1997; 27 Nov 1998
Togo 4 Dec 1997; 9 Mar 2000
Trinidad and Tobago 4 Dec 1997; 27 Apr 1998
Tunisia 4 Dec 1997; 9 July 1999
Turkmenistan 3 Dec 1997; 19 Jan 1998
Uganda 3 Dec 1997; 25 Feb 1999

Ukraine 24 Feb 1999

United Kingdom 3 Dec 1997; 31 Jul 1998
Uruguay 3 Dec 1997; 7 June 2001

Vanuatu 4 Dec 1997

Venezuela 3 Dec 1997; 14 Apr 1999

Yemen 4 Dec 1997; 1 Sep 1998

Zambia 12 Dec 1997; 23 Feb 2001

Zimbabwe 3 Dec 1997; 18 Jun 1998

Non-Signatories (47)

Armenia

Azerbaijan

Bahrain

Belarus

Bhutan

China

Cuba

Egypt

Estonia

Finland

Georgia

India

Iran

Iraq

Israel

Kazakhstan

Korea, North

Korea, South

Kuwait

Kyrgyzstan

Laos

Latvia

Lebanon

Libya

Micronesia

Mongolia

Morocco

Myanmar (Burma)

Nepal

Oman

Pakistan

Palau

Papua New Guinea

Russia

Saudi Arabia

Singapore

Somalia

Sri Lanka

Syria

Tonga

Turkey

Tuvalu

United Arab Emirates

United States of America

Uzbekistan

Vietnam

Yugoslavia