

LANDMINE MONITOR

2017

International **TO BAN**
CAMPAIGN
LANDMINES



LANDMINE MONITOR 2017

Monitoring and Research Committee, ICBL-CMC Governance Board
Danish Demining Group • Handicap International
Human Rights Watch • Mines Action Canada
Research team leaders • ICBL-CMC staff experts

© December 2017 by International Campaign to Ban Landmines – Cluster Munition Coalition (ICBL-CMC).

All rights reserved.

ISBN: 978-2-9701146-2-8

Cover photograph © Helaine Boyd/HALO Trust, May 2017

Back cover (left) © Youcef Rafai/ICBL, September 2017

Back cover (right) © Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit, June 2017

Cover design by Lixar I.T. Inc.

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor provides research and monitoring for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC). For more information visit www.the-monitor.org or email monitor2@icblcmc.org.

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor makes an effort to limit the environmental footprint of reports by publishing all of our research reports online. This report is available online.

Detailed country profiles are available online at www.the-monitor.org/cp

INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LANDMINES

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) is committed to the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty (or “Ottawa Convention”) as the best framework for ending the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of antipersonnel mines and for destroying stockpiles, clearing mined areas, and assisting affected communities.

The ICBL calls for universal adherence to the Mine Ban Treaty and its full implementation by all, including:

- No more use, production, transfer, and stockpiling of antipersonnel landmines by any actor under any circumstances;
- Rapid destruction of all remaining stockpiles of antipersonnel landmines;
- More efficient clearance and destruction of all emplaced landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW);
- Fulfillment of the rights and needs of all landmine and ERW victims.

PREFACE

LANDMINES AND EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR

Peace agreements may be signed and hostilities may cease, but landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) are an enduring legacy of conflict.

Antipersonnel mines are munitions designed to explode from the presence, proximity, or contact of a person. This includes improvised landmines, also known as improvised explosive devices (IEDs), with those same victim-activated characteristics. Antivehicle mines are munitions designed to explode from the presence, proximity, or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person. Landmines are victim-activated and indiscriminate; whoever triggers the mine, whether a child or a soldier, becomes its victim. Mines emplaced during a conflict against enemy forces can still kill or injure civilians decades later.

ERW refer to ordnance left behind after a conflict. Explosive weapons that for some reason fail to detonate as intended become unexploded ordnance (UXO). These unstable explosive items are left behind during and after conflicts and pose dangers similar to landmines. Abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO) are explosive weapons that have not been used during armed conflict but have been left behind and are no longer effectively controlled. ERW can include artillery shells, grenades, mortars, rockets, air-dropped bombs, and cluster munition remnants. Under the international legal definition, ERW consist of UXO and AXO, but not mines.

Both landmines and ERW pose a serious and ongoing threat to civilians. These weapons can be found on roads, footpaths, farmers' fields, forests, deserts, along borders, in and surrounding houses and schools, and in other places where people are carrying out their daily activities. They deny access to food, water, and other basic needs, and inhibit freedom of movement. They endanger the initial flight and prevent the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced people, and hamper the delivery of humanitarian aid.

These weapons instill fear in communities, whose citizens often know they are walking in mined areas, but have no possibility to farm other land, or take another route to school. When land cannot be cultivated, when medical systems are drained by the cost of attending to landmine/ERW casualties, and when countries must spend money clearing mines rather than paying for education, it is clear that these weapons not only cause appalling human suffering, but that they are also a lethal barrier to development and post-conflict reconstruction.

There are solutions to the global landmine and ERW problem. The 1997 Mine Ban Treaty (officially the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction) provides the best framework for governments to alleviate the suffering of civilians living in areas affected by antipersonnel mines. Governments who join this treaty must stop the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of antipersonnel mines immediately. They must destroy all stockpiled antipersonnel mines within four years and clear all antipersonnel mines in all mined areas under their jurisdiction or control within 10 years. In addition, States Parties in a position to do so must provide assistance for the care and treatment of landmine survivors, their families and communities, and support for mine/ERW risk education programs to help prevent mine incidents.

This legal instrument provides a framework for taking action, but it is up to governments to implement treaty obligations and it is the task of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to work together with governments to ensure they uphold their treaty obligations.

The ultimate goal of the ICBL and its sister campaign, the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC), is a world free of landmines, cluster munitions, and ERW, where civilians can walk freely without the fear of stepping on a mine, children can play without mistaking an unexploded submunition for a toy, and communities don't bear the social and economic impact of mines or ERW presence for decades to come.

INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO BAN LANDMINES

The ICBL is a global network in some 100 countries, working locally, nationally, and internationally to eradicate antipersonnel mines. It received the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize jointly with its founding coordinator Jody Williams in recognition of its efforts to bring about the Mine Ban Treaty.

The campaign is a loose, flexible network whose members share the common goal of working to eliminate antipersonnel landmines.

The ICBL was launched in October 1992 by a group of six NGOs: Handicap International, Human Rights Watch, Medico International, Mines Advisory Group, Physicians for Human Rights, and Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation. These founding organizations witnessed the horrendous effects of mines on the communities they were working with in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, and saw how mines hampered and even prevented their development efforts in these countries. They realized that a comprehensive solution was needed to address the crisis caused by landmines, and that the solution was a complete ban on antipersonnel mines.

The founding organizations brought to the international campaign practical experience of the impact of landmines. They also brought the perspective of the different sectors they represented: human rights, children's rights, development issues, refugee issues, and medical and humanitarian relief. ICBL member campaigns contacted other NGOs, who spread the word through their networks; news of this new coalition and the need for a treaty banning antipersonnel landmines soon stretched throughout the world. The ICBL organized conferences and campaigning events in many countries to raise awareness of the landmine problem and the need for a ban, and to provide training to new campaigners to enable them to be effective advocates in their respective countries.

Campaign members worked at the local, national, regional, and global level to encourage their governments to support the mine ban. The ICBL's membership grew rapidly, and today there are campaigns in some 100 countries.

The Mine Ban Treaty was opened for signature on 3 December 1997 in Ottawa, Canada. It was due to the sustained and coordinated action by the ICBL that the Mine Ban Treaty became a reality.

Part of the ICBL's success is its ability to evolve with changing circumstances. The early days of the campaign were focused on developing a comprehensive treaty banning antipersonnel

mines. Once this goal was achieved, attention shifted to ensuring that all countries join the treaty and that all States Parties fully implement their treaty obligations. Today, the campaign also encourages States Parties to complete their major treaty obligations by 2025, a target agreed in the 2014 Maputo Declaration.

The ICBL works to promote the global norm against mine use and advocates for countries who have not joined the treaty to take steps to do so. The campaign also urges non-state armed groups to abide by the spirit of the treaty.

Much of the ICBL's work is focused on promoting implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, which provides the most effective framework for eliminating antipersonnel landmines. This includes working in partnership with governments and international organizations on all aspects of treaty implementation, from stockpile destruction to mine clearance to victim assistance.

The campaign has been successful in part because it has a clear campaign message and goal; a non-bureaucratic campaign structure and flexible strategy; and an effective partnership with other NGOs, international organizations, and governments.

In January 2011, the ICBL merged with the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) to become the ICBL-CMC, but the CMC and the ICBL remain two distinct and strong campaigns.

LANDMINE AND CLUSTER MUNITION MONITOR

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor provides research and monitoring for the ICBL and the CMC and is formally a program of the ICBL-CMC. It is the *de facto* monitoring regime for the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. It monitors and reports on States Parties' implementation of, and compliance with, the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and more generally, it assesses the international community's response to the humanitarian problems caused by landmines, cluster munitions, and other explosive remnants of war (ERW). The Monitor represents the first time that NGOs have come together in a coordinated, systematic, and sustained way to monitor humanitarian law or disarmament treaties and to regularly document progress and problems, thereby successfully putting into practice the concept of civil society-based verification.

In June 1998, the ICBL created Landmine Monitor as an ICBL initiative. In 2008, Landmine Monitor also functionally became the research and monitoring arm of the CMC. In 2010, the initiative changed its name from Landmine Monitor to Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor (known as "the Monitor") to reflect its increased reporting on the cluster munition issue. Responsibility for the coordination of the Monitor lies with the Monitoring and Research Committee, a standing committee of the ICBL-CMC Governance Board. The ICBL-CMC produces and publishes Landmine Monitor and Cluster Munition Monitor as separate publications.

The 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 and cluster munitions. This is done through extensive collection, analysis, and distribution of publicly available information. Although in some cases it does entail investigative missions, the Monitor is not designed to send researchers into harm's way and does not include hot war-zone reporting.

Monitor reporting complements the transparency reporting by states required under international treaties. It reflects the shared view that transparency, trust, and mutual collaboration are crucial elements for the successful eradication of antipersonnel mines, cluster munitions, and ERW. The Monitor was also established in recognition of the need for independent reporting and evaluation.

The Monitor aims to promote and advance discussion on mine-, cluster munition-, and ERW-related issues, and to seek clarifications to help reach the goal of a world free of mines, cluster munitions, and ERW. The Monitor works in good faith to provide factual information about issues it is monitoring, in order to benefit the international community as a whole.

The Monitor system features a global reporting network and an annual report. A network of more than two dozen researchers and a 13-person Editorial Team gathered information to prepare this report. The researchers come from the CMC and ICBL's campaigning coalitions and from other elements of civil society, including journalists, academics, and research institutions.

Unless otherwise specified, all translations were done by the Monitor.

As was the case in previous years, the Monitor acknowledges that this ambitious report is limited by the time, resources, and information sources available. The 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 an important subject.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This is the 19th annual Landmine Monitor report. It is the sister publication to the Cluster Munition Monitor report, first published in November 2010. *Landmine Monitor 2016* provides a global overview of the landmine situation. Chapters on developments in specific countries and other areas are available in online Country Profiles at www.the-monitor.org/cp.

Landmine Monitor covers mine ban policy, use, production, trade, and stockpiling, and also includes information on contamination, clearance, casualties, victim assistance, and support for mine action. The report focuses on calendar year 2015, with information included up to November 2016 when possible.

IN MEMORIAM DR. ROBERT MTONGA

Dr. Robert "Bob" Mtonga, member of the Governance Board of the ICBL-CMC passed away in March 2017. A long-time researcher for the Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor, Dr Mtonga tirelessly championed the ban on landmines and cluster munitions throughout Africa and beyond. The Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor team wishes to pay tribute to him and acknowledge the important contributions he has made to a world free of landmines and cluster munitions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A broad-based network of individuals, campaigns, and organizations produced this report. It was assembled by a dedicated team of research coordinators and editors, with the support of a significant number of donors.

Researchers are cited separately on the Monitor website at www.the-monitor.org. The Monitor is grateful to everyone who contributed research to this report. We wish to thank the scores of individuals, campaigns, NGOs, international organizations, field practitioners, and governments who provided us with essential information. We are grateful to ICBL-CMC staff for their review of the content of the report, and their crucial assistance in the release, distribution, publication, and promotion of Monitor reports.

Responsibility for the coordination of the Monitor lies with the Monitoring and Research Committee, a standing committee of the ICBL-CMC Governance Board comprised of four NGOs as well as Monitor research team leaders and ICBL-CMC staff. The committee's members include: Danish Demining Group (Richard MacCormac), Handicap International (Alma Taslidžan Al-Osta), Human Rights Watch (Stephen Goose), Mines Action Canada (Paul Hannon), Loren Persi Vicentic (casualty and victim assistance team coordinator), Amelie Chayer (ICBL-CMC acting director), and Jeff Abramson (Monitor program manager). From January to November 2017, the Monitor's Editorial Team undertook research, updated country profiles, and produced thematic overviews for *Landmine Monitor 2017*. The Editorial Team included:

- Ban policy: Mark Hiznay, Stephen Goose, Marta Kosmyna, Yeshua Moser-Puangsuwan, and Mary Wareham, with assistance from Jacob Ware;
- Contamination, clearance, and support for mine action: Jennifer Reeves, Amelie Chayer, and Marion Loddo; and
- Casualties and victim assistance: Loren Persi Vicentic, Éléa Boureux, Clémence Caraux-Pelletan, Michael Moore, Jennifer Reeves, and Marianne Schulze, with appreciation to Erin Hunt for research in 2016 that contributed to this report.

The Monitor acknowledges the contributions of the Mine Action Review (www.mineactionreview.org), which has conducted the mine action research in 2017, including on survey and clearance, and shared all its resulting landmine and cluster munition reports with the Monitor. The Monitor is responsible for the findings presented online and in its print publications.

Jeff Abramson of ICBL-CMC provided final editing in October and November 2017 with assistance from Morgan McKenna (publications consultant) and Arsen Markarov (intern).

Report formatting was undertaken by Lixar I.T. Inc. Nimmerrichter - XEST printed the report in Austria. This report was also published digitally at www.the-monitor.org.

We extend our gratitude to Monitor contributors*:

- Government of Australia
- Government of France
- Government of Germany
- Government of Luxembourg
- Government of Norway
- Government of Sweden
- Government of Switzerland
- Government of the United States of America**
- Holy See
- UNICEF
- UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS)

The Monitor's supporters are in no way responsible for, and do not necessarily endorse, the material contained in this report. We also thank the donors who have contributed to the organizational members of the Monitoring and Research Committee and other participating organizations.

* *List accurate as of November 2017.*

** *Specifically for research on mine action, support for mine action, casualties, and victim assistance.*

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AXO	abandoned explosive ordnance
BAC	battle area clearance
CCW	1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons
CHA	confirmed hazardous area
CMC	Cluster Munition Coalition
ERW	explosive remnants of war
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
HI	Handicap International
ICBL	International Campaign to Ban Landmines
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IED	improvised explosive device
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
ISU	Implementation Support Unit
NGO	non-governmental organization
NSAG	non-state armed group
NTS	non-technical survey
SHA	suspected hazardous area
TS	technical survey
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
UXO	unexploded ordnance

GLOSSARY

Abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO) – Explosive ordnance that has not been used during an armed conflict, that has been left behind or dumped by a party to an armed conflict, and which is no longer under its control. Abandoned explosive ordnance is included under the broader category of explosive remnants of war.

Accession – Accession is the way for a state to become a party to an international treaty through a single instrument that constitutes both signature and ratification.

Adherence – The act of becoming a party to a treaty. This can be through signature and ratification, or through accession.

“All reasonable effort” – Describes what is considered a minimum acceptable level of effort to identify and document contaminated areas or to remove the presence or suspicion of mines/ERW. “All reasonable effort” has been applied when the commitment of additional resources is considered to be unreasonable in relation to the results expected.

Antihandling device – According to the Mine Ban Treaty, an antihandling 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.”

Antipersonnel mine – According to the Mine Ban Treaty, an antipersonnel 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.”

Antivehicle mine – According to the Mine Ban Treaty, an antivehicle mine is a mine designed “to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person.”

Area cancellation – Area cancellation describes the process by which a suspected hazardous area is released based solely on the gathering of information that indicates that the area is not, in fact, contaminated. It does not involve the application of any mine clearance tools.

Area reduction – Area reduction describes the process by which one or more mine clearance tools (e.g. mine detection dogs, manual deminers, or mechanical demining equipment) are used to gather information that locates the perimeter of a suspected hazardous area. Those areas falling outside this perimeter, or the entire area if deemed not to be mined, can be released.

Battle area clearance (BAC) – The systematic and controlled clearance of dangerous areas where the explosive hazards are known not to include landmines.

Casualty – The person injured or killed in a landmine, ERW, or IED incident, either through direct contact with the device or by being in its proximity.

Clearance – Tasks or actions to ensure the removal and/or the destruction of all mine and ERW hazards from a specified area to a specified depth.

Cleared land – A defined area cleared through the removal and/or destruction of all specified mine and ERW hazards to a specified depth.

Cluster munition – According to the Convention on Cluster Munitions a cluster munition is a “conventional munition that is designed to disperse or release explosive submunitions each weighing less than 20 kilograms, and includes those submunitions.” Cluster munitions consist of containers and submunitions. Launched from the ground or air, the containers open and disperse submunitions (or bomblets, from fixed dispensers) over a wide area. Submunitions are typically designed to pierce armor, kill personnel, or both.

Confirmed hazardous area – An area where the presence of mine/ERW contamination has been confirmed on the basis of direct evidence of the presence of mines/ERW.

Demining – The set of activities that lead to the removal of mine and ERW hazards, including survey, mapping, clearance, marking, and the handover of cleared land.

Explosive remnants of war (ERW) – Under Protocol V to the Convention on Conventional Weapons, explosive remnants of war are defined as unexploded ordnance and abandoned explosive ordnance. Mines are explicitly excluded from the definition.

Explosive ordnance disposal – The detection, identification, evaluation, rendering safe, recovery, and disposal of explosive ordnance.

Improvised explosive device (IED) – A device placed or produced in an improvised manner incorporating explosives or noxious chemicals. An improvised explosive device (IED) may be victim-activated or command-detonated. IEDs that can be activated by the presence, proximity or contact of a person (victim-activated) are banned under the Mine Ban Treaty, but command-detonated IEDs are not.

Improvised mine, also improvised landmine and improvised antipersonnel landmine – An IED acting as a mine, landmine or antipersonnel landmine.

International Mine Action Standards – Standards issued by the UN to improve safety and efficiency in mine action by providing guidance, establishing principles and, in some cases, defining international requirements and specifications.

Land release – The process of applying all reasonable effort to identify, define, and remove all presence and suspicion of mines/ERW with the minimum possible risk involving the identification of hazardous areas, the cancellation of land through non-technical survey, the reduction of land through technical survey, and the clearance of land with actual mine/ERW contamination.

Mine action center – A body charged with coordinating day-to-day mine action operations, normally under the supervision of a national mine action authority. Some mine action centers also implement mine action activities.

Mine/ERW risk education – Activities which seek to reduce the risk of injury from mines and ERW by awareness-raising and promoting behavioral change, including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison.

Non-state armed groups (NSAG) – For Landmine Monitor purposes, non-state armed groups include organizations carrying out armed rebellion or insurrection, as well as a broader range of non-state entities, such as criminal gangs and state-supported proxy forces.

Non-technical survey (NTS) – The collection and analysis of data, without the use of technical interventions, about the presence, type, distribution, and surrounding environment of mine/ERW contamination, in order to define better where mine/ERW contamination is present, and where it is not, and to support land release prioritization and decision-making processes through the provision of evidence. Non-technical survey activities typically include, but are not limited to, desk studies seeking information from central institutions and other relevant sources, as well as field studies of the suspected area.

Reduced land – A defined area concluded not to contain evidence of mine/ERW contamination following the technical survey of a suspected or confirmed hazardous area.

Residual risk – In the context of humanitarian demining, the term refers to the risk remaining following the application of all reasonable efforts to remove and/or destroy all mine or ERW hazards from a specified area to a specified depth.

Submunition – Any munition that, to perform its task, separates from a parent munition (cluster munition). All air-dropped submunitions are commonly referred to as “bomblets,” although the term bomblet has a specific meaning in the Convention on Cluster Munitions. When ground-launched, they are sometimes called “grenades.”

Survivors – People who have been directly injured by an explosion of a landmine, submunition, or other ERW and have survived the incident.

Suspected hazardous area (SHA) – An area where there is reasonable suspicion of mine/ERW contamination on the basis of indirect evidence of the presence of mines/ERW.

Technical survey (TS) – The collection and analysis of data, using appropriate technical interventions, about the presence, type, distribution, and surrounding environment of mine/ERW contamination, in order to define better where mine/ERW contamination is present, and where it is not, and to support land release prioritization and decision-making processes through the provision of evidence. Technical survey activities may include visual search, instrument-aided surface search, and shallow- or full sub-surface search.

Unexploded cluster submunitions – Submunitions that have failed to explode as intended, becoming unexploded ordnance.

Unexploded ordnance (UXO) – Unexploded ordnance (UXO) refers to munitions that were designed to explode but for some reason failed to detonate.

Victim – The individual killed or injured by a mine/ERW explosion (casualty), his or her family, and community.

Victim assistance – Victim assistance includes, but is not limited to, data collection and needs assessment, emergency and continuing medical care, physical rehabilitation, psychological support and social inclusion, economic inclusion, and laws and public policies to ensure the full and equal integration and participation of survivors, their families, and communities in society.

1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction

Table Key

States Parties: Ratified or acceded as of November 2017

Signatory: Signed, but not yet ratified as of November 2017

Non-signatories: Not yet acceded as of November 2017

The Americas

Antigua & Barbuda	Guyana
Argentina	Haiti
Bahamas	Honduras
Barbados	Jamaica
Belize	Mexico
Bolivia	Nicaragua
Brazil	Panama
Canada	Paraguay
Chile	Peru
Colombia	St. Kitts & Nevis
Costa Rica	Saint Lucia
Dominica	St. Vincent & the
Dominican Rep.	Grenadines
Ecuador	Suriname
El Salvador	Trinidad & Tobago
Grenada	Uruguay
Guatemala	Venezuela
Cuba	United States

East & South Asia & the Pacific

Afghanistan	Maldives
Australia	Nauru
Bangladesh	New Zealand
Bhutan	Niue
Brunei Darussalam	Palau
Cambodia	Papua New Guinea
Cook Islands	Philippines
Fiji	Samoa
Indonesia	Solomon Islands
Japan	Thailand
Kiribati	Timor-Leste
Malaysia	Tuvalu
Marshall Islands	Vanuatu
China	Myanmar
India	Nepal
Korea, North	Pakistan
Korea, South	Singapore
Lao PDR	Sri Lanka
Micronesia	Tonga
Mongolia	Vietnam

Europe, the Caucasus & Central Asia

Albania	Greece	Norway
Andorra	Holy See	Poland
Austria	Hungary	Portugal
Belarus	Iceland	Romania
Belgium	Ireland	San Marino
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Italy	Serbia
Bulgaria	Latvia	Slovakia
Croatia	Liechtenstein	Slovenia
Cyprus	Lithuania	Spain
Czech Republic	Luxembourg	Sweden
Denmark	Macedonia, FYR	Switzerland
Estonia	Malta	Tajikistan
Finland	Moldova	Turkey
France	Monaco	Turkmenistan
Germany	Montenegro	Ukraine
	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Armenia	Kazakhstan	Russia
Azerbaijan	Kyrgyzstan	Uzbekistan
Georgia		

Middle East & North Africa

Algeria	Kuwait	Tunisia
Iraq	Oman	Yemen
Jordan	Qatar	
Bahrain	Lebanon	Saudi Arabia
Egypt	Libya	Syria
Iran	Morocco	United Arab Emirates
Israel	Palestine	

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola	Ethiopia	Nigeria
Benin	Gabon	Rwanda
Botswana	Gambia	São Tomé & Príncipe
Burkina Faso	Ghana	Senegal
Burundi	Guinea	Seychelles
Cameroon	Guinea-Bissau	Sierra Leone
Cape Verde	Kenya	Somalia
Central African Rep.	Lesotho	South Africa
Chad	Liberia	South Sudan
Comoros	Madagascar	Sudan
Congo, Rep.	Malawi	Swaziland
Côte d'Ivoire	Mali	Tanzania
Dem. Rep. Congo	Mauritania	Togo
Djibouti	Mauritius	Uganda
Equatorial Guinea	Mozambique	Zambia
Eritrea	Namibia	Zimbabwe
	Niger	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAJOR FINDINGS	1
BAN POLICY	7
7 Banning Antipersonnel Mines	
8 Use of antipersonnel landmines	
18 Stockpiles of antipersonnel landmines possessed by states not party and non-state armed groups	
19 Production of antipersonnel mines	
20 Transfers of antipersonnel mines	
21 Universalizing the landmine ban	
24 Status and Operation of the Mine Ban Treaty	
CONTAMINATION AND CLEARANCE	31
32 Status and Key Developments	
32 Mine Contamination in 2016	
34 Mine Clearance in 2016	
38 Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 Obligations	
38 Completion of Article 5 implementation	
39 Progress on meeting deadlines	
42 Monitoring the progress of States Parties against their Article 5 obligations and the Maputo Action Plan	
44 Other issues affecting clearance operations	
CASUALTIES	51
51 Overview	
53 Casualty Recording for 2016	
VICTIM ASSISTANCE	65
65 Introduction	
67 Frameworks for Assistance	
73 Availability of and Accessibility to Services	
SUPPORT FOR MINE ACTION	81
81 2016 Figures and Trends	
82 International Contributions in 2016	
89 National Contributions in 2016	
90 Five-Year Support to Mine Action 2012–2016	
STATUS OF THE CONVENTION	93
93 Treaty Status	
96 Mine Ban Treaty	



Parallel rows of pressure-plate initiated improvised mines with anti-lift devices stretch for up to six kilometers in Fallujah, Iraq.

© Simon Conway/HALO Trust, May 2017

MAJOR FINDINGS

Twenty years after the Mine Ban Treaty was negotiated and signed, it continues to be a tremendous life-saving success. *Landmine Monitor 2017* details progress toward the goal of a mine-free world, with 162 countries implementing the Mine Ban Treaty and most of the 35 countries that remain outside it nonetheless abiding by its key provisions. A small number of states and non-state armed groups use antipersonnel mines, including improvised mines, which contributed to a very high number of casualties recorded in 2016. Many countries continue to clear mine contamination, and international funding for mine action increased in 2016. However, very few States Parties appear to be on track to meet clearance deadlines, and support to victims remains inadequate.

USE

From October 2016 through October 2017, Landmine Monitor has confirmed new use of antipersonnel mines by the government forces of Myanmar and Syria, neither of which are party to the Mine Ban Treaty.

- Antipersonnel mines have been used by government forces of Myanmar throughout the past 20 years and by government forces of Syria since 2012.
- There have been no allegations of the use of antipersonnel mines by States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty in the reporting period.

Non-state armed groups (NSAGs) used antipersonnel mines in at least nine countries, including States Parties Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Ukraine, and Yemen.

- There was no new use of antipersonnel mines by NSAGs in Colombia for the first time since Landmine Monitor began publishing in 1999.
- The extensive use of improvised mines by the Islamic State has resulted in new casualties and contamination.

CASUALTIES

2016 was the second year in a row with exceptionally high numbers of people recorded as killed or injured by landmines—including improvised types that mostly act as antipersonnel mines, cluster munition remnants, and other explosive remnants of war (ERW).

- In 2016, the Monitor recorded 8,605 mine/ERW casualties, of which at least 2,089 people were killed.
- The high total was mostly due to casualties recorded in armed conflicts in Afghanistan, Libya, Ukraine, and Yemen. Accurate data gathering for active conflicts, however, remains challenging.
- Following a sharp increase in 2015, the casualty total in 2016 marked the highest number of annual recorded casualties in Monitor data since 1999 (9,228), the most child casualties ever recorded, and the highest number of annual casualties caused by improvised mines.

Casualties were identified in 52 states and four other areas in 2016, of which 35 are States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty.

- The vast majority of recorded landmine/ERW casualties were civilians (78%) where their status was known, which is similar to the past three years.
- In 2016, children accounted for 42% of all civilian casualties where the age was known.
- Women and girls made up 16% of all casualties where the sex was known, a slight increase compared to 2015 and recent years.
- The Monitor has recorded more than 110,000 mine/ERW casualties since its global tracking began in 1999, including some 80,000 survivors.

CONTAMINATION AND CLEARANCE

Sixty-one states and areas are contaminated by antipersonnel mines as of November 2017.

- This includes 33 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, 24 states not party, and four other areas.
- Algeria declared completion of clearance in February 2017. Mozambique, which had declared completion in 2015 but subsequently found previously unidentified antipersonnel mine contamination in 2016 and 2017, completed clearance in May 2017.
- Massive antipersonnel mine contamination (more than 100 km² total per country) is believed to exist in Afghanistan, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Thailand, and Turkey.

About 170 km² of land was reported to be cleared of landmines in 2016, almost the same amount as in 2015.

- In 2016, more than 232,000 antipersonnel mines and some 29,000 antivehicle mines were destroyed. This represented a significant increase from 2015 results.
- The largest total clearance of mined areas in 2016 was achieved in Afghanistan, Croatia, Iraq, and Cambodia, which together accounted for more than 83% of recorded clearance.
- Over the past five years (2012–2016), approximately 927 km² of mined areas have been cleared. Some 1.1 million antipersonnel mines and more than 68,000 antivehicle mines have been destroyed in the context of mine and battle area clearance.

Twenty-eight States Parties, one state not party, and one other area have completed clearance of all mined areas on their territory since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force in 1999.

- One state, Ukraine, is in violation of Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty due to missing its 1 June 2016 clearance deadline without having requested and being granted an extension.
- Jordan and Nigeria, where antipersonnel mine contamination is found, should declare that they have obligations under Article 5 and request a new deadline to complete clearance.
- Three States Parties were granted extended clearance deadlines at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties in 2016: Ecuador, Niger, and Peru. Five States Parties requested extended deadlines for approval at the Sixteenth Meeting of States Parties in December 2017: Angola, Ecuador, Iraq, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.

- Only four States Parties appear to be on track to meet their treaty-mandated clearance deadlines: Chile, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mauritania, and Peru.

SUPPORT FOR MINE ACTION

Donors and affected states contributed approximately US\$564.5 million in international and national support for mine action in 2016, an increase of \$39.3 million (7%) from 2015.

Thirty-two donors contributed \$479.5 million in **international support** for mine action to 40 states and three other areas. This represents an increase of almost \$85.5 million (22%) from 2015.

Eleven affected states reported providing \$85.0 million in **national support** for their own mine action programs, a decrease of \$46.2 (35%) million compared with 2015. More than \$35 million of this decrease occurred in one country, Angola.

After three years of declining support (a 26% decrease between 2012 and 2015), total international support provided in 2016 represents the third-highest level of the past decade—after the \$498.9 million provided in 2012, and the \$480.4 million in 2010.

- The top five mine action donors—the United States (US), the European Union (EU), Japan, Germany, and Norway—contributed 70% of all international funding, with a combined total of \$335.6 million.
- Twenty donors increased their funding in 2016, with the EU and Germany accounting for \$55 million (64%) of the global increase.
- The top five recipient states—Iraq, Afghanistan, Croatia, Cambodia, and Lao PDR—received \$258.7 million, or 54% of all international support in 2016.
- Iraq received more funding than any other country and from the largest number of donors.

VICTIM ASSISTANCE

In 2016–2017, most States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty with significant numbers of mine victims suffered from a lack of adequate resources to fulfill the commitments of the 2014–2019 Maputo Action Plan. Findings below relate to the 31 States Parties with significant numbers of mine victims.

- Although approximately two-thirds of the States Parties had active coordination mechanisms, survivors' representatives participated in just 17 of the coordinating processes among those 20 States Parties; even then this often did not result in their contributions being taken into account.
- States Parties still need to demonstrate what they are doing to increase the capacity of survivors' organizations and to enhance their meaningful participation in all relevant matters.
- In many states and regions, facilities providing rehabilitation services were limited, were often not available in all remote areas where needed, and sometimes prohibitively expensive. However, construction of several much-needed prosthetics centers was reported in 2016–2017.
- Access to employment, training, and other income-generation support activities was reduced noticeably in many of the States Parties over the past few years, leaving significant gaps where opportunities for livelihoods were most needed.

STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION, PRODUCTION, AND TRANSFER

Collectively, States Parties have destroyed more than 53 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines, including more than 2.2 million destroyed in 2016.

- Belarus completed the destruction of its stockpiles in April 2017 after being in violation of the convention since 2008.

- As many as 31 of the 35 states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty stockpile antipersonnel landmines.
- In 1999, states stockpiled about 160 million antipersonnel mines, but today the global total may be less than 50 million.
- NSAGs and criminal groups in Afghanistan, India, Iraq, Libya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen, and Western Sahara were reported to possess stocks.

Eighty-six States Parties have declared that they do not retain any antipersonnel mines, including 34 states that stockpiled antipersonnel mines in the past.

- In September 2017, Algeria destroyed the 5,970 antipersonnel mines it retained for training purposes after completing its landmine clearance program.

Forty-one states have ceased production of antipersonnel mines, including four that are not party to the Mine Ban Treaty: Egypt, Israel, Nepal, and the US.

- Eleven states claim a right to produce antipersonnel mines, unchanged from the previous report: China, Cuba, India, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and Vietnam.
- While most of these countries are not believed to be actively producing mines, new information emerged that active production is on-going in India.

The use of factory-produced antipersonnel mines in conflicts in Ukraine and Yemen, where declared stockpiles had been destroyed, indicates that some transfers, either internally among actors or from sources external to the country, are occurring.

- Companies from Egypt and India exhibited sales brochures offering antipersonnel mines, or components for them, at an international arms fair in February 2017 in Abu Dhabi.
- At least nine states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty have formal moratoriums on the export of antipersonnel mines: China, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and the US.

TREATY COMPLIANCE

In general, States Parties' implementation of and compliance with the Mine Ban Treaty has been excellent. The core obligations have largely been respected, and when ambiguities have arisen they have been dealt with in a satisfactory manner. However, there are remaining compliance concerns regarding a small number of issues.

- One state, Ukraine, is in violation of Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty due to missing its 1 June 2016 clearance deadline without having requested and being granted an extension.
- Yemen previously confirmed that its forces violated the treaty by using antipersonnel mines in 2011. As of November 2017, investigations were still pending.
- Greece and Ukraine have missed their deadlines to complete stockpile destruction. Ukraine has 4.9 million antipersonnel mines remaining to be destroyed, while Greece has 643,267.
- A total of 71 States Parties have reported that they retain antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes, of which 37 retain more than 1,000 mines. Finland, Turkey, and Bangladesh each retain more than 12,000 mines.
- Only 48% of States Parties have submitted annual reports for calendar year 2016, a slight increase from the previous year (45%). A total of 83 States Parties have not submitted a report for calendar year 2016. Only one State Party has not submitted an initial report: Tuvalu (due 28 August 2012).

НЕ ПІДХОДЬ!
НЕ ТОРКАЙСЯ
ВИБУХОНЕБЕЗПЕЧНИХ
ПРЕДМЕТІВ!

ГУ ДСНС УКРАЇНИ
У ДОНЕЦЬКІЙ ОБЛАСТІ

ЗАСТЕРІГАЄ

ПОБАЧИВ-
ТЕЛЕФОНУЙ
101

СТОП МІНИ!
DANGER MINES!

Billboard in Slavyansk, Donetsk region of Ukraine, warns of dangers posed by mines and unexploded ordnance.

© Benas Gerdziunas, September 2016

BAN POLICY

BANNING ANTIPERSONNEL MINES

2017 marks 20 years since the Mine Ban Treaty was adopted in Oslo on 18 September 1997 and opened for signature in Ottawa less than three months later. In between those key milestones, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and its then coordinator Jody Williams were awarded the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize.

After two decades, the Mine Ban Treaty has matured into an emerging international norm with impressive universality. A total of 162 States Parties are implementing the treaty's provisions prohibiting antipersonnel landmines and requiring victim assistance, clearance of mined areas within 10 years, and destruction of stockpiled mines within four years. Most of the 35 countries that remain outside of the treaty are nonetheless abiding by its key provisions. The stigma against landmines remains strong.

But not all States Parties are on track to fulfill their Mine Ban Treaty obligations in a timely fashion. Missed stockpile destruction deadlines, missed deadlines for extensions of mine clearance deadlines, and repeated requests for extensions of mine clearance deadlines raise compliance concerns.

Additionally, new landmine use, particularly the widespread use of so-called improvised mines by non-state armed groups (NSAGs), is resulting in a significant increase in casualties and threatening to undermine the progress toward the long-held goal of a landmine-free world. While mine use by government forces remains a rare phenomenon, the government forces of states not party Myanmar and Syria used antipersonnel landmines in 2016 and 2017.

NSAGs used antipersonnel landmines in at least nine countries, including Ukraine and Yemen. The extensive use of improvised mines by the forces of the Islamic State (IS) has created new casualties and contaminated land.

These improvised landmines are often referred to as improvised explosive devices (IEDs) or booby-traps. However, most are exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person and therefore meet the definition of an antipersonnel mine contained in the Mine Ban Treaty and are prohibited regardless of whether they were fabricated in a factory or elsewhere.

Some states have chosen not to use the humanitarian disarmament framework provided by the Mine Ban Treaty to address what they call the “IED threat” and instead pursue non-binding measures through the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW). Such an approach is short-sighted, misguided, and costly. It may appeal to states that have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty such as China, Russia, and the United States (US), but it ignores a key opportunity to remind NSAGs of the stigma that the Mine Ban Treaty has created against any use of antipersonnel mines, by any actor, under any circumstances. In November 2016, the ICBL called on Mine Ban Treaty States Parties to condemn any new use of improvised antipersonnel mines and seek out new ways to stigmatize and stop this use.¹ As Mine Ban Treaty president Austria affirmed in October 2017, the Mine Ban Treaty clearly encompasses all antipersonnel mines, regardless of whether they are improvised or factory-produced, and irrespective of who used them.²

Like-minded governments, UN agencies, and international organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) continue to work together with the ICBL to address Mine Ban Treaty compliance challenges in a cooperative manner. The unity demonstrated by that community over the past two decades remains strong and focused on the Mine Ban Treaty’s ultimate objective of putting an end to the suffering and casualties caused by antipersonnel mines.

USE OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

In this reporting period—October 2016 through October 2017—Landmine Monitor has confirmed new use of antipersonnel mines by the government forces of Myanmar and Syria, neither of which are party to the Mine Ban Treaty. There have been no allegations of the use of antipersonnel mines by States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty in the reporting period.

Landmine Monitor recorded new use of antipersonnel mines by NSAGs in Afghanistan, India, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Ukraine, and Yemen.³

There was no new use of antipersonnel mines in Colombia for the first time since the Monitor began publishing in 1999. The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia-Ejército del Pueblo, FARC) and the Colombian government signed an agreement in November 2016 to end the armed conflict. This resulted in a halt to the FARC’s widespread use of improvised antipersonnel landmines and the surrender and destruction of its stockpile (*see below*). On 1 October 2017, a ceasefire agreement between the government of Colombia and the National Liberation Army (Unión Camilista-Ejército de Liberación Nacional, ELN) took effect.⁴

Locations of antipersonnel mine use October 2016–October 2017

Use by government forces	Use by non-state armed groups	
Myanmar Syria	Afghanistan India Iraq Myanmar Nigeria	Pakistan Syria Ukraine Yemen

Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are indicated in **bold**.

1 Statement by the ICBL, Mine Ban Treaty 15th Meeting of States Parties, Santiago, 30 November 2016, bit.ly/ICBL15MSP30Nov.

2 Explanation of vote by Austria, UN General Assembly (UNGA) First Committee on Disarmament and International Security, New York, 31 October 2017.

3 NSAGs used mines in at least 10 countries in 2015–2016 and 2014–2015, seven countries in 2013–2014, eight countries in 2012–2013, six countries in 2011–2012, four countries in 2010, six countries in 2009, seven countries in 2008, and nine countries in 2007. NSAGs often use improvised mines, rather than factory-made antipersonnel mines. In the reporting period, there were also reports of NSAG use of antivehicle mines in Afghanistan, Cameroon, Iraq, Kenya, Lebanon, Mali, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, Syria, Tunisia, Ukraine, and Yemen.

4 “Colombia Cease-Fire Agreement Takes Effect Sunday,” *Voice of America*, 30 September 2017, www.voanews.com/a/colombia-cease-fire-takes-effect-october-1/4050834.html.

The use of landmines, improvised landmines, and other types of IEDs by Boko Haram militants in Nigeria has become more acute. Nigeria has not provided an Article 7 transparency report since 2012; the required annual report should update States Parties regarding new mine use within the country. Nigeria also did not provide updated information at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties in November–December 2016.

Landmine Monitor has been unable to confirm allegations of new antipersonnel mine use by NSAGs in Cameroon, Chad, Iran, Libya, Mali, Niger, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Tunisia.

USE BY AND IN STATES NOT PARTY

Myanmar

Since the publication of its first annual report in 1999, Landmine Monitor has consistently documented the use of antipersonnel mines by government forces and NSAGs in Myanmar. In September 2016, Deputy Minister of Defense Major General Myint Nwe informed parliament that the army continues to use landmines in internal armed conflict. He stated that government forces, known as Tatmadaw, used landmines to protect state-owned factories, bridges, and power towers, and its outposts in military operations. The deputy minister stated that landmines were removed when the military abandoned outposts, or warning signs were placed where landmines were planted, and soldiers were not present.⁵ In June 2017, a Ministry of Defense official stated to the Landmine Monitor that the military does not use landmines near highly populated areas.⁶

According to eyewitness accounts, photographic evidence, and multiple reports, antipersonnel mines have been laid between Myanmar's two major land crossings with Bangladesh, resulting in casualties among Rohingya refugees fleeing government attacks on their homes. The mine use began in late August 2017, when Myanmar government forces began operations against the Rohingya population, causing the flight of more than 600,000 people to neighboring Bangladesh. It is unclear if this mine use has continued as parts of the border area remain inaccessible.

Displaced Rohingya civilians who crossed into Bangladesh witnessed a military truck arrive on the Myanmar side of the border from which they witnessed Myanmar government soldiers unloading three crates on 28 August.⁷ They said the soldiers removed antipersonnel landmines from the crates and placed them in the ground, later returning at night to place more mines. On 5 September, *Reuters* reported that two Bangladeshi sources witnessed three to four groups working near the border's barbed wire fence "putting something into the ground" that *Reuters* subsequently determined to be landmines.⁸ Also on 5 September, two children from Myanmar who had fled to Bangladesh were injured after reportedly attempting to destroy landmines they discovered on the border.⁹

⁵ "Pyithu Hluttaw hears answers to questions by relevant ministries," *Global New Light of Myanmar*, 13 September 2016, www.burmalibrary.org/docs23/GNLM2016-09-13-red.pdf.

⁶ Landmine Monitor meeting with Min Htike Hein, Assistant Permanent Secretary to the Minister for Defense, Naypyitaw, 26 June 2017.

⁷ Email and phone interviews with researchers working with an NGO assisting displaced Rohingya civilians who wished to remain anonymous, 17 September 2017. According to the researchers, the mines were emplaced within Taung Pyo Let Yar village tract of Maungdaw township, adjacent to border pillar No. 31 in Bangladesh, an area that demarcates the beginning of the land border between Bangladesh and Myanmar. Researchers told Landmine Monitor that the landmine use continued over the following days, progressing northeast along the border within the townships of Mee Taik, Nga Yant Chaung, Hlaing Thi, Bauk Shu Hpweit, and In Tu Lar.

⁸ Krishna N Das, "Exclusive: Bangladesh protests over Myanmar's suspected landmine use near border," *Reuters*, 5 September 2017, bit.ly/ReutersBangladesh5Sep17; and Ananya Roy, "Bangladesh accuses Myanmar government of laying landmines near border," *International Business Times*, 6 September 2017, bit.ly/IBTlandmine6Sep17.

⁹ S. Bashu Das, "2 Rohingya children injured in landmine blast near Naikhongchhari border," *Dhaka Tribune*, 5 September 2017, bit.ly/Rohingyachildren5Sep17.

Amnesty International reported on 9 September that it had spoken to several eyewitnesses who said they saw Myanmar military forces, including military personnel and the Border Guard Police, using antipersonnel mines near Myanmar's border with Bangladesh.¹⁰ Human Rights Watch (HRW) reported on 23 September that military personnel had planted antipersonnel mines in northern Rakhine state prior to their attacks on predominantly Rohingya villages.¹¹ Rohingya refugees from Buthidaung and Rathedaung townships in Rakhine state told HRW that they saw the Burmese military laying antipersonnel mines on roads as the military entered and attacked villagers. Two other Rohingya refugees told HRW that men in apparent Myanmar military uniforms were seen in the northern part of Taung Pyo Let Yar performing some activity on the ground. One said that on 4 September he observed several soldiers from a patrol stop at least twice, kneel down on the ground, dig into the ground with a knife, and place a dark item into the earth. Both Amnesty International and HRW reviewed photos of the mines used along the Bangladesh border that clearly show PMN-1 type antipersonnel mines lying in the ground. Neither organization could determine if these mines were originally manufactured in the Soviet Union or copies of that mine made by Myanmar, named MM-2, or by China, named Type 58.

NSAGs in Myanmar also used antipersonnel mines in the reporting period. In June 2017, a local administrator in Tarlaw, Myitkyina township, Kachin state blamed the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) for landmines that had caused civilian casualties near the town as well as loss of livestock.¹² In January 2017, the Democratic Karen Benevolence Army (DKBA -Kyaw Htet) faction acknowledged that it had laid mines that injured two Myanmar Army soldiers in the Mae Tha Wor area of Hlaingbwe township in Kayin state.¹³ In November 2016, two members of the KIA were apprehended by government forces, and confessed to laying landmines near Labunkadaung village in Hpakan township. When the army took the KIA soldiers to the spot to defuse the mines they had laid, one exploded, killing both of them.¹⁴ In September and October 2016, mines were laid during armed conflict in Hlaingbwe township by a faction of the DKBA.¹⁵

Syria

In late 2011, the first reports emerged of Syrian government use of antipersonnel mines in the country's border areas.¹⁶ A Syrian official acknowledged the government had "undertaken many measures to control the borders, including planting mines."¹⁷

In January 2016, Doctors Without Borders (Medecins sans Frontieres, MSF) reported that Syrian government forces laid landmines around the town of Madaya in Rif Dimashq governorate, 10 kilometers from the Lebanon border. According to MSF, civilians trying to

10 Amnesty International, "Myanmar Army landmines along border with Bangladesh pose deadly threat to fleeing Rohingya," 9 September 2017, bit.ly/AIMyanmar9Sep17.

11 HRW, "Landmines Deadly for Fleeing Rohingya: Military Lays Internationally Banned Weapon," 23 September 2017, www.hrw.org/news/2017/09/23/burma-landmines-deadly-fleeing-rohingya.

12 Tun Lin Aung, "Landmines scare Myitkyina farmers," *Eleven Myanmar*, 2 June 2017, www.elevenmyanmar.com/local/9806.

13 Ye Mon and Ei Ei Thu, "Kayin landmine scare sparks tourism fears," *Myanmar Times*, 6 January 2017, www.mmmtimes.com/national-news/24435-explosion-reignites-landmine-fears.html.

14 "Landmine explosion kills two KIA troops," *Global New Light of Myanmar*, 29 November 2016, www.burmalibrary.org/docs23/GNLM2016-11-29-red.pdf.

15 Unpublished information provided to the Landmine Monitor by the Karen Human Rights Group, 6 September 2017. This DKBA faction has been referred to as DKBA #907, Kloh Htoo Baw (Golden Drum), and Brigade #5. Each of these terms refers to different configurations of DKBA units commanded by the brigadier general commonly known as Na Kha Mway, whose real name is Saw Lah Pwe. See also, "Landmine kills Kayin village head," *Eleven Myanmar*, 17 September 2016, www.elevenmyanmar.com/local/5972.

16 ICBL Press Release, "ICBL publicly condemns reports of Syrian forces laying mines," 2 November 2011, <http://www.icbl.org/en-gb/news-and-events/news/2011/syrian-forces-laying-mines.aspx>.

17 "Assad troops plant land mines on Syria-Lebanon border," *The Associated Press*, 1 November 2011, www.haaretz.com/news/middle-east/assad-troops-plant-land-mines-on-syria-lebanon-border-1.393200.

flee the city have been killed and injured by “bullets and landmines.”¹⁸ In October 2016, residents of Madaya claimed that the Lebanese armed group Hezbollah, operating together with Syrian government forces, laid antipersonnel mines around the town. A medical group and a media organization reported that “landmines” have been laid around the edge of the town.¹⁹

The non-state armed group Islamic State (IS) used landmines extensively in 2017, with the Syrian Network for Human Rights (SNHR) reporting 12 casualties in Raqqa governorate in just August and September, from incidents in Kasrat Srour,²⁰ Raqqa city,²¹ and Hneida.²² Syria’s state-run news agency reported in October that a photographer with Syrian state TV was killed in the central Homs province when a landmine left behind by IS militants exploded.²³

As IS retreated from former strongholds, it left behind improvised landmines and booby-traps in a last-ditch effort to kill civilians and government forces. The SNHR reported several incidents from mines that IS fighters likely laid, as the group controlled the territory for prolonged periods of time. For example, in Aleppo governorate alone, SNHR reported civilian casualties in August, September, and October 2016 from landmines that IS apparently laid in the villages of Najm,²⁴ Abu Qalqal,²⁵ Al Humar,²⁶ and Al Dadat.²⁷ In October 2017, a British citizen fighting with the Kurdish People’s Protection Units (YPG) was killed while clearing landmines in the abandoned Raqqa city.²⁸ Between September 2015 and January 2017, Mines Advisory Groups (MAG) cleared 7,500 improvised mines and other improvised devices from Iraq and Syria.²⁹

During a five-day investigation in Manbij in early October 2016, HRW collected the names of 69 civilians, including 19 children, killed by improvised mines, including booby-traps, laid by IS in schools, homes, and on roads during and after the fighting for control for the city, involving IS and the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF)—a coalition of Kurdish, Arab, and

18 MSF, “Syria: Siege and Starvation in Madaya,” 7 January 2016, www.doctorswithoutborders.org/article/syria-siege-and-starvation-madaya.

19 See, “Injured by one of 8,000 landmines in desperate escape bid, Madaya man faces double amputation,” *Syria Direct*, 5 October 2016, bit.ly/SyriaDirect5Oct2016; Syrian American Medical Association, “Madaya: Starvation Under Siege,” January 2016, p. 1, www.sams-usa.net/foundation/images/Report_Madaya_Starvation_Under_Siege.pdf; and Monitor email interview with Kristen Gillespie Demilio, Editor-in-Chief, *Syria Direct*, 7 October 2016.

20 SNHR, “Civilians killed in ISIS landmine planted by ISIS in Kasrat Srour village in Raqqa governorate on September 23,” 24 September 2017, bit.ly/SNHR24Sep17.

21 SNHR, “Civilians killed in ISIS’s landmine explosion in al Tayyar neighborhood in Raqqa city on September 14,” 16 September 2017, bit.ly/SNHR16Sep17; SNHR, “Children killed in ISIS’s landmine explosion in Raqqa city on August 14,” 15 August 2017, bit.ly/SNHR15Aug17; SNHR, “A mother and her son killed by ISIS landmine explosion in Raqqa city on August 7,” 8 August 2017, bit.ly/SNHR7Aug17; and SNHR, “Victims killed by ISIS landmine explosion near the southern entrance of Raqqa city on August 4,” 5 August 2017, bit.ly/SNHR5Aug17.

22 SNHR, “Aziz Ajjan killed in ISIS’s landmine explosion in Hneida village in Raqqa governorate on August 6,” 7 August 2017, bit.ly/Raqqa7Aug.

23 “IS land mine kills Syrian state TV photographer,” *Associated Press* (Beirut), 17 October 2017, www.foxnews.com/world/2017/10/10/latest-is-land-mine-kills-syrian-state-tv-photographer.html.

24 SNHR, “Children died in ISIS landmine explosion in Najm village in Aleppo governorate, August 23,” London, 23 August 2016, bit.ly/sn4hr23Aug2016.

25 SNHR, “Victims died due to ISIS landmine explosion in Abu Qalqal town in Aleppo governorate, September 2,” London, 2 September 2016, bit.ly/SNHR2Sep16.

26 SNHR, “Civilians died due to ISIS landmines explosion in Mazyounet Al Humar village in Aleppo governorate, September 21,” London, 21 September 2016, bit.ly/SNHR21Sep16.

27 SNHR, “Children died in ISIS landmine explosion in O’wn Al Dadat village in Aleppo governorate in October 4,” London, 4 October 2016, bit.ly/SNHR4Oct16.

28 Lizzie Dearden, “Jac Holmes: British man who volunteered to fight against Isis killed in Syria,” *The Independent*, 24 October 2017, bit.ly/IndependentJacHolmes.

29 Chris Loughran and Sean Sutton, “MAG: Clearing Improvised Landmines in Iraq,” *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Vol. 21, Issue 1, April 2017, <http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-journal/vol21/iss1/>.

other forces supported by the US government.³⁰ Nearly all the incidents HRW documented appeared to have been caused by improvised mines, rather than by explosives detonated by a vehicle or by remote-control.

USE BY NON-STATE ARMED GROUPS IN OTHER STATES NOT PARTY

Pakistan

In March 2017, Pakistan reconfirmed that antipersonnel mines, antivehicle mines, and IEDs have been used by NSAGs throughout the country.³¹ NSAGs in Balochistan and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa used antipersonnel landmines and victim-activated explosive devices during the reporting period. Pakistan's Parliamentary Committee on SAFRON (State and Frontier Regions) urged the government to establish a fund for the victims of landmine blasts. The committee expressed discontentment that at least 50 people have died and hundreds of others have been injured in landmine blasts in South Waziristan agency alone. It noted that according to a rough estimate, about 10,000 landmines are laying in the Mehsud inhabited area, which need to be removed before they claim further lives.³²

Use has been attributed to Tehrik Taliban Pakistan and Balochistan insurgent groups as well as clan feuds.³³ In April 2016, a representative of Pakistan told the Monitor that 14% of recovered IEDs used by militants in Pakistan are victim-activated. The explosive devices are victim-activated through pressure-plate and infra-red initiation. Sometimes these improvised antipersonnel mines are used as detonators for larger explosive devices, or one initiator will set off multiple explosive devices.³⁴

India

In July 2017, the Deputy Inspector General of Police in Chhatisgarh state informed the state news agency that "Pressure IEDs planted randomly inside the forests in unpredictable places, where frequent de-mining operations are not feasible, remain a challenge."³⁵ The use of these victim-activated improvised mines was attributed by the police to the Communist Party of India-Maoist (CPI-M) and its armed wing, the People's Liberation Guerrilla Army.³⁶ In September 2017, an elephant was killed after it stepped on a landmine attributed to the CPI-M in Jharkhand state.³⁷ In May 2017, India's Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF)

³⁰ HRW Press Release, "Syria: Improvised Mines Kill, Injure Hundreds in Manbij," 26 October 2016, www.hrw.org/news/2016/10/26/syria-improvised-mines-kill-injure-hundreds-manbij.

³¹ CCW Amended Protocol II Article 13 Report, Form B, 31 March 2017, bit.ly/PakCCWII2017.

³² Email from Raza Shah Khan, Executive Director, Sustainable Peace and Development Organization (SPADO), 21 September 2017. He noted that media outreach and humanitarian response is very limited in South Waziristan but it has been confirmed that the local communities have carried out some other protests requesting the authorities to take immediate measures to clear the areas from landmines and ERW and provide support to the landmine victims.

³³ Email from Raza Shah Khan, SPADO, 21 September 2017.

³⁴ Presentation given by Pakistani delegation to the CCW Amended Protocol II Meeting of Experts, 6 April 2016, bit.ly/PakistanCCW6Apr2016; and Landmine Monitor interview with Pakistani delegation to the CCW Amended Protocol II Meeting of Experts, Geneva, 8 April 2016.

³⁵ Tikeshwar Patel, "IEDs pose huge challenge in efforts to counter Naxals: police," *Press Trust of India*, 24 July 2017, www.ptinews.com/news/8915393_IEDs-pose-huge-challenge-in-efforts-to-counter-Naxals--police.

³⁶ The CPI-M and a few other smaller groups are often referred to collectively as Naxalites. The Maoists also have a People's Militia with part-time combatants with minimal training and unsophisticated weapons.

³⁷ A.S.R.P. Mukesh, "Blast in tiger turf kills tusker," *The Telegraph*, 21 September 2017, www.telegraphindia.com/1170922/jsp/frontpage/story_174397.jsp.

recovered a cache of 53 landmines, in Jharkhand state and in December 2016, the CRPF recovered another cache of 120 landmines, also in Jharkhand state.³⁸

USE BY NON-STATE ARMED GROUPS IN STATES PARTIES

Afghanistan

Use of improvised mines and other IEDs by anti-government elements in 2016 and 2017 resulted in further casualties. In June, Afghanistan informed States Parties that new use of pressure-plate improvised mines, which are causing approximately 60 deaths a month, was adding to their clearance burden and making it hard to meet their Article 5 obligations.³⁹ There have been no reports of antipersonnel mine use by coalition or Afghan national forces.

The use of improvised mines in Afghanistan is mainly attributed to the Taliban, Haqqani Network, and IS. The UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) reported that anti-government forces used victim-activated improvised mines in decreasing numbers throughout 2016 and the first half of 2017. However, UNAMA also reported that use of pressure-plate improvised mines⁴⁰ substantially contributed to the increases in both woman and child casualties and a 42% increase in civilian deaths by improvised mines compared to the same period in 2016.⁴¹



A Valmara 69 mine in a mine field dating back to the 1980s outside Basra, Iraq.

© Noe Falk Nielsen/Danish Demining Group, May 2017

Iraq

While there were not any reports of use of antipersonnel mines by government forces or its international coalition partners, IS forces fighting the government of Iraq have used improvised landmines, other types of IEDs, and victim-activated booby-traps extensively since 2014.⁴²

IS continued its extensive use of improvised landmines into 2017. In Mosul, scores of civilians were killed by improvised mines while attempting to flee fighting between IS and Iraqi Federal Police units.⁴³ The group has also planted improvised mines around mass graves, in an effort to kill investigative journalists and aid workers.⁴⁴ As IS continues to lose ground in Iraq, it consistently leaves improvised mines

³⁸ “Over 50 landmines recovered in Jharkhand,” *Statesman*, 16 May 2017, www.thestatesman.com/cities/over-50-landmines-recovered-in-jharkhand-1494065802.html; and “120 land mines found in Latehar forest,” *Times of India*, 12 December 2016, bit.ly/landminesLatehar.

³⁹ Statement of Afghanistan, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Session on Clearance, Geneva, 8–9 June 2017, bit.ly/AfgClearanceInt2017.

⁴⁰ A pressure plate is a method for triggering a detonation of an explosive device by the pressure exerted by the weight of a person or a vehicle. If the device is capable of being triggered by the presence, proximity, or activity of a human being, it is banned under the Mine Ban Treaty.

⁴¹ UNAMA, “Afghanistan: Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict mid-year report 2017,” Kabul, July 2017, p. 5, bit.ly/UNAMAAfgmid2017.

⁴² See, for example, “ISIS’s latest threat: laying landmines,” *IRIN*, 6 November 2014, www.irinnews.org/news/2014/11/06/isis-s-latest-threat-laying-landmines; and Mike Giglio, “The Hidden Enemy in Iraq,” *Buzzfeed*, 19 March 2015, bit.ly/HiddenEnemyIraq.

⁴³ Kareem Khadder, Ingrid Formanek, and Laura Smith-Spark, “Mosul battle: Civilians killed by landmines as they flee, police say,” *CNN*, 25 February 2017, www.cnn.com/2017/02/25/middleeast/western-mosul-offensive/index.html.

⁴⁴ Lizzie Dearden, “Isis rigs mass grave with landmines to kill journalists and war crime investigators,” *The Independent*, 1 March 2017, bit.ly/ISISrigsgraves.

and booby-traps behind as it retreats.⁴⁵ Between September 2015 and January 2017, MAG cleared 7,500 improvised mines and other improvised devices from Iraq and Syria.⁴⁶

Nigeria

Boko Haram militants have allegedly been laying unspecified types of landmines and victim-activated IEDs in Nigeria since mid-2014.⁴⁷ In both 2016 and early 2017, UNMAS identified ongoing extensive use of improvised mines by the Boko Haram group in northern areas of Nigeria. UNMAS also received reports of possible use of factory-made antipersonnel mines.⁴⁸ A number of incidents occurred apparently from the use improvised mines. On 21 August 2017, at least two Nigerian cattle farmers were killed and three severely injured when they stepped on a landmine while traveling to Biu, Borno state. The civilians were apparently attempting to flee a Boko Haram ambush, and were running across fields when they triggered the landmine, allegedly planted by the insurgents.⁴⁹

Ukraine

Landmine Monitor has received no information that Ukrainian government forces have used antipersonnel mines in violation of the Mine Ban Treaty in 2016–2017.⁵⁰ Since 2014, the government of Ukraine has stated that it has not used antipersonnel mines in the conflict and has accused Russian-supported forces of laying landmines in Ukraine.⁵¹ In December 2014, Ukrainian government officials stated that “no banned weapons” had been used in the “Anti-Terrorist Operations Zone” by Ukrainian armed forces or forces associated with them, such as volunteer battalions.⁵²

There is significant evidence present at different locations that antipersonnel mines of Soviet-origin with production markings from the 1980s as well as antipersonnel mines with production markings from the 2000s, indicating Russian origin, are available.⁵³

⁴⁵ “Islamic State is losing land but leaving mines behind,” *The Economist*, 30 March 2017, bit.ly/ISleavesmines.

⁴⁶ Chris Loughran and Sean Sutton, “MAG: Clearing Improvised Landmines in Iraq,” *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Vol. 21, Issue 1, April 2017, <http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-journal/vol21/iss1/>.

⁴⁷ See, for example, “Five killed in Boko Haram mine blast, ambush,” *Vanguard*, 21 June 2017, www.vanguardngr.com/2017/06/five-killed-boko-haram-mine-blast-ambush/.

⁴⁸ UNMAS, “Mission Report: UNMAS Explosive Threat Scoping Mission to Nigeria, 3 to 14 April 2017,” p. 2.

⁴⁹ “Au moins deux morts dans l’explosion d’une mine anti-personnelle au Nigeria,” *Voice of America*, 21 August 2017, bit.ly/VOANigeria21Aug17.

⁵⁰ Russia stated in October 2017, “We note with great regret that the information on alleged violations of Ottawa Convention is not verified at all. As we can see with regard to events in Ukraine the UN Secretary General investigation mechanism envisaged by Ottawa Convention remains inactive. Moreover, at the 2015-2016 State Parties meetings no one even tried to question Kiev’s compliance with Ottawa Convention during the civil war that it unleashed in the South-East of the country.” Statement by Vladimir Yermakov, UNGA First Committee Debate on Conventional Weapons, New York, 20 October 2017, http://reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/1com/1com17/statements/20Oct_Russia.pdf.

⁵¹ Submission of Ukraine, Mine Ban Treaty Third Review Conference, Maputo, Mozambique, 18 June 2014, www.maputoreviewconference.org/fileadmin/APMBC-RC3/3RC-Ukraine-information.pdf; and statement of Ukraine, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Cooperative Compliance, Geneva, 26 June 2015, bit.ly/Ukraine26June2015.

⁵² In February 2016, Ukraine stated that “its Armed Forces are authorized to use mines in command-detonate mode, which is not prohibited under the Convention. All mines planted in command-detonate mode are recorded, secured and access is restricted.” “Report and Preliminary Observations Committee On Cooperative Compliance (Algeria, Canada, Chile, Peru and Sweden), 2016 Intersessional Meetings,” May 2016, p. 4, bit.ly/MBTComplianceMay2016. The Military Prosecutor confirmed to HRW that an assessment had been undertaken to ensure that stockpiled KSF-1 and KSF-1S cartridges containing PFM-1 antipersonnel mines, BKF-PFM-1 cartridges with PFM-1S antipersonnel mines, and 9M27K3 rockets with PFM-1S antipersonnel mines are not operational, but rather destined for destruction in accordance with the Mine Ban Treaty.

⁵³ Evidence of markings from 2003: Security Service of the Ukraine, “SBU reveals three hidings with ammunition and Russian mine in ATO area,” 15 November 2016, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/2256-.cuYxfDr2.dpbs>. Markings from 2010: Ukrainian Military TV, “Докази присутності російських військ на Донбасі,” YouTube.com, 1 March 2017, www.youtube.com/watch?v=QfA7c4iBBLU.

Ukrainian armed forces and the security services continue to confiscate caches of antipersonnel landmines along the front line, including MON-50 directional mines,⁵⁴ MON-90 directional mines,⁵⁵ PMN-1 and PMN-2 blast mines,⁵⁶ and POM-2 scatterable mines.⁵⁷ Ukrainian soldiers were killed or wounded by antipersonnel mines in 2017 on 2 October, 11 August, 15 July, and on 9 May.⁵⁸ In September 2016, Ukraine's Department of Defense Intelligence reported that separatists had laid POM-2 antipersonnel mines.⁵⁹ Later that month, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine reported the presence of antivehicle and antipersonnel mines that it said were preventing the SMM representatives from traveling from Pervomaïsk toward Zolote, between Mykolaiv province and Luhansk province.⁶⁰ In April 2017, an international OSCE observer was killed and two others injured by an antivehicle mine in Luhansk region.⁶¹

Yemen

Due to the extremely limited access to the country, it is not clear if antipersonnel landmines were used in Yemen in 2017. However, new use was recorded during late 2016 and in previous years.

In April 2017, HRW reported evidence of new use of antipersonnel mines in the

-
- 54 Ukrainian Military TV, "Докази присутності російських військ на Донбасі," YouTube.com, 1 March 2017, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QfA7c4iBBLU>; Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU reveals 2 Russian mines in ATO area," 2 May 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3281-.BFgZrg1s.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU seizes landmines produced in Russia in the ATO area," 25 April 2017, www.ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/21/view/3227-.o3KKyH3U.dpbs; and Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU reveals cache with explosives in ATO area," 16 January 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/2553#.gDmJqCLm.dpbs>.
- 55 Security Service of Ukraine, "СБУ виявила дві схованки зі зброєю та боєприпасами у районі проведення АТО," 30 August 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/ua/news/1/category/1/view/3842#.ihBWxsxc.dpbs>.
- 56 "A stockpile of antipersonnel mines retrieved from a separatist storage position," Instagram Post by bring_me_the_swampy, 23 September 2017, www.instagram.com/p/BZZlg4_nnDx/?taken-by=bring_me_the_swampy; Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU reveals cache with mines, explosives and anti-tank grenade launchers in ATO area," 27 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3253-.FR2O7p8Y.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU seizes ammunitions of Russian origin in the ATO area," 11 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3146-.Kz15RzRS.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU records militants using weapons of Russian production," 1 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3085-.xM1gyOfw.dpbs>; and Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU reveals prohibited mines in ATO area that are in operational service with Russian army," 16 May 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3354#.lejPDIBG.dpbs>.
- 57 Swampy, "Clearance around forward positions," Beyond the Borders, 27 October 2017, <https://swampy.freq.wtf/2017/10/27/3672/>. Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU prevents terrorist attacks prepared by Russian secret services in Mariupol," 17 August 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3793-.tidSa5nz.dpbs>. Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU deactivates mine of Russian production in ATO area," 26 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3236-.GCLfhJGT.dpbs>. Security Service of Ukraine, "SBU reveals three hidings with ammunition and Russian mine in ATO area," 15 November 2016, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/2256#.lyvz95Vv.dpbs>.
- 58 One killed in action (KIA) by OZM-72 mine in Bohdanivka, Mariupol: "Ministry of Defense: Russian sniper unit was deployed near Zaitseve," *Ukrainian Crisis Media Center*, 2 October 2017, <http://uacrisis.org/60925-polkovnyk-motuzanyk-7>; Three wounded and one killed in action by antipersonnel mines in Avdiivka and Zaitseve, Donetsk Oblast: "Зведення прес-центру штабу АТО" ("Briefing of the press center of the ATO headquarters"), *ATO Press Center*, 11 August 2017; One killed in action by antipersonnel mine in Shyrokyne, Mariupol: "Боєць з великої літери," *Five News*, 18 July 2017, www.5.ua/regiony/boiets-z-velykoi-litery-dobrovoltzia-z-57i-bryhady-zsu-provely-v-ostanniu-put-150581.html; One wounded by PMN-2 mine: Photos added to Facebook, by Vasyl Sakovets, Facebook, 15 June 2017, www.facebook.com/vasil.sakovets/posts/1350466698400599?aid=13P92Y.wghot.
- 59 Ukraine Crisis Media Center, "Most militant attacks - in Mariupol direction - Col. Andriy Lysenko," 3 September 2016, <http://uacrisis.org/ua/46719-lisenko-20>.
- 60 "Latest from OSCE Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine, based on information received as of 19:30, 26 September 2016," OSCE SMM to Ukraine, Kiev, 27 September 2016, www.osce.org/ukraine-smm/268961.
- 61 "Landmine blast kills OSCE observer in Ukraine," *Al Jazeera*, 23 April 2017, www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/04/land-blast-kills-osce-observer-ukraine-170423125142890.html.

governorates of Aden, Marib, Sanaa, and Taizz in 2015–2016.⁶² It attributed responsibility for this mine use to Houthi forces and forces loyal to former President Ali Abdullah Saleh. In September 2016, HRW reported Houthi-Saleh forces' use of antipersonnel mines in Aden, Abyan, Marib, Lahj, and Taizz governorates in 2015–2016.⁶³

HRW also reported that the Islamist armed group Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), which is also a party to the conflict, used antipersonnel mines in Yemen in 2016.⁶⁴

On 2 April 2017, Yemen's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is controlled by the Houthis and Saleh's General People's Congress Party, denied that Houthi-Saleh forces had used antipersonnel landmines, affirming the Sanaa-based authorities are "vigilant in abiding by [their] commitments" under the Mine Ban Treaty.⁶⁵

In early 2017, a UN Panel of Experts on Yemen reported that Houthi-Saleh forces have used victim-activated IEDs that deployed antivehicle mines as the main charge in Taizz.⁶⁶ Antivehicle landmines claimed casualties in Bayda governorate in October 2017 and Jawf governorate in April 2017, but it is unclear when those mines were laid.⁶⁷

A joint operation by a coalition of states led by Saudi Arabia against Houthi forces in Yemen was continuing as of October 2017. Although there is evidence of use of cluster munitions by members of this coalition, there has been no evidence to suggest that members of the Saudi Arabia-led coalition have used landmines in Yemen.

Allegations of new use and other reports

Landmine Monitor has also recorded allegations and other reports of new mine use by NSAGs in States Parties Cameroon, Chad, Mali, Niger, Philippines, and Tunisia, as well as states not party Iran and Saudi Arabia. The Monitor cannot confirm use in any of these instances.

Various media outlets have continued to report new "landmine" use by Boko Haram militants in **Chad** and **Niger**.⁶⁸ Landmine Monitor has not confirmed the nature of the devices used or the circumstances of the allegations.

⁶² HRW, "Yemen: Houthi-Saleh Forces Using Landmines," 20 April 2017, www.hrw.org/news/2017/04/20/yemen-houthi-saleh-forces-using-landmines.

⁶³ HRW, "Yemen: Houthi Landmines Claim Civilian Victims," 8 September 2016, www.hrw.org/news/2016/09/08/yemen-houthi-landmines-claim-civilian-victims; HRW, "Yemen: New Houthi Landmine Use," 18 November 2015, www.hrw.org/news/2015/11/18/yemen-new-houthi-landmine-use; and HRW, "Yemen: Houthis Used Landmines in Aden," 5 September 2015, www.hrw.org/news/2015/09/05/yemen-houthis-used-landmines-aden.

⁶⁴ HRW, "Yemen: Houthi-Saleh Forces Using Landmines," 20 April 2017, www.hrw.org/news/2017/04/20/yemen-houthi-saleh-forces-using-landmines.

⁶⁵ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Yemen response in letter to HRW, 2 April 2017, bit.ly/YemenHRW2Apr2017.

⁶⁶ HRW, "Yemen: Houthi-Saleh Forces Using Landmines," 20 April 2017, www.hrw.org/news/2017/04/20/yemen-houthi-saleh-forces-using-landmines.

⁶⁷ Ali Owaida, "Landmine explosion kills 4 troops in central Yemen," *Anadolu Agency*, 18 October 2017, <http://aa.com.tr/en/middle-east/landmine-explosion-kills-4-troops-in-central-yemen/940837>; and "Landmine explosion kills 2 soldiers in Yemen's north," *Anadolu Agency*, 30 April 2017, <http://aa.com.tr/en/middle-east/landmine-explosion-kills-2-soldiers-in-yemens-north/808574>.

⁶⁸ "Landmine Explosion Kills 6 Soldiers at Niger-Nigerian Border," *Africa News*, 8 January 2016, www.africanews.com/2016/01/18/landmine-explosion-kills-6-soldiers-at-niger-nigerian-border/; Edwin Kindzeka Moki, "Boko Haram Land Mine Kills 2 in Cameroon Military Convoy," *The Daily Mail*, 15 February 2016, www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/ap/article-3447888/Boko-Haram-land-kills-2-Cameroon-military-convoy.html; Edwin Kindzeka Moki, "Cameroon Vigilantes Hunt for Boko Haram Landmines," *Voice of America News*, 4 March 2016, www.voanews.com/a/cameroon-vigilantes-hunt-for-boko-haram-landmines/3219444.html; "Fighting Boko Haram: Landmine seriously injures 3 Cameroonian service men," *Cameroon Concord*, 8 June 2016, bit.ly/CameroonConcord8Jun2016; "Boko Haram landmine kills four Chadian soldiers," *Reuters*, 27 August 2016, www.reuters.com/article/us-nigeria-security-chad-idUSKCN1120KY; and "Boko Haram Landmines Inflict Heavy Toll on Cameroon," *Latin America Herald Tribune*, 29 June 2016, www.laht.com/article.asp?ArticleId=2415012&CategoryId=12395. Niger has not filed an updated Article 7 report since 2012, but noted in an Article 5 extension request of March 2016 that new contamination by Boko Haram had occurred. Chad submitted an annual Article 7 report in March 2016, but did not include any information on new contamination. Cameroon has not filed an updated Article 7 report since 2009 and has provided no official information to States Parties on any new contamination.

In **Cameroon**, allegations of use by Boko Haram of improvised antipersonnel mines have been reported in the northern extreme of the country where it shares borders with Nigeria and Chad. Boko Haram has been documented to manufacture and use improvised antipersonnel mines across the border in Nigeria. In 2015, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported the presence of landmines in Cameroon's Fotokol and Mayo Moskota, both in Logone et Chari department.⁶⁹ In 2016 and early 2017, UNMAS identified use of improvised mines by Boko Haram in northern Cameroon, but did not indicate if these were antipersonnel mines or antivehicle mines.⁷⁰

In August 2016 in **Libya**, an allegation surfaced that IS militants laid landmines sometime prior to being forced out of Derna in eastern Libya in mid-2015. The Monitor is not in a position to verify the allegation.⁷¹ According to media reports, IS militants laid landmines and victim-activated explosive devices around Sirte.⁷²

In **Mali**, 39 casualties were reported to be caused by improvised mines being detonated by vehicles. Handicap International indicates that these devices, equipped with a pressure-plate initiating mechanism, could be activated upon contact or by the weight of a person. However, they have only been reported to be activated by either vehicles or command detonation.⁷³

In the **Philippines**, in May 2017, the Philippines Army was engaged in armed conflict with an Islamist armed group in Marawi,⁷⁴ Mindanao, who reportedly used improvised mines resulting in casualties.⁷⁵ There have also been periodic reports of improvised mine use by Abu Sayyaf.⁷⁶ In 2017, the Monitor was provided a technical drawing of New People's Army/Communist Party of the Philippines command-detonated landmines fitted with an antihandling device that can be turned on or off manually.⁷⁷

In **Tunisia**, NSAGs in Jebel Al-Cha'anby in Qsrein Wilaya/Kasserine governorate near the Algerian border have allegedly laid improvised antipersonnel mines. The Monitor could not independently confirm this. Casualties of improvised mines sometimes referred to as "landmines" continued to be reported in 2016 and early 2017.⁷⁸

Saudi Arabia has reported that soldiers have been injured by landmines on its border with Yemen. In 2016 and 2017, reports of mine use and seizures have occurred in Aseer

⁶⁹ UNHCR/International Organization for Migration (IOM), "Cameroon: Far North – Displaced Population Profiling," 19 May 2015, bit.ly/UNCHRCameroon19May15.

⁷⁰ UNMAS, "Mission Report: UNMAS Explosive Hazard Mitigation Response in Cameroon 9 January – 13 April 2017," p. 11.

⁷¹ See, "Senior leader in Derna Shura Council killed by an ISIS landmine in Al-Heela," *Libyan Express*, 1 August 2016, bit.ly/LibyaSnrLeader1Aug16.

⁷² See, Lewis, A., "Libya forces de-mine and clear Sirte after liberation from Isis militants," *The Independent*, 11 August 2016, bit.ly/DemineSirte11Aug16; Sudarsan Raghavan, "Even with U.S. airstrikes, a struggle to oust ISIS from Libyan stronghold," *Washington Post*, 7 August 2016, bit.ly/OustISILibya7Aug17; and "A Sirte girl undergoes a massive 17-hour operation for landmine injuries," *The Libya Observer*, 29 May 2016, bit.ly/SirteGirlLandmine.

⁷³ Email from Maddalena Malgarini, Technical Protection Coordinator, Handicap International-Mali, 26 September 2017.

⁷⁴ The group is most commonly referred to as the "Muata group," but also has been known as Dawlah Islamiya and the Islamic State of Lanao, and is reported to be comprised of former MILF guerrillas and some foreign militants.

⁷⁵ See, "AFP: 2 soldiers lost legs after tripping on land mines in Marawi," *GMA News*, 18 August 2017, bit.ly/AFPlandminesMarawi; and "Snipers, land mines delay liberation of Marawi City," *Business Mirror*, 26 June 2017, <http://businessmirror.com.ph/snipers-land-mines-delay-liberation-of-marawi-city/>.

⁷⁶ Bong Garcia, "Bomb explosion kills farm owner in Basilan," *SunStar Zamboanga*, 20 March 2017, www.sunstar.com.ph/zamboanga/local-news/2017/03/20/bomb-explosion-kills-farm-owner-basilan-531939.

⁷⁷ Technical drawings of "New People's Army (NPA) Improvised Remote Firing Switch with integral anti-lift device" based on a device recovered by Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD) in June 2015 in Sarangani province, Mindanao. Provided to the Monitor by email, 9 September 2017.

⁷⁸ See, for example, "Tunisia landmine blasts kills shepherdess," *News24 (AFP)*, 17 June 2017, www.news24.com/Africa/News/tunisia-landmine-blasts-kills-shepherdess-20170616.

and Jazan provinces. Saudi Arabia has blamed Houthi forces as well as smugglers for using antipersonnel mines.⁷⁹

STOCKPILES OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES POSSESSED BY STATES NOT PARTY AND NON-STATE ARMED GROUPS

The Monitor estimates that as many as 31 of the 35 states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty stockpile antipersonnel landmines. In 1999, the Monitor estimated that, collectively, states not party stockpiled about 160 million antipersonnel mines, but today the global total may be less than 50 million.⁸⁰

It is unclear if all 31 states are currently stockpiling antipersonnel mines. Officials from the UAE have provided contradictory information regarding its possession of stocks, while Bahrain and Morocco have stated that they have only small stockpiles used solely for training purposes in clearance and detection techniques.

Three states not party, all in the Pacific, have said that they do not stockpile antipersonnel mines: Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Tonga. In its 2012 voluntary transparency report, Palestine stated that it does not possess a stockpile of antipersonnel mines, and it does not retain any mines for training purposes.

States not party to the Mine Ban Treaty routinely destroy stockpiled antipersonnel mines as an element of ammunition management programs and the phasing out of obsolete munitions. In recent years, such stockpile destruction has been reported in China, Israel, Mongolia, Pakistan, Russia, the US, and Vietnam.

NON-STATE ARMED GROUPS

Fewer NSAGs appear to be able to obtain factory-made antipersonnel mines now that production and transfers have largely halted under the Mine Ban Treaty. Some NSAGs in states not party have acquired landmines by stealing them from government stocks, purchasing

Largest stockpilers of antipersonnel mines

Russia	26.5 million
Pakistan	estimated 6 million
India	estimated 4–5 million
China	“less than” 5 million
US	3 million
Total	45 million

States not party that likely have stockpiled antipersonnel mines

Armenia	Korea, North	Pakistan
Azerbaijan	Korea, South	Russia
Bahrain	Kyrgyzstan	Saudi Arabia
China	Lao PDR	Singapore
Cuba	Lebanon	Sri Lanka
Egypt	Libya	Syria
Georgia	Mongolia	UAE
India	Morocco	US
Iran	Myanmar	Uzbekistan
Israel	Nepal	Vietnam
Kazakhstan		

⁷⁹ See, “Saudi soldier killed by landmine near Yemen border,” *Middle East Online*, 9 December 2016, www.middle-east-online.com/english/?id=80238; and Mohammed Al-Sulami, “Saudi Border Guards stops efforts to plant land mines, smuggle weapons in southern Kingdom,” *Arab News*, 20 March 2017, www.arabnews.com/node/1071011/saudi-arabia#photo/7.

⁸⁰ In 2014, China informed Landmine Monitor that its stockpile is “less than” five million, but there is an amount of uncertainty about the method China uses to derive this figure. For example, it is not known whether antipersonnel mines contained in remotely-delivered systems, so-called “scatterable” mines, are counted individually or as just the container, which can hold numerous individual mines. Previously, China was estimated to have 110 million antipersonnel mines in stockpile.

them from corrupt officials, or removing them from minefields. Most appear to make their own improvised landmines from locally available materials.

During this reporting period, NSAGs and criminal groups in Afghanistan, India, Iraq, Libya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen, and Western Sahara were reported to possess stocks of factory-made antipersonnel mines or components to manufacture improvised landmines. The Monitor largely relies on reports of seizures by government forces, reports of significant use, or verified photographic evidence from journalists to identify NSAGs possessing mine stockpiles.

PRODUCTION OF ANTIPERSONNEL MINES

More than 50 states produced antipersonnel mines at some point in the past.⁸¹ Forty-one states have ceased production of antipersonnel mines, including four that are not party to the Mine Ban Treaty: Egypt, Israel, Nepal, and the US.⁸²

In November 2015, Singapore Technologies Engineering announced that it had ceased production of antipersonnel mines and published the decision on its website in a section entitled “Sustainability Governance.”⁸³ In a letter to PAX, a Dutch NGO, the company’s President Tan Pheng Hock stated, “ST Engineering is now no longer in the business of designing, producing and selling of anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions or any related key components.”⁸⁴ The Monitor will continue to list Singapore as a producer until the government formally commits to no future production. Singapore already observes an indefinite export moratorium.

The Monitor identifies 11 states as producers of antipersonnel mines, unchanged from the previous report: China, Cuba, India, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and Vietnam. Most of these countries are not believed to be actively producing mines but reserve the right to do so. Those most likely to be actively producing are India, Myanmar, Pakistan, and South Korea.

Production of antipersonnel mines by India appeared to be ongoing in 2016 and 2017. Purchase order records retrieved from a publicly accessible online government transaction database list at least a dozen private companies providing components of M-16, M-14, and APER 1B antipersonnel mines to the Indian Ordnance Factories in late 2016 and throughout 2017.⁸⁵ Components were produced under these contracts and supplied to the Ammunition

⁸¹ There are 51 confirmed current and past producers. Not included in that total are five States Parties that some sources have cited as past producers, but who deny it: Croatia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Thailand, and Venezuela. It is also unclear if Syria has produced antipersonnel mines.

⁸² Additionally, Taiwan passed legislation banning production in June 2006. The 36 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty that once produced antipersonnel mines are Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, BiH, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uganda, the UK, and Zimbabwe.

⁸³ See the Singapore Technologies Engineering 2015 annual report, www.stengg.com/media/30108/st-engineering-annual-report-2015.pdf. See also, Stop Explosive Investments, “Singapore Technologies Engineering stops production of cluster munitions,” 18 November 2015, bit.ly/STE18Nov2015. Investors received similar letters; and Local Authority Pension Fund Forum, “ST Engineering Quits Cluster Munitions,” 18 November 2015, www.lapfforum.org/wp-content/press/files/20151118SingaporeTechnologiespressreleasefinal.pdf.

⁸⁴ Letter to PAX from Tan Pheng Hock, President and Chief Executive Officer, Singapore Technologies Engineering Ltd, 11 November 2015.

⁸⁵ Landmine Monitor compiled a listing of “current contracts” showing who the contract was awarded to, and which companies applied for consideration, the number of units, cost and total cost and when it is to be delivered by plus other information. Indian Ordnance Factories website (accessed 9 November 2017), <http://ofb.gov.in/index.php?wh=purchaseorders&lang=en>. All current contracts are with one of two Indian Ordnance Factories located in Maharashtra state, where the mines are assembled with components from private companies. Presumably they produce and add the explosive charge here, as no vendor provides more than fuzes, bodies, and other parts.

Factory Khadki and Ordnance Factory Chandrapur, both in Maharashtra state.⁸⁶ In February 2017, a private Indian arms manufacturer had components for bounding fragmentation antipersonnel landmines listed within their sales catalogue on display at the IDEX military trade event in Abu Dhabi.⁸⁷

NSAGs in countries including Afghanistan, Cameroon, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Syria make antipersonnel mines. MAG reported in November 2016 that IS produced near factory quality improvised mines on a large scale.⁸⁸

TRANSFERS OF ANTIPERSONNEL MINES

A *de facto* global ban on the transfer of antipersonnel mines has been in effect since the mid-1990s. This ban is attributable to the mine ban movement and the stigma attached to antipersonnel mines.

Landmine Monitor has never conclusively documented any state-to-state transfers of antipersonnel mines since it began publishing annually in 1999. However, the use of factory-produced antipersonnel mines in conflicts in Ukraine and Yemen, where declared stockpiles had been destroyed, indicates that some transfers, either internally among actors or from sources external to the country, are occurring.

Three types of antipersonnel mines produced in the 1980s have been used in Yemen since 2013: PPM-2 mines, GYATA-64 mines, and Bulgarian-made PSM-1 bounding fragmentation mines. None of these mines were among the four types of antipersonnel mines that Yemen reported stockpiling in the past. This indicates that Yemen's 2002 declaration to the UN Secretary-General on the completion of landmine stockpile destruction was incorrect or incomplete, or that these mines were acquired from another source after 2002. In a September 2016 letter, Yemen's Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Sanaa, controlled by the Houthis and the General People's Congress, said that individuals had smuggled weapons, including landmines, into Yemen in recent years, noting that the current government had not been able to control its land or sea borders due to instability and fighting.⁸⁹

The State Security Service of Ukraine reported seizing and recovering antipersonnel mines from Russian-backed separatists during 2016, including 24 MON-series directional fragmentation munitions, five OZM-72 bounding fragmentation mines, and one PMN-2 blast mine.⁹⁰ In 2017, Ukrainian authorities continue to confiscate caches of antipersonnel mines,

⁸⁶ The following companies were listed as having concluded contract listed for production of components of antipersonnel mines on the Indian Ordnance Factories Purchase Orders between October 2016 and November 2017: Sheth & Co., Supreme Industries Ltd., Pratap Brothers, Brahm Steel Industries, M/s Lords Vanjya Pvt. Ltd., Sandeep Metalkraft Pvt Ltd., Milan Steel, Prakash Machine Tools, Sewa Enterprises, Naveen Tools Mfg. Co. Pvt. Ltd., Shyam Udyog, and Dhruv Containers Pvt. Ltd. In addition the following companies had established contracts for the manufacture of mine components: Ashoka Industries, Alcast, Nityanand Udyog Pvt. Ltd., Miltech Industries, Asha Industries, and Sneh Engineering Works. Mine types indicated were either M-16, M-14, APERS 1B, or "APM" mines, <http://ofbindia.gov.in/index.php?wh=purchaseorders&lang=en>. From searching the Indian Ordnance Factories website, http://ofb.gov.in/vendor/general_reports/show/registered_vendors/820 (accessed 8 November 2017).

⁸⁷ Ashoka Manufacturing Limited, Marketing Brochure, undated, <http://ashokagroup.net/brochures/defence.pdf>. Brochure was observed on display at IDEX by Omega Research in February 2017. Email from Omega Research, 7 November 2017.

⁸⁸ MAG Policy Brief, "Humanitarian Response, Improvised Landmines and IEDs: Policy issues for principled mine action," November 2016, www.maginternational.org/download/587908d82414d/.

⁸⁹ Letter to HRW from Yemen's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 7 September 2016, www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/supporting_resources/yemeni_mofa_response_to_hrw_landmines_sept_7_2016.pdf.

⁹⁰ All data taken from State Security Service of Ukraine website for 2016, starting at <https://ssu.gov.ua/ua/news/27/category/21> and working backwards in time.

including MON-50 directional mines,⁹¹ MON-90 directional mines,⁹² PMN-1 and PMN-2 blast mines,⁹³ and POM-2 scatterable mines.⁹⁴ Ukraine completed its destruction of stockpiled PMN mines in 2003; other mine types are possessed by Russia, Ukraine, and any number of successor states of the Soviet Union.

At least nine states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty, including six landmine producers, have enacted formal moratoriums on the export of antipersonnel mines: China, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and the US. Other past exporters have made statements declaring that they have stopped exporting, including Cuba and Vietnam. Iran also claims to have stopped exporting in 1997, despite evidence to the contrary.⁹⁵

In February 2017, the Egyptian Ministry of Military Production advertised “Heliopolis plastic antipersonnel landmines” for sale at its display at the IDEX arms fair in Abu Dhabi.⁹⁶ Egyptian authorities did not respond to a June 2017 request by the Monitor for further information regarding the apparent change in policy on export, and possibly production, indicated by the IDEX sales brochure. In December 2012, Egypt said that it “imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines in 1980.”⁹⁷

UNIVERSALIZING THE LANDMINE BAN

Since the Mine Ban Treaty entered into force on 1 March 1999, states that had not signed it by then may no longer sign and ratify the treaty but must accede, a process that essentially

-
- ⁹¹ Ukrainian Military TV, “Докази присутності російських військ на Донбасі,” YouTube.com, 1 March 2017, www.youtube.com/watch?v=QfA7c4iBBU; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU reveals 2 Russian mines in ATO area,” 2 May 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3281#.BFgZrg1s.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU seizes landmines produced in Russia in the ATO area,” 25 April 2017, <https://www.ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/21/view/3227#.o3KKyH3U.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU reveals cache with explosives in ATO area,” 16 January 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/2553#.gDmJqCLm.dpbs>;
- ⁹² Security Service of Ukraine, “СБУ виявила дві схованки зі зброєю та боєприпасами у районі проведення АТО,” 30 August 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/ua/news/1/category/1/view/3842#.ihBWxsxc.dpbs>.
- ⁹³ Swampy, “Clearance around forward positions,” Beyond the Borders, 27 October 2017, <http://swampy.freq.wtf/2017/10/27/3672/>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU reveals cache with mines, explosives and anti-tank grenade launchers in ATO area,” 27 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3253#.FR207p8Y.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU seizes ammunitions of Russian origin in the ATO area,” 11 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3146#.Kz15RzRS.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU records militants using weapons of Russian production,” 1 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3085#.xM1gyOfw.dpbs>; and Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU reveals prohibited mines in ATO area that are in operational service with Russian army,” 16 May 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3354#.lejPDLBG.dpbs>.
- ⁹⁴ Swampy, “Clearance around forward positions,” Beyond the Borders, 27 October 2017, <http://swampy.freq.wtf/2017/10/27/3672/>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU prevents terrorist attacks prepared by Russian secret services in Mariupol,” 17 August 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3793#.tidSa5nz.dpbs>; Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU deactivates mine of Russian production in ATO area,” 26 April 2017, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/3236#.GCLfhJGT.dpbs>; and Security Service of Ukraine, “SBU reveals three hidings with ammunition and Russian mine in ATO area,” 15 November 2016, <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/1/view/2256#.lyvz95Vv.dpbs>.
- ⁹⁵ Landmine Monitor received information in 2002–2004 that demining organizations in Afghanistan were clearing and destroying many hundreds of Iranian YM-I and YM-I-B antipersonnel mines, date stamped 1999 and 2000, from abandoned Northern Alliance frontlines. Information provided to Landmine Monitor and the ICBL by HALO Trust, Danish Demining Group, and other demining groups in Afghanistan. Iranian antipersonnel and antivehicle mines were also part of a shipment seized by Israel in January 2002 off the coast of the Gaza Strip.
- ⁹⁶ Brochure, Heliopolis Co. for Chemical Industries, National Organization for Military Production, Ministry of Military Production, Arab Republic of Egypt, p. 23. AP T78 and AP T79 plastic antipersonnel landmines. Received from Omega Research via Twitter, 3 March 2017, twitter.com/Omega_RF/status/836968523293405185.
- ⁹⁷ Statement of Egypt, “Explanation of Vote on Resolution on the Ottawa APLM Convention, L.8,” UNGA First Committee, New York, 2 December 2012, www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/1com/1com12/eov/L8_Egypt.pdf.

combines signature and ratification. Of the 162 States Parties, 132 signed and ratified the treaty, while 30 acceded.⁹⁸

The last country to accede to the Mine Ban Treaty was Oman on 20 August 2014.

The 35 states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty include the Marshall Islands, which is the last signatory yet to ratify.

On 2 March 2016, Ambassador Ravinatha Pandukabhaya Aryasinha announced that Sri Lanka's cabinet of ministers has approved accession to the Mine Ban Treaty, but the instrument of accession had not been deposited with the UN as of 31 October 2017.⁹⁹

The US government announced policy measures in June and September 2014 banning US production and acquisition of antipersonnel landmines, accelerating stockpile destruction, and banning mine use, except on the Korean Peninsula.¹⁰⁰ The Obama administration also indicated its "aspiration" for the US to "eventually accede to the Ottawa Convention," but there have been few signs of new steps toward that goal.¹⁰¹ The administration of Donald Trump has not indicated if US landmine policy will be revisited.



Photo exhibition at Basantapur Durbar Square in Kathmandu to raise awareness about landmines and celebrate the 18th anniversary of the Mine Ban Treaty's entry into force.

© Ban Landmines Campaign Nepal (NCBL), March 2017

ANNUAL UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

Since 1997, the annual UN General Assembly (UNGA) resolution has provided states outside the Mine Ban Treaty with an important opportunity to indicate their support for the humanitarian rationale of the treaty and the objective of its universalization. A dozen countries that have acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty since 1999 did so after voting in favor of consecutive UNGA resolutions.¹⁰²

On 5 December 2016, UNGA Resolution 71/34 calling for universalization and full implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty was adopted by a vote of 164 in favor, none against, and 20 abstentions.¹⁰³ This is a decrease in votes in favor from the 2015 resolution of 168 states in favor, none against, and 17 abstentions, which was the highest number of affirmative votes for the annual resolution.¹⁰⁴ Regrettably, Mine Ban Treaty States Parties Kuwait, Nicaragua, and Samoa abstained from voting on the annual resolution in 2016.

⁹⁸ The 30 accessions include two countries that joined the Mine Ban Treaty through the process of "succession." These two countries are Montenegro (after the dissolution of Serbia and Montenegro) and South Sudan (after it became independent from Sudan). Of the 132 signatories, 44 ratified on or before entry into force (1 March 1999) and 88 ratified afterward.

⁹⁹ ICBL, "Sri Lanka decides to join Mine Ban Treaty," 3 March 2016, www.icbl.org/en-gb/news-and-events/news/2016/sri-lanka-decides-to-join-mine-ban-treaty.aspx.

¹⁰⁰ Office of the Press Secretary, "Fact Sheet: Changes to U.S. Anti-Personnel Landmine Policy," The White House, 23 September 2014, www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/23/fact-sheet-changes-us-anti-personnel-landmine-policy.

¹⁰¹ Office of the Press Secretary, "Press Gaggle by Press Secretary Josh Earnest en route Joint Base Andrews, 6/27/2014," The White House, 27 June 2014, bit.ly/WhiteHouse27June2016.

¹⁰² This includes: Belarus, Bhutan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, FYR Macedonia, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, and Turkey.

¹⁰³ The 20 states that abstained were: Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, Kuwait, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Syria, the US, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.

¹⁰⁴ Previously, the resolution's highest number of affirmative votes was 165 in favor in 2013 and 2010, while the lowest number of votes in favor was 138 in 2001.

A core of 14 states not party have abstained from consecutive Mine Ban Treaty resolutions, most of them since 1997: Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Syria, Uzbekistan, the US, and Vietnam.¹⁰⁵

Non-state armed groups

Some NSAGs have expressed a willingness to observe the ban on antipersonnel mines, which reflects the strength of the growing international norm and stigmatization of the weapon. At least 65 NSAGs have committed to halt using antipersonnel mines since 1997.¹⁰⁶ The exact number is difficult to determine, as NSAGs have no permanence, frequently split into factions, go out of existence, or become part of state structures.

In Colombia, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia-Ejército del Pueblo, FARC) and the Colombian government signed an agreement in November 2016 to end the armed conflict. This halted the FARC's widespread use of improvised antipersonnel landmines and resulted in the surrender and destruction of its stockpile (*see below*). On 1 October 2017, a ceasefire agreement between the government of Colombia and the National Liberation Army (Unión Camilista-Ejército de Liberación Nacional, ELN) took effect.¹⁰⁷ In the agreement, the ELN committed not to use antipersonnel landmines that could endanger the civilian population.

CONVENTION ON CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS

Amended Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) entered into force on 3 December 1998 and regulates the production, transfer, and use of landmines, booby-traps, and other explosive devices. Weaknesses of the original protocol and inadequate measures to improve it through Amended Protocol II gave impetus to the Ottawa Process that resulted in the Mine Ban Treaty.

As of October 2017, a total of 104 states were party to Amended Protocol II. Only 10 of these states have not joined the Mine Ban Treaty: China, Georgia, India, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Sri Lanka, and the US. Therefore, for antipersonnel mines, the protocol is only relevant for those 10 countries as the 94 other states are bound by the much higher standards provided by the Mine Ban Treaty.

The original Protocol II on mines, booby-traps, and other devices entered into force on 2 December 1983 and has largely been superseded by the 1996 Amended Protocol II, but 13 states that are party to the original protocol have yet to ratify the amended protocol.¹⁰⁸

A total of 17 states that stockpile antipersonnel mines are not party to the Mine Ban Treaty, CCW Amended Protocol II, or CCW Protocol II. Five of these states are also landmine producers.

States that stockpile antipersonnel mines but are not party to the CCW

Armenia	Libya
Azerbaijan	<i>Myanmar</i>
Bahrain	Nepal
Egypt	Saudi Arabia
<i>Iran</i>	<i>Singapore</i>
Kazakhstan	Syria
<i>Korea, North</i>	UAE
Kyrgyzstan	<i>Vietnam</i>
Lebanon	

Note: *Italics indicate states that also reserve the right to produce antipersonnel mines.*

¹⁰⁵ Uzbekistan voted in favor of the UNGA resolution on the Mine Ban Treaty in 1997.

¹⁰⁶ As of October 2015, 45 through the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment, 19 by self-declaration, and four by the Rebel Declaration (two signed both the Rebel Declaration and the Deed of Commitment). See, Geneva Call, "Deed of Commitment," undated, www.genevacall.org/how-we-work/deed-of-commitment/. Prior to 2000, several declarations were issued regarding the mine ban by NSAGs, some of whom later signed the Deed of Commitment and the Rebel Declaration.

¹⁰⁷ "Colombia Cease-Fire Agreement Takes Effect Sunday," *Voice of America*, 30 September 2017, www.voanews.com/a/colombia-cease-fire-takes-effect-october-1/4050834.html.

¹⁰⁸ Cuba, Lao PDR, Mongolia, and Uzbekistan, and Mine Ban Treaty States Parties Burundi, Djibouti, Lesotho, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Togo, Uganda, and Uzbekistan.

STATUS AND OPERATION OF THE MINE BAN TREATY

In general, States Parties' implementation of and compliance with the Mine Ban Treaty has been excellent. The core obligations have largely been respected, and when ambiguities have arisen they have been dealt with in a satisfactory manner. However, there are serious compliance concerns regarding a small number of States Parties with respect to use of antipersonnel mines and missed stockpile destruction deadlines. In addition, some States Parties are not doing nearly enough to implement key provisions of the treaty, including those concerning mine clearance and victim assistance, which are detailed in other chapters of this report.

COMPLIANCE

At the Mine Ban Treaty Third Review Conference in June 2014, States Parties created a new Committee on Cooperative Compliance to consider whether a concern about compliance with the prohibitions contained in Article 1.1 is potentially credible and, if so, to consider any follow-up that might be appropriate for States Parties.¹⁰⁹

The Committee on Cooperative Compliance most recently provided a report on its activities to the intersessional meetings in June 2017.¹¹⁰ According to the report, beginning in January 2017, the committee met with representatives of South Sudan, Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen to continue its cooperative dialogue regarding allegations of use of antipersonnel mines. Previously, at the 15th Meeting of States Parties in November 2016, the president, in her capacity as the chair of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance presented the activity report of the committee's work in 2016, which mainly comprised of dialogue with representatives of States Parties Sudan, South Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen.¹¹¹

In September 2017, the President of the Mine Ban Treaty, Thomas Hajnoczi, Ambassador of Austria to the UN, contacted Myanmar, a state not party to the treaty, regarding new mine use allegations. He stated, "I have asked the government of Myanmar to clarify the situation and consider an independent fact-finding mission with international participation into this matter. Any use of anti-personnel mines, an indiscriminate weapon which has dire consequences on civilian populations, is of grave concern to the States Parties of our Convention."

Use of antipersonnel mines by States Parties

In this reporting period, commencing October 2016, there have been no allegations of use of antipersonnel mines by government forces of States Parties.

Until *Landmine Monitor Report 2013*, there had never been a confirmed case of use of antipersonnel mines by the armed forces of a State Party since the Mine Ban Treaty became binding international law in 1999. That has no longer been the case since Yemen confirmed that its forces violated the convention by using antipersonnel mines in 2011.

¹⁰⁹ The committee will also, "When appropriate, in close consultation with the States Parties concerned, clarify the situation, and if as a result it assesses that the concern is credible, make suggestions on steps that the States Parties concerned could take to ensure that the Convention remains strong and effective; For cases where the concern is credible, present preliminary observations at intersessional meetings if need be, and conclusions and recommendations at Meetings of the States Parties or Review Conferences; Remain transparent and accountable, including by reporting on activities at both intersessional and Meetings of the States Parties or Review Conferences." "Decisions on the Convention's Machinery and Meetings," Maputo, 27 June 2014, p. 5, www.maputoreviewconference.org/fileadmin/APMBC-RC3/3RC-Decisions-Machinery-27Jun2014.pdf.

¹¹⁰ Mine Ban Treaty Committee on Cooperative Compliance, "Preliminary observations: Committee on Cooperative Compliance (Austria, Iraq, Peru, United Kingdom and Sweden)," 8–9 June 2017, bit.ly/CoopCompInter2017.

¹¹¹ "Activity Report and Conclusions of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance Presented by the Committee on Cooperative Compliance (Algeria, Canada, Chile, Peru and Sweden)," APLC/MSP.15/2016/5, 17 October 2016, www.apminebanconvention.org/fileadmin/APMBC/MSP/15MSP/Conclusions-cooperativecompliance-EN.pdf.

The Mine Ban Treaty's Committee on Cooperative Compliance continued to follow-up on past allegations of antipersonnel mine use from previous years by the armed forces of South Sudan (in 2013 and 2011), Sudan (in 2011), Ukraine (in 2014), and Yemen (in 2011).

Stockpile destruction

At least 157 of the 162 States Parties do not stockpile antipersonnel mines. This includes 92 states that have officially declared completion of stockpile destruction and 65 states that have declared they never possessed antipersonnel mines (except in some cases for training in detection and clearance techniques).

Collectively, States Parties have destroyed more than 53 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines, including more than 2.2 million destroyed in 2016.

On 5 April 2017, the Ministry of Defense of Belarus confirmed in a statement that it “has fully fulfilled its international obligations under the Ottawa Convention,” by completing the destruction of “3.4 million antipersonnel mines PFM-1 with the support of the European Union.”¹¹² Belarus had a deadline of 1 March 2008 to destroy all stockpiles of antipersonnel mines under its jurisdiction or control.

Poland completed the destruction of its stockpile in April 2016, more than a year before its deadline.¹¹³ Poland began destroying its stockpile of more than one million antipersonnel mines in 2003.¹¹⁴

Three States Parties possess more than 5.5 million antipersonnel mines remaining to be destroyed: Ukraine (4.9 million), Greece (643,267), and Oman (7,630). It is uncertain if two other States Parties possess stocks. Tuvalu has not made an official declaration, but is not thought to possess antipersonnel mines. Somalia acknowledged that “large stocks are in the hands of former militias and private individuals,” and that it is “putting forth efforts to verify if in fact it holds antipersonnel mines in its stockpile.”¹¹⁵

Oman destroyed 3,052 antipersonnel mines during 2016.¹¹⁶ To date, Oman has declared the destruction of 4,578 antipersonnel mines, 30% of its stockpile. It has committed to destroy its stockpile by the deadline of 1 February 2019.

Greece and Ukraine remain in violation of Article 4 after failing to complete the destruction of their stockpiles by their four-year deadline.¹¹⁷ The Cartagena Action Plan 2010–2014 called on States Parties that missed their deadline to comply without delay, and also to communicate their plans to do so, to request any assistance needed, and to provide an expected completion date. The Maputo Action Plan added a call for these states to provide a plan for the destruction of their remaining stockpiles by 31 December 2014.

Complicated legal and contractual issues surrounding the destruction of **Greece's** stockpile of antipersonnel mines continue to stall any physical destruction. This situation is further complicated by the stockpiles being located in both Greece and Bulgaria. Greece

¹¹² Statement of Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Belarus, 5 April 2017, www.mil.by/ru/news/62864/. This was confirmed in the latest update at the 2017 intersessional meetings, where Belarus declared the destruction of approximately 3,366,500 PFM-1 series mines, as well as the previous destruction of 45,425 PMN, 114,384 PMN-2, 57,324 POM-2, 12,799 POMZ-2, and 64,843 POMZ-2M mines. Statement of Belarus, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, 8–9 June 2017, bit.ly/PolandInter2017.

¹¹³ Statement of Poland, Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, Santiago, November–December 2016, bit.ly/Poland15MSPGeneral.

¹¹⁴ Poland initially reported 1,055,971 stockpiled antipersonnel mines at the end of 2002. During 2003, it destroyed 58,291 POMZ-2 (2M) mines due to expiration of shelf life. It destroyed another 12,990 stockpiled mines in 2005, again because their shelf life had expired.

¹¹⁵ No stockpiled mines have been destroyed since the treaty came into force for Somalia, which has a destruction deadline of 1 October 2016. It has not provided an annual update to its transparency report since 2014. Mine Ban Treaty Initial Article 7 Report (for the period 16 April 2012 to 30 March 2013), Sections B, E, and G, bit.ly/MBTSomalia2013Art7.

¹¹⁶ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (in Arabic), 8 May 2017, bit.ly/MBTOmanArt72017.

¹¹⁷ Greece had a deadline of 1 March 2008, while Ukraine had a deadline of 1 June 2010.

stated at the 2017 intersessional meetings that “the remaining stockpile will be destroyed over a period of 20 months after the signature of a revised contract with the MOD [Ministry of Defense], notwithstanding of course any future unforeseen circumstances beyond our control.”¹¹⁸

At the May 2016 intersessional meetings, **Ukraine** stated that on 19 October 2015 an additional agreement was reached among the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense, NATO Support and Procurement Agency, and the Pavlograd Chemical Plant for the resumption of the destruction of stockpiles of PFM-type antipersonnel mines. Ukraine reported the destruction of 652,840 mines in 2016, an increase from 19,944 destroyed mines in 2015.¹¹⁹ Ukraine has not detailed any plans to destroy stockpiled POM-2 antipersonnel mines.

The FARC in Colombia were previously known to be a major producer of antipersonnel mines. Disarmament of the FARC, including destruction of its antipersonnel landmine stockpile and components occurred under UN supervision. Disarmament was completed on 22 September 2017. The UN mission destroyed 3,528 antipersonnel mines formerly belonging to the FARC, as well as components, including more than 38,000 kilograms of explosives and more than 46,000 detonators.¹²⁰

Mines retained for training and research (Article 3)

Article 3 of the Mine Ban Treaty allows a State Party to retain or transfer “a number of antipersonnel mines for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques...The amount of such mines shall not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for the above-mentioned purposes.”

A total of 71 States Parties have reported that they retain antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes, of which 37 retain more than 1,000 mines and three (Finland, Turkey, and Bangladesh) each retain more than 12,000 mines. Eighty-six States Parties have declared that they do not retain any antipersonnel mines, including 34 states that stockpiled antipersonnel mines in the past. On 18 September 2017, Algeria destroyed the 5,970 antipersonnel mines it retained for training purposes after completing its landmine clearance program.

In addition to those listed above, another 34 States Parties each retain fewer than 1,000 mines and together possess a total of 13,746 retained mines.¹²¹ This amount is 479 more retained mines than reported for the previous year, due to Bosnia and Herzegovina and Cambodia dropping below the 1,000-mine threshold.

While laudable for transparency, several States Parties are still reporting as retained antipersonnel mines devices that are fuzeless, inert, rendered free from explosives, or otherwise irrevocably rendered incapable of functioning as an antipersonnel mine, including by the destruction of the fuzes. Technically, these are no longer considered antipersonnel mines as defined by the Mine Ban Treaty; a total of at least 12 States Parties retain antipersonnel mines in this condition.¹²²

The ICBL has expressed concern at the large number of States Parties that are retaining mines but apparently not using those mines for permitted purposes. For these States

¹¹⁸ Statement of Greece, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Geneva, June 2017, bit.ly/GreeceInter2017.

¹¹⁹ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report, Form G, 1 April 2016, bit.ly/MBTArt7Ukraine2016.

¹²⁰ “Misión de la ONU concluyó hoy la inhabilitación de armas de las Farc,” *Radio Nacional de Colombia*, 22 September 2017, www.radionacional.co/noticia/paz/mision-de-la-onu-concluye-hoy-la-inhabilitacion-de-armas-de-las-farc.

¹²¹ BiH (982), Angola (972), Zambia (907), Mali (900), Honduras (826), Mauritania (728), UK (724), Cambodia (720), Portugal (694), Italy (620), Germany (587), South Africa (576), Bhutan (490), Zimbabwe (450), Cyprus (440), Togo (436), Nicaragua (435), Congo (322), Slovenia (299), Cote d’Ivoire (290), Uruguay (260), Argentina (212), Cape Verde (120), Ethiopia (107), Eritrea (101), Lithuania (100), Jordan (100), Gambia (100), Ecuador (90), Rwanda (65), Senegal (50), Benin (30), Guinea-Bissau (9), Burundi (4).

¹²² Afghanistan, Australia, BiH, Canada, Eritrea, France, Gambia, Germany, Lithuania, Mozambique, Senegal, and Serbia.

States retaining more than 1,000 antipersonnel mines

State	Last declared total (for year)	Initial declaration	Consumed during 2016	Year of last declared consumption	Total quantity reduced as excess to need
Finland	16,292 (2016)	16,500	208	2016	-
Turkey	14,462 (2016)	16,000	338	2016	-
Bangladesh	12,050 (2016)	15,000	0	2013	-
Sweden	6,044 (2016)	13,948	71	2016	-
Belarus	5,989 (2016)	7,530	8	2016	-
Greece	5,650 (2016)	7,224	32	2016	-
Croatia	5,530 (2016)	17,500	57	2016	-
Venezuela	4,875 (2011)	4,960	N/R	2010	-
Tunisia	4,509 (2016)	5,000	61	2016	-
France	3,941 (2016)	4,539	14	2016	-
Yemen	3,760 (2016)	4,000	0	2008	-
Bulgaria	3,517 (2016)	10,466	6	2016	6,446
Nigeria	3,364 (2011)	3,364	N/R	None ever	-
Thailand	3,339 (2016)	15,604	6	2016	4,517
Serbia	3,149 (2014)	5,000	N/R	2011	1,970
Djibouti	2,996 (2004)	2,996	N/R	Unclear	-
Indonesia	2,454 (2015)	4,978	N/R	2009	2,524
Brazil	2,437 (2015)	17,000	N/R	2015	-
Chile	2,424 (2016)	28,647	298	2016	23,694
Romania	2,395 (2016)	4,000	0	2013	1,500
Belgium	2,288 (2016)	5,980	0	2015	-
Czech Rep.	2,217 (2016)	4,859	1	2016	-
Peru	2,015 (2016)	9,526	0	2012	7,487
Oman	2,000 (2015)	2,000	N/R	None ever	-
Canada	1,888 (2016)	1,781	8	2016	-
Denmark	1,783 (2015)	4,991	N/R	2013	2,900
Tanzania	1,780 (2008)	1,146	N/R	2007	-
Uganda	1,764 (2011)	2,400	N/R	2003	-
Namibia	1,634 (2009)	9,999	N/R	2009	-
Spain	1,613 (2016)	10,000	0	2014	6,000
Netherlands	1,557 (2014)	4,076	N/R	2013	-
Mozambique	1,355 (2016)	1,427	0	2012	260
Japan	1,262 (2016)	15,000	226	2016	-
Slovakia	1,129 (2016)	7,000	18	2016	5,500
Sudan	1,124 (2016)	10,000	814	2016	-
Kenya	1,020 (2007)	3,000	N/R	2007	-
Botswana	1,019 (2011)	1,019	N/R	Unclear	-
Partial total	142,595	316,595	2,166		62,798

Note: N/R = not reported.

Parties, the number of mines retained remains the same each year, indicating none are being consumed (destroyed) during training or research activities. No other details have been provided about how the mines are being used. A total of eight States Parties have never reported consuming any mines retained for permitted purposes since the treaty entered into force for them: Burundi, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Djibouti, Nigeria, Oman, Senegal, and Togo.

TRANSPARENCY REPORTING

Article 7 of the Mine Ban Treaty requires that each State Party “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” regarding steps taken to implement the treaty. Thereafter, States Parties are obligated to report annually, by 30 April, on the preceding calendar year.

Only one State Party has not submitted an initial report: Tuvalu (due 28 August 2012).


As of 31 October 2017, 47% of States Parties had submitted annual reports for calendar year 2016, an increase from the previous year (45%). A total of 85 States Parties have not submitted a report for calendar year 2016. Of this latter group, most have failed to submit an annual transparency report for two or more years.¹²³

No state that is currently not party to the treaty submitted a voluntary report in 2016. In previous years, Morocco (2006, 2008–2011, and 2013), Azerbaijan (2008 and 2009), Lao PDR (2010), Mongolia (2007), Palestine (2012 and 2013), and Sri Lanka (2005) submitted voluntary reports.

Iraq, Tunisia, Nigeria, and other states with recent allegations or confirmed reports of use of improvised landmines by NSAGs have failed to provide information on new contamination in their annually updated Article 7 reports.

¹²³ States that have not submitted reports for two or more years are noted in *italics*: Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo (Rep of), Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, DRC, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Nauru, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and Grenadines, Samoa, São Tomé & Príncipe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Tanzania, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Vanuatu, Venezuela, and Zambia.

1997 MINE BAN TREATY: STATUS 2017



States Parties (162)
 Signatories (1)
 Non-signatories



Demining team in Batiabombe, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

© Kelvin Batumike/Handicap International, August 2016

CONTAMINATION AND CLEARANCE

States and other areas with antipersonnel mine contamination as of October 2017

Afghanistan	India	Senegal
Angola	Iran	Serbia
Argentina*	Iraq	Somalia
Armenia	Israel	South Sudan
Azerbaijan	Jordan	Sri Lanka
Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH)	Korea, North	Sudan
Cambodia	Korea, South	Syria
Chad	Kyrgyzstan	Tajikistan
Chile	Lao PDR	Thailand
China	Lebanon	Turkey
Colombia	Libya	Ukraine
Croatia	Mauritania	United Kingdom (UK)*
Cuba	Morocco	Uzbekistan
Cyprus**	Myanmar	Vietnam
Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	Niger	Yemen
Ecuador	Nigeria	Zimbabwe
Egypt	Oman	<i>Kosovo</i>
Eritrea	Pakistan	<i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i>
Ethiopia	Palestine	<i>Somaliland</i>
Georgia	Peru	<i>Western Sahara</i>
	Russia	

Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are indicated in **bold**; other areas are indicated by *italics*.
* Argentina and the UK both claim sovereignty over the Falkland Islands/Malvinas, which still contain mined areas.

** Cyprus states that no areas contaminated by antipersonnel mines remain under Cypriot control.

Ten States Parties have residual or suspected contamination: Algeria, Cameroon, Djibouti, Kuwait, Mali, Moldova, Namibia, Palau, the Philippines, and Tunisia.

STATUS AND KEY DEVELOPMENTS¹

- Sixty-one states and areas have an identified threat of antipersonnel mine contamination (33 States Parties, 24 states not party, and four other areas). A further 10 States Parties have either suspected or residual antipersonnel mine contamination.
- A total of about 170km² was reported to be cleared of landmines in 2016, almost the same amount as in 2015. More than 232,000 antipersonnel mines were reported to be destroyed in 2016, an increase from the 158,000 in 2015.
- New contamination in 2016 and 2017, much of which consisted of improvised mine contamination, was reported in the following States Parties: Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Ukraine, and Yemen; and in states not party: India, Libya, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, and Syria. All of these states already had contamination from previous years. There were unconfirmed reports of new antipersonnel mine contamination in Cameroon, Chad, Iran, Mali, Niger, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Tunisia.
- Twenty-eight States Parties have completed implementation of Article 5 since 1999. Algeria declared completion in February 2017.² Mozambique, which had declared completion in 2015 but subsequently found previously unidentified antipersonnel mine contamination in 2016 and 2017, completed clearance in May 2017.³
- In 2016, three States Parties submitted extension requests that were granted at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties: Ecuador, Niger, and Peru. Five States Parties requested extended deadlines for approval at the Sixteenth Meeting of States Parties in December 2017: Angola, Ecuador, Iraq, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.
- Ukraine is in violation of Article 5 due to missing its 1 June 2016 clearance deadline without having requested and been granted an extension.
- Jordan and Nigeria should declare that they have obligations under Article 5 and request a new deadline to complete clearance.
- Only four States Parties appear to be on track to meet their Article 5 clearance deadline: Chile, DRC, Mauritania, and Peru.

MINE CONTAMINATION IN 2016

It is not possible to provide a global estimate of the total area contaminated by landmines, due to a lack of data. The extent of contamination is not known in 26 countries (seven States Parties, 19 states not party) and one other area. The global picture did not change considerably in 2016, although a number of countries, particularly States Parties, have continued to improve their knowledge of the extent of their contamination through the increased use of land release methodologies, to cancel suspected hazardous areas by non-technical survey, and to reduce confirmed hazardous areas through technical survey.

In some states, contamination increased as a result of new use of antipersonnel mines, although the extent of the new contamination—particularly by improvised mines—is not known as survey has not been conducted. There was new contamination in 2016 and/or 2017 in States Parties: Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Ukraine, and Yemen; and in states not party: India, Libya, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, and Syria. There were unconfirmed reports of

¹ The Monitor acknowledges the contributions of Mine Action Review (www.mineactionreview.org), which has conducted the mine action research in 2017, including on survey and clearance, and shared all its resulting landmine and cluster munition reports with the Monitor. The Monitor is responsible for the findings presented online and in its print publications.

² Declaration of Fulfilment of Article 5, submitted by Algeria, 10 February 2017, p. 8, bit.ly/AlgeriaDecl2017.

³ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form I. Four small suspected mined areas with a combined size of 1,881m² remained submerged under water. These areas are “suspended” and Mozambique plans to address them once the water level has receded and access can be gained. See, Declaration of Completion of Implementation of Article 5, submitted by Mozambique, 16 December 2015, p. 5; and statement of Mozambique, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Geneva, 8 June 2017.

Estimated extent of mine contamination at end of 2016

Sub-Saharan Africa	Americas	East and South Asia, and the Pacific	Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia	Middle East and North Africa
Massive (More than 100 km²)				
Angola Chad		Afghanistan Cambodia Thailand	Azerbaijan BiH Croatia Turkey	Iraq
Heavy (20–99 km²)				
Ethiopia Eritrea South Sudan Zimbabwe	Colombia	Sri Lanka		Lebanon
Medium (5–19 km²)				
Sudan	Argentina* Chile		Tajikistan UK*	Jordan Palestine
Light (Less than 5 km²)				
DRC Mauritania Mozambique Niger <i>Somaliland</i>	Ecuador Peru		Armenia <i>Kosovo</i> <i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i> Serbia	
No estimate provided				
Nigeria Senegal Somalia	Cuba	China India Korea, North Korea, South Lao PDR Myanmar Pakistan Vietnam	Cyprus** Georgia*** Kyrgyzstan Russia Ukraine Uzbekistan	Egypt Iran Israel Libya Morocco Oman Syria <i>Western Sahara</i> Yemen

Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are indicated in **bold**; other areas are indicated by *italics*.
* Argentina and the UK both claim sovereignty over the Falkland Islands/Malvinas, which still contain mined areas.

** Cyprus states that no areas contaminated by antipersonnel mines remain under Cypriot control.

*** The known area in Georgia is small, but there also may be mined areas in South Ossetia.

new antipersonnel mine contamination in Cameroon, Chad, Iran, Mali, Niger, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and Tunisia. (See the *Ban Policy* chapter for details.)

Several of the states for which no estimate is provided are heavily or massively contaminated. The Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) separating North Korea and South Korea and the Civilian Control Zone (CCZ) immediately adjoining the southern boundary of the DMZ remain among the most heavily mined areas in the world, but no data is available on

the extent of contamination.⁴ Morocco, Myanmar, Russia, and Syria also have widespread contamination, but the extent is not known.

Ten States Parties have residual or suspected contamination: Algeria,⁵ Cameroon,⁶ Djibouti,⁷ Kuwait,⁸ Mali,⁹ Moldova,¹⁰ Namibia,¹¹ Palau,¹² the Philippines,¹³ and Tunisia.¹⁴

MINE CLEARANCE IN 2016

Total global clearance of landmines in 2016 was about 170km², with at least 232,000 antipersonnel mines destroyed. However, this is an underestimation, as some actors, such as the army, police, or commercial operators, may not systematically report clearance results. Moreover, in some states, informal clearance or community-based clearance has been conducted, which is not subject to quality management and entry into the national databases. For further details of land release results, both survey and clearance, see individual country profiles on the Monitor website.¹⁵

No mine clearance occurred in States Parties Ethiopia and Serbia. Only survey was conducted in Mauritania and Mozambique. In Cyprus, 0.01km² was cleared but only antivehicle mines were found.¹⁶ Oman reported that it cleared a mined area but did not report the size or the number and type of mines that were destroyed.¹⁷ In Somalia, 0.04km² was cleared but no mines or UXO were found.¹⁸ In Western Sahara, no areas containing antipersonnel mines were cleared in 2016 east of the berm.¹⁹



Mine risk education at a camp for internally displaced persons from Mosul, Iraq.

© Noe Falk Nielsen/Danish Demining Group, September 2016

- 4 Response by the Permanent Mission of South Korea to the UN in New York, 9 May 2006; and K. Chang-Hoon, "Find One Million: War With Landmines," *Korea Times*, 3 June 2010.
- 5 The north of Algeria is said to be contaminated by an unknown number of improvised mines laid by insurgent groups. See, Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report, 2017, p. 22.
- 6 In Cameroon, allegations of use by Boko Haram of improvised antipersonnel mines have been reported.
- 7 Djibouti completed its clearance of known mined areas in 2003 and France declared it had cleared a military ammunition storage area in Djibouti in November 2008, but there are concerns that there may be mine contamination along the Eritrean border following a border conflict in June 2008. Djibouti has not made a formal declaration of full compliance with its Article 5 obligations.
- 8 Antipersonnel mine casualties were reported in Kuwait in 2016.
- 9 In Mali, casualties have been reported to be caused by improvised mines. It has been reported that these mines may be activated upon contact or by the weight of a person, although they have only been reported to have been activated either by vehicles or command detonated.
- 10 Moldova, which had an Article 5 deadline of 1 March 2011, made a statement in June 2008 that suggested it had acknowledged its legal responsibility for clearance of any mined areas in the breakaway republic of Transnistria, where it continues to assert its jurisdiction. However, this statement was later disavowed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Geneva, 2 June 2008, bit.ly/MoldovaNSA2008.
- 11 Despite a statement made by Namibia at the Second Review Conference that it was in full compliance with Article 5, questions remain as to whether there are mined areas in the north of the country, for example, in the Caprivi region bordering Angola.
- 12 Palau may have residual antipersonnel mine contamination.
- 13 The Philippines, which has alleged use of antipersonnel mines by non-state armed groups over recent years, has not formally reported the presence of mined areas.
- 14 There have been casualties from victim-activated improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in Tunisia in 2015, 2016, and 2017. Due to the nature of the ongoing conflict, it is likely that these devices were recently laid.
- 15 See Mine Action country profiles available on the Monitor website, www.the-monitor.org/cp.
- 16 Email from Julie Myers, UNMAS (based on information provided by Joseph Huber, UNMAS), 24 July 2017.
- 17 Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), bit.ly/MBTArt7reports.
- 18 Email from Tom Griffiths, HALO Trust, 31 May 2017.
- 19 Email from Virginie Auger, UNMAS, 29 March 2017.

Clearance of mined area in 2016

State/area	Mined area cleared (km ²)	Antipersonnel mines destroyed	Notes
Afghanistan	49.2	19,114	
Croatia	38.7	1,380	
Iraq	27.36	17,113	Data discrepancies, large areas cleared with little contamination, and incomplete reporting
Cambodia	26.7	7,578	There are discrepancies between data sources
Algeria	N/R	62,589	Reported release of 28km ² but did not specify how much was clearance
Chile	3.5	N/R	Number of AP mines destroyed not reported
Turkey	3.4	9,422	Not all clearance results were reported
Yemen	3	16,440	
South Sudan	2.6	585	There are discrepancies between data sources
Sri Lanka	2.3	59,304	
Zimbabwe	1.7	23,193	
Jordan	1.4	100	Areas verified
Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)	1.3	1,313	There are discrepancies between data sources
Angola	1.2	1,350	Results from national operators not available
<i>Somaliland</i>	1.1	121	
Sudan	1.0	105	
Israel	0.9	4,313	Area cleared by the Israeli Defense Force is unknown
Azerbaijan	0.8	17	All AP mines were destroyed during battle area clearance, only AV mines were found in the mined areas
Lebanon	0.6	501	There are discrepancies between data sources
Chad	0.6	96	This total area includes area reduced by technical survey
Tajikistan	0.5	1,248	There are discrepancies between data sources
United Kingdom	0.4	1,807	Between October and December 2016; results for beginning of 2016 were reported in previous Monitor edition
Thailand	0.4	1,231	
Colombia	0.3	210	

State/area	Mined area cleared (km ²)	Antipersonnel mines destroyed	Notes
South Korea	0.2	134	Did not report type of mines destroyed
<i>Kosovo</i>	0.2	40	Slight discrepancy between data sources
Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	0.2	33	There are discrepancies between data sources
<i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i>	0.1	117	
Ukraine	0.05	4	Clearance results not available for national operators
Palestine	0.03	24	Slight discrepancies between data sources
Senegal	0.03	20	Conflicting figures provided by mine action center
Peru	0.02	1,886	Number of mines destroyed between April 2016 and March 2017
Niger	0.02	325	May include results from the end of 2015
Armenia	0.02	2	
Georgia	0.01	19	
Ecuador	0.001	565	
Lao PDR	0	112	No systematic clearance. Figure includes AP and AV mines
Morocco	See note	288	An improbable 283km ² of cleared area reported
Vietnam	0	3	Mines destroyed during survey
Total global clearance	169.84	232,702	

Note: AP mines = antipersonnel mines; AV mines = antivehicle mines; N/R = not reported.

No clearance or survey results were reported for States Parties Eritrea and Nigeria, and for states not party China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia,²⁰ Syria, and Uzbekistan.

Of the 10 states that are massively contaminated with more than 100km² of mine contamination, three reported very low clearance results of less than 1km² in 2016: States Parties Chad and Thailand, and state not party Azerbaijan.

Mine clearance in 2012–2016 (km²)

Year	Mined area cleared	Antipersonnel mines destroyed	Antivehicle mines destroyed
2016	170	232,702	29,000
2015	171	157,672	14,000
2014	201	231,708	11,500
2013	185	275,000	4,500
2012	200	240,000	9,300
Total	927	1,137,082	68,300

²⁰ In its CCW Amended Protocol II and Protocol V transparency reports for 2016, Russia reported that its armed forces engineering units conducted demining and explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) in 80 regions of the country. In total, more than 306,616 explosive devices were destroyed, including 20,698 IEDs. See, CCW Amended Protocol II Article 13 Report (for 2016), Form B; and Protocol V Article 10 Report (for 2016), Form A. However, it did not report how much was mined area and how many antipersonnel mines were destroyed.

IMPROVISED MINES

States and other stakeholders in humanitarian demining paid particular attention in 2016 and 2017 to the increasing prevalence of improvised mines, and the specific challenges they pose to the mine action community in meeting the obligations of the Mine Ban Treaty, and in protecting civilians during or in the immediate aftermath of conflict, including emergency humanitarian crises.

An improvised explosive device (IED) is a device produced in an improvised manner incorporating explosives or noxious chemicals. IEDs that are designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person meet the definition of an antipersonnel mine.²¹ They fall under the Mine Ban Treaty, therefore affected states are required to report on such contamination in their Article 7 transparency reports and to clear it in accordance with Article 5. These devices are frequently known as improvised mines.

Improvised mines are not new and have been found in many countries for decades. The countries mentioned here do not comprise an exhaustive list, so the true extent of global improvised mine contamination is probably more widespread.²² In 2016 and 2017, large quantities of improvised mine contamination and/or numerous incidents and casualties were reported in the following States Parties: Afghanistan, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Niger, Nigeria, Ukraine, and Yemen. In addition, improvised mines were occasionally found in the following States Parties: Algeria, Somalia, and Turkey.²³ There are unconfirmed reports of improvised antipersonnel mine use in Cameroon and Mali.

Improvised mine contamination has also been identified in the following states not party in 2016 and 2017: India, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, and Syria.²⁴

No data exists on the extent of improvised mine contamination in any state.²⁵ In Afghanistan, a “preliminary survey” in 2016 identified about 220km² of newly contaminated land affected by pressure-plate IEDs, which are landmines. This data needed further non-technical survey and had not been entered into the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) or reported in Afghanistan’s Article 7 report.²⁶ UNMAS/the Directorate of Mine Action (DMAC) believes the number of devices is far fewer than the number of mass-produced mines, however acknowledges that amid Afghanistan’s continuing conflict, comprehensive survey of improvised mines is impossible.²⁷ Colombia reports a national estimate of 51km² of mine contamination, which is largely improvised mines, although it has yet to establish a national baseline.²⁸ In 2016, Iraq reported 6.67 km² of improvised mine contamination, which is far less than the actual extent of contamination.²⁹

²¹ See the glossary at the beginning of this report and in the Casualties chapter for definitions of IEDs and improvised mines.

²² Danish Demining Group (DDG) calculated that an estimated 67% of the countries where DDG is present also have an IED problem. See, Robert Keeley, “Improvised Explosive Devices (IED): A Humanitarian Mine Perspective,” *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Issue 21.1, April 2017, p. 5.

²³ For further details, see individual country profiles on mine action and casualties on the Monitor website, www.the-monitor.org.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ According to the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), “The scale of the IED problem remains poorly defined, although evidence to data suggests that the largest numbers of devices are associated with mass-produced improvised landmines. Numbers of booby traps and command wire/radio controlled devices in urban areas should become clearer as more operations take place in liberated towns and villages, and as more data becomes available. Until such information does become available, it is hard to predict the relative levels of effort required to address different types of IED and the associated equipment, competence and cost implications.” GICHD, “An initial study into mine action and improvised explosive devices,” February 2017, p. 49.

²⁶ Interview with Mohammad Shafiq Yosufi, Director, Directorate of Mine Action (DMAC), in Geneva, 9 February 2017; and Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA), “Operational Work Plan 1396,” undated but 2017, p. 2.

²⁷ “MAPA Operational Work Plan 1396,” undated but 2017, p. 22.

²⁸ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2015), Form D, bit.ly/MBTArt7reports.

²⁹ Data received from Ahmed Al Jasim, Directorate of Mine Action (DMA), 6 April 2017.

There has been increased discussion on appropriate policies, practices, and techniques for addressing IEDs, including improvised mines. During 2016 and 2017, articles and reports have been produced regarding the issue by actors such as the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and Mines Advisory Group (MAG), and published in the *Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*.³⁰

States Parties have a number of obligations with regards to improvised mines. Affected States Parties must report any confirmed or suspected improvised antipersonnel mine contamination in their Article 7 transparency reports. Resources must be made available to assess the extent of contamination and develop appropriate strategies to address it. States Parties should exchange expertise to ensure that standards are adequate for addressing improvised mines. Affected countries and donors must be prepared to cover the related costs of equipment and resources related to dealing with improvised mines, which may be higher than dealing with manufactured mines. Finally, States Parties should also monitor progress towards meeting any Article 5 obligations related to improvised mines to ensure compliance with the Mine Ban Treaty.

MINE BAN TREATY ARTICLE 5 OBLIGATIONS

Under Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty, States Parties are required to clear all antipersonnel mines as soon as possible, but not later than 10 years after becoming party to the treaty. States Parties that consider themselves unable to complete their mine clearance obligations within the deadline may submit a request for a deadline extension of up to 10 years.

COMPLETION OF ARTICLE 5 IMPLEMENTATION

On 10 February 2017, Algeria announced that it had completed clearance.³¹

States Parties that have completed Article 5 implementation since 1999

Albania	Denmark	Guinea-Bissau	Rwanda
Algeria	France	Honduras	Suriname
Bhutan	FYR Macedonia	Hungary	Swaziland
Bulgaria	Gambia	Malawi	Tunisia
Burundi	Germany	Montenegro*	Uganda
Congo	Greece	Mozambique	Venezuela
Costa Rica	Guatemala	Nicaragua	Zambia

*Montenegro still has to formally report completion of Article 5 implementation, but is not believed to have any antipersonnel mine contamination left.

In 2015, Mozambique declared completion of clearance, but additional contamination was found and subsequently cleared in 2016–2017.³²

30 GICHD, "An initial study into mine action and improvised explosive devices," February 2017; MAG, "Why Principles Matter. Humanitarian Mine Action and Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs)," Policy Brief, May 2017; Robert Keeley, "Improvised Explosive Devices (IED): A Humanitarian Mine Perspective," *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Issue 21.1, April 2017; Chris Loughran and Sean Sutton, "MAG: Clearing Improvised Landmines in Iraq," *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Issue 21.1; and Abigail Jones, "Do no harm: the challenge of protecting civilians from the IED threat in south-central Somalia," *The Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*, Issue 21.1, April 2017.

31 Declaration of Completion of Implementation Article 5, submitted by Algeria, 10 February 2017, p. 8, bit.ly/AlgeriaDecl2017.

32 Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form I. Four small suspected mined areas with a combined size of 1,881m² remained submerged under water. These areas are "suspended" and Mozambique plans to address them once the water level has receded and access can be gained. See, Declaration of Completion of Implementation of Article 5, submitted by Mozambique, 16 December 2015, p. 5; and statement of Mozambique, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Geneva, 8 June 2017.

In addition, state not party Nepal and other area Taiwan have completed clearance of known mined areas since 1999. El Salvador, a State Party, completed clearance in 1994 before the Mine Ban Treaty was created.

Jordan³³ has declared completion of clearance under the Mine Ban Treaty (in 2012) but is still finding antipersonnel mine contamination and therefore does not appear in the table above. Nigeria³⁴ declared completion of clearance in 2011, however there have been reports of new contamination resulting from recent use of antipersonnel mines by a non-state armed group. It therefore does not appear in the table above.

PROGRESS ON MEETING DEADLINES

As of October 2017, only four States Parties appear on track to meet their clearance deadlines, while 17 appear not to be on track, and the status of two is unclear. Five States Parties are awaiting approval of their extension requests submitted in 2017. One State Party has missed its deadline and is in violation of the treaty. Two States Parties that have declared completion in the past are still finding antipersonnel mine contamination and should request new deadlines.

The assessments of the status of each State Party regarding the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations are made through consideration of several factors, including the remaining challenge and the extent to which it is known, clearance rates, mine action capacity and assets, funding prospects, and the existence of any conflict and insecurity problems.

In 2016, three States Parties submitted requests for extended deadlines to complete their Article 5 obligations which were granted at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties in November 2016.

- **Ecuador** submitted an extension request due to unforeseen circumstances resulting from the earthquake in 2016 preventing it from meeting its deadline.³⁵ States Parties granted the requested three-month extension until 31 December 2017 and asked Ecuador to submit a detailed request by 31 March 2017,³⁶ which it did (*see below*).
- **Niger** requested until 31 December 2020 to complete survey and clearance of all mined areas.³⁷ In granting the request, States Parties noted that the request did not contain a detailed annual workplan with benchmarks for progress leading to completion. The meeting noted that monthly and annual projections could support Niger's efforts in mobilizing financial and technical resources. States Parties asked Niger to provide a revised workplan by 30 April 2017, in addition to annual progress reports.³⁸ Niger had not submitted an updated workplan as of October 2017.
- **Peru** requested until 31 December 2024 to complete survey and clearance, noting the difficulties of the terrain and the acquisition of data on additional contaminated areas through information exchanges with Ecuador.³⁹ In granting the request, States Parties noted that improvements to its land release methodology could result in Peru proceeding with faster implementation. They asked Peru to provide by 30 April 2018 an updated workplan for the remaining period covered by the extension.⁴⁰

³³ Declaration of Completion of Implementation of Article 5, APLC/MSP.12/2012/Misc.3, Geneva, 4 December 2012.

³⁴ Declaration of Completion of Implementation of Article 5, APLC/MSP.14/2015/Misc.2, Geneva, 16 December 2015.

³⁵ Letter from Efraín Baus Palacios, Director of Neighbourhood Relations and Sovereignty for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility, and President of the National Humanitarian Demining Center of Ecuador, to Amb. Patricia O'Brian, Permanent Representative of Ireland to the UN in Geneva, and Chair of the Article 5 Committee, Note No. 14839-DRVS/CENDESMI, Quito, 26 November 2016.

³⁶ Final Report, Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, 14 December 2016, p. 8, bit.ly/MBTMSP15Final.

³⁷ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request, dated 15 May 2016, submitted 15 April 2016, p. 13.

³⁸ Final Report, Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, 14 December 2016, p. 6.

³⁹ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request (revised), dated July 2016, submitted 2 August 2016.

⁴⁰ Final Report, Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, 14 December 2016, p. 7.

States Parties with outstanding Article 5 obligations, their deadlines, and status of any deadline extensions as of October 2017

States Parties	Original deadline	Extension period	Deadline	Status
Afghanistan	1 March 2013	10 years	1 March 2023	Not on track
Angola	1 January 2013	5 years	1 January 2018	Extension request submitted to 2025
Argentina	1 March 2010	10 years	1 March 2020	No change since extension granted
BiH	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Not on track
Cambodia	1 January 2010	10 years	1 January 2020	Not on track
Chad	1 November 2009	14 months (1 st extn.) 3 years (2 nd extn.) 6 years (3 rd extn.)	1 January 2020	Not on track
Chile	1 March 2012	8 years	1 March 2020	On track
Colombia	1 March 2011	10 years	1 March 2021	Not on track
Croatia	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Not on track
Cyprus	1 July 2013	3 years (1 st extn.) 3 years (2 nd extn.)	1 July 2019	No change since extension granted
DRC	1 November 2012	26 months (1 st extn.) 6 years (2 nd extn.)	1 January 2021	On track
Ecuador	1 October 2009	8 years (1 st extn.) 3 months (2 nd extn.)	31 December 2017	Extension request submitted to 2022
Eritrea	1 February 2012	3 years (1 st extn.) 5 years (2 nd extn.)	1 February 2020	Not on track
Ethiopia	1 June 2015	5 years	1 June 2020	Not on track
Iraq	1 February 2018	N/A	N/A	Extension request submitted to 2028
Jordan	1 May 2009	3 years Declared completion in 2012, but contamination still found	1 May 2012	Should submit extension request
Mauritania	1 January 2011	5 years (1 st extn.) 5 years (2 nd extn.)	1 January 2021	On track
Niger	1 September 2009	N/A* (1 st extn.) 1 year (2 nd extn.) 4 years (3 rd extn.)	31 December 2020	Unclear
Nigeria	1 March 2012	Declared completion in 2011, but contamination still found		Should submit extension request
Oman	1 February 2025	N/A	N/A	Unclear

States Parties	Original deadline	Extension period	Deadline	Status
Peru	1 March 2009	8 years (1 st extn.) 7 years 8 months (2 nd extn.)	31 December 2024	On track
Senegal	1 March 2009	7 years (1 st extn.) 5 years (2 nd extn.)	1 March 2021	Not on track
Serbia	1 March 2014	5 years	1 March 2019	Not on track
Somalia	1 October 2022	N/A	N/A	Not on track
South Sudan	9 July 2021	N/A	N/A	Not on track
Sudan	1 April 2014	5 years	1 April 2019	Not on track
Tajikistan	1 April 2010	10 years	1 April 2020	Not on track
Thailand	1 May 2009	9.5 years	1 November 2018	Extension request submitted to 2023
Turkey	1 March 2014	8 years	1 March 2022	Not on track
Ukraine	1 June 2016	N/A	N/A	Should submit extension request
United Kingdom	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Not on track
Yemen	1 March 2009	6 years (1 st extn.) 5 years (2 nd extn.)	1 March 2020	Not on track
Zimbabwe	1 March 2009	22 months (1 st extn.) 2 years (2 nd extn.) 2 years (3 rd extn.) 3 years (4 th extn.)	1 January 2018	Extension request submitted to December 2025

Note: N/A = not applicable.

* Niger's first extension request was granted until 31 December 2015 in accordance with a procedure for mined areas discovered after the expiration of the state's Article 5 deadline.

In 2017, five States Parties submitted requests for extended deadlines to complete their Article 5 obligations, for approval at the Sixteenth Meeting of States Parties in December:

- **Angola** requested until 1 January 2025 with the goal of eliminating 1,461 mined areas.⁴¹ The Committee on Article 5 Implementation noted that Angola did not provide annual projections of mined areas to be addressed. Angola indicated that once the dimension of the problem and its extent are more accurately identified it would be possible to plan more realistic activities, and identify the necessary resources in order to eliminate the problem.⁴²
- **Ecuador** submitted an extension request until 31 December 2022.⁴³ Ecuador stated that it was requesting an additional five years to clear the remaining 0.1km² of mined areas because mechanical assets cannot be used in these areas and operating conditions are very challenging.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request, dated 31 March 2017, submitted 11 May 2017, p. 20. The areas comprised of 1,074 confirmed areas, corresponding to 104km², and 287 suspected hazardous areas, corresponding to 141km².

⁴² "Preliminary observations," Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Article 5 Implementation, 8–9 June 2017, pt. 46.

⁴³ Ecuadorian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Request for renewal of extension of the deadline to complete the destruction of antipersonnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5, paragraphs 3 and 6 of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on their Destruction," March 2017.

⁴⁴ Additional information to Ecuador's Extension Request, 8 September 2017.

- **Iraq** submitted an extension request until 1 February 2028.⁴⁵ The ICBL noted that it is understandable that Iraq has submitted a request for 10 years due to the magnitude of contamination and security challenges. However, it stated, “As has been done for other States Parties in the past, we recommend that Iraq be granted only the amount of time necessary to prepare a plan...A shorter extension period would enable Iraq to better assess the scale of contamination once it is possible to access areas that are currently inaccessible, before presenting a long-term plan.”⁴⁶
- **Thailand** submitted an extension request until 1 November 2023 to complete survey and clearance of all mined areas.⁴⁷ As of July 2017, Thailand had 409.73km² remaining to be addressed.⁴⁸ It expects that up to 86.5% may be cancelled through non-technical survey.⁴⁹
- **Zimbabwe** submitted an extension request until December 2025 to complete survey and clearance of all mined areas.⁵⁰ The Committee on Article 5 Implementation noted that the request contained an updated workplan with milestones to be met over the course of the extension period.⁵¹ Zimbabwe stated that an eight-year National Mine Action Plan was in the process of being finalized and, once approved, would be provided as an annex to the extension request.⁵²

Ukraine is in violation of Article 5 for missing its 1 June 2016 clearance deadline. The Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties expressed serious concern that Ukraine is in a situation of non-compliance with Article 5. It called on Ukraine to submit as soon as possible a request for extension, and it welcomed the commitment by Ukraine to continue to engage with the Committee on Article 5 Implementation.⁵³ At the intersessional meetings in June 2017, Ukraine said that it would start implementing Article 5 once the integrity of the whole territory is restored.⁵⁴ As of October 2017, Ukraine had still not submitted an extension request.

MONITORING THE PROGRESS OF STATES PARTIES AGAINST THEIR ARTICLE 5 OBLIGATIONS AND THE MAPUTO ACTION PLAN

In the Maputo Action Plan, adopted at the Third Review Conference on 27 June 2014, States Parties agreed to “intensify their efforts to complete their respective time-bound obligations with the urgency that the completion work requires.”⁵⁵ Actions #8, #9, and #11 relate to clearance.

The Committee on Article 5 Implementation presented its preliminary observations at the intersessional meetings in June 2017, reporting on 25 States Parties that had submitted information by that date.⁵⁶

⁴⁵ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request (revised), 28 August 2017.

⁴⁶ Statement of the ICBL on Iraq’s Extension Request, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Geneva, 8 June 2017.

⁴⁷ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request (revised), dated 30 March 2017, 8 September 2017.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, executive summary.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁵⁰ Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request (revised), 9 August 2017.

⁵¹ “Preliminary observations,” Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Article 5 Implementation, 8–9 June 2017, pt. 287.

⁵² Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline Extension Request (revised), 9 August 2017, p. 19.

⁵³ Final Report, Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, 14 December 2016, p. 8.

⁵⁴ Statement of Ukraine, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Article 5 Implementation, Geneva, 8 June 2017.

⁵⁵ Maputo Action Plan, 27 June 2014, bit.ly/MaputoActionPlan.

⁵⁶ Preliminary Observations of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation, 23 June 2015, bit.ly/MBTArt5Prelim2015.

The assessment of progress under the Maputo Action Plan is drawn from both the committee's observations and Landmine Monitor's review of the progress of States Parties.

Maputo Action Plan Action #8: quantification and qualification of remaining contamination challenge

Almost all States Parties need to improve the quantification and qualification of the remaining contamination challenge. Only four States Parties have a clear understanding of the remaining contamination: Chile, Ecuador, Mauritania, and the UK. Twelve States Parties have a good knowledge of the locations of confirmed and suspected contamination but survey



A mine detection rat receives a reward for identifying a mine during training in Cambodia.

© Simon Guillemin/APOPO, March 2016

is needed to clarify the actual extent of contamination within those areas: Angola, BiH, Croatia, Cyprus, Jordan, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, and Zimbabwe. Thirteen States Parties have reported on known contaminated areas, but do not have a complete picture of the extent of contamination, as there are areas that have not been surveyed: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mozambique, Niger, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen. In addition, DRC may have contaminated areas that have not yet been identified. Eritrea has not provided an update on estimated extent of contamination since the end of 2013. Two States Parties have not formally reported the locations of any mined areas, Nigeria and Oman.

The committee assessed the degree of clarity of the remaining challenge, finding that only 10 of the 25 States Parties assessed had provided a high degree of clarity in their reporting: Afghanistan, Angola, Cyprus, Mauritania, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe. This compared to seven of 17 States Parties in 2015.

Maputo Action Plan Action #9: application of land release methodologies

Afghanistan and Angola are in the process of conducting nationwide surveys. In Angola, this has resulted in the cancellation of, on average, 90% of suspected contaminated areas.⁵⁷ Five States Parties used non-technical survey in 2016 to cancel large amounts of suspected mined area, and thus greatly decrease their estimate of remaining contamination: Angola, BiH, Cambodia, Thailand, and South Sudan. Non-technical and technical survey were also used to better define the extent of contamination in Afghanistan, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, DRC, Ecuador, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Ukraine, the UK, and Zimbabwe. In 2016, Jordan was in the process of verifying areas for missing mines.⁵⁸ Colombia's strategic plan for 2016–2021 aims to establish a national baseline of contamination.⁵⁹

In Somalia, no nationwide survey has been conducted, mainly due to the security situation.⁶⁰ Continuous conflict in Yemen since March 2015 has prevented systematic survey.

In Chile and Niger, no survey was conducted, only clearance.⁶¹ Ethiopia did not conduct

⁵⁷ Mine Ban Treaty Second Article 5 Extension Request, 11 May 2017, p. 5.

⁵⁸ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), p. 4; and email from Mohammad Breikat, National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation (NCDR), 10 April 2017.

⁵⁹ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2015), Form D.

⁶⁰ UNMAS, "2017 Portfolio of Mine Action Projects, Somalia," undated.

⁶¹ Chile, Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form F2; and Analysis of Niger's Third Article 5 deadline Extension Request, 25 October 2016.

survey or systematic clearance.⁶² No survey or clearance was conducted in Serbia in 2016.⁶³ Four other States Parties did not report any results of land release or confirmation of mined areas through survey in 2016: Cameroon, Eritrea, Nigeria, and Oman.

Turkey did not report the results of its comprehensive desk assessment of minefield records of the eastern and Syrian borders conducted in 2016.⁶⁴ Algeria reported the release of 28km², but did not specify how much was cleared and how much was released through survey.⁶⁵

Almost all States Parties that implemented systematic mine clearance programs in 2016 used land release methodologies (survey and clearance), although the degree to which they were aligned with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) varies. The committee called on States Parties to align their national mine action standards with the revised IMAS, if they have not already done so.⁶⁶

Maputo Action Plan Action #11: on-time submission of high-quality requests

In 2017, five states submitted requests on time: Angola, Ecuador, Iraq, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.

The level of quality of the requests varied greatly. All five requests included information on progress made so far, and some form of political commitment to complete the task of mine clearance. Some lacked the key components that would characterize high-quality requests: consistent data, detailed plans for land release activities during the extension period, and milestones to measure progress.

The extension request process in 2017 demonstrated the value of exchanges between requesting states, the Committee on Article 5 implementation, and other stakeholders. Indeed, all requesting states submitted either revised requests or additional information in the course of the process, some of which was of significantly improved quality.

Jordan, Nigeria, and Ukraine should submit extension requests to address the contamination that has been identified, either new or previously existing, after they declared completion of clearance or after their deadline has passed.

Maputo Action Plan Action #25: annual submission of high-quality and updated information

As of October 2017, Article 7 transparency reports for 2016 were still outstanding for four mine-contaminated States Parties: Eritrea, Nigeria, Niger, and Somalia. Twelve were outstanding in the same month of 2016.

(See the table “Clearance of mined area in 2016” above for notes about the quality of information provided on clearance by individual states.)

OTHER ISSUES AFFECTING CLEARANCE OPERATIONS

Funding

Inadequate funding was cited as a challenge to achieving Article 5 implementation deadlines by the following States Parties: Afghanistan, Angola, BiH, Cambodia, Chad, Iraq, Niger, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

Although DRC can achieve its Article 5 deadline, it reported funding difficulties.

⁶² Statement of Ethiopia, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Article 5 Implementation, Geneva, 8 June 2017; and Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form G.

⁶³ Email from Slađana Košutić, Serbian Mine Action Center (SMAC), 6 April 2017; and Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form D.

⁶⁴ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form A; and statement of Turkey, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Victim Assistance, Geneva, 8 June 2017.

⁶⁵ Declaration of Completion of Implementation of Article 5, submitted by Algeria, 10 February 2017, p. 8, bit.ly/AlgeriaDecl2017.

⁶⁶ “Preliminary observations,” Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Article 5 Implementation, 8–9 June 2017, pt. 22.

National ownership

Almost all Mine Ban Treaty States Parties with contamination have a national mine action program or institutions that are assigned to fulfil the state's clearance obligations. In Turkey, the Turkish Mine Action Center (TURMAC) was established in 2015, but political events in 2016 resulted in institutional changes. A capacity needs assessment was conducted in 2016 to form the basis for future capacity development.⁶⁷

Ukraine is taking steps toward the establishment of a national mine action program.⁶⁸

In Afghanistan in October 2016, UNMAS formally handed leadership of the Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA) to the Directorate of Mine Action (DMAC).⁶⁹ The UN Mine Action Center for Afghanistan (UNMACA) changed its name to "UNMAS in support of DMAC" (UNMAS/DMAC) in November 2016.⁷⁰ In DRC, UNMAS reported that the transfer of responsibility to the Congolese Mine Action Center (Centre Congolais de Lutte Antimines, CCLAM) was completed in early 2016.⁷¹ In South Sudan, the National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) reported that the transition from UN to national ownership was suspended and that NMAA lacked the basic means to fulfil its functions.⁷²



A deminer works a minefield near the village of Balincë, Kosovo.

© Emanuele Amighetti/HALO Trust, January 2017

States Parties Nigeria and Oman do not have national mine action programs.

In contrast, fewer than half of states not party have functioning mine action programs.⁷³ There were no new mine action programs established among states not party in 2016. The following 12 states not party do not have national mine action

programs: China, Cuba, Kyrgyzstan, India, Morocco, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Syria, and Uzbekistan. Egypt's mine clearance program is not functioning⁷⁴ and the status of Iran's mine action center is not clear. Some of these states not party are among the most contaminated countries in the world. Yet the understanding of the extent of contamination, and the scale of land release efforts, is much lower than in States Parties. This underlines the importance of striving for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty in order to address the threat posed by antipersonnel mines.

All the other areas (Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Western Sahara) have mine action centers.

⁶⁷ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), Form H; statement of Turkey, Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Meetings, Committee on Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, Geneva, 8 June 2017; and email from Lt.-Col. Halil Şen, TURMAC, 21 June 2017.

⁶⁸ "Mine Action Activities," Side-event presentation by Amb. Vaidotas Verba, Head of Mission, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Project Coordinator in Ukraine, at the 19th International Meeting of Mine Action National Programme Directors and UN Advisors, Geneva, 17 February 2016.

⁶⁹ Interviews with Mohammad Shafiq Yosufi, DMAC, in Geneva, 9 February 2017; and with Yngvil Foss, Country Programme Manager, UNMAS, in Geneva, 6 February 2017.

⁷⁰ Email from Mohammad Wakil Jamshidi, Chief of Staff, UNMAS/DMAC, 16 May 2017.

⁷¹ UNMAS, "About UNMAS Support of One UN and the GODRC," March 2016, www.mineaction.org/print/programmes/drc.

⁷² Interview with Jurkuch Barach Jurkuch, NMAA, in Geneva, 6 September 2017.

⁷³ Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Israel, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Palestine, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam.

⁷⁴ In January 2017, Egypt's Minister of International Cooperation, Sahar Nasr, announced the establishment of the National Centre for Landmine Action and Sustainable Development. Minister Nasr said that the center would begin clearing 600km² on the northern coast and would also establish infrastructure after clearance was completed. See, H. Salah, "Establishment of National Center for Mines Action and Sustainable Development completed: Nasr," *Daily News Egypt*, 23 January 2017, www.dailynewsegyp.com/2017/01/23/612214/.

Clearance in conflict

In 2016 and 2017, conflict affected land release operations in 11 States Parties (Afghanistan, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen) and four states not party (Libya, Myanmar, Pakistan, and Syria). Insecurity has also restricted access to some areas that are or may be antipersonnel mine-affected in DRC,⁷⁵ Ethiopia,⁷⁶ Jordan,⁷⁷ Senegal,⁷⁸ Tajikistan,⁷⁹ Turkey,⁸⁰ and Western Sahara. In Tajikistan, in 2015 and 2016, survey and clearance operations were restricted on the border with Afghanistan due to insecurity. However, improved security conditions in 2017 enabled full survey and clearance operations to resume.⁸¹

In South Sudan, a resurgence in violence forced mine action operations to close in the second half of 2016.⁸²

In Libya and Syria, where there is limited clearance capacity, international mine action clearance operators continued to focus their efforts on capacity building and training of national actors, much of it taking place outside the country.⁸³ In Ukraine, the State Emergency Services (SESU), which is responsible for humanitarian demining, suffered severe losses of buildings and vehicles during the conflict. The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Project Coordinator and Danish Demining Group (DDG) provided the SESU with equipment and training in 2016 to support their operational capacity.⁸⁴

In 2016, a number of security incidents directly affected demining activities, several resulting in casualties. In Afghanistan in 2016, nine deminers were killed and 10 injured in attacks by armed groups.⁸⁵ In Chad, a number of deminers were killed and injured in mine blasts during missions in the north, east, and west of the country.⁸⁶ In Colombia in 2017, Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) staff had to leave an area due to direct threats from a dissident FARC faction.⁸⁷ In Somalia in 2016, two demining staff were killed and one injured in a shooting incident, reportedly due to a conflict between rival sub-clans that was not directly targeted at demining

⁷⁵ Mine Ban Treaty Second Article 5 deadline Extension Request, 7 April 2014, p. 10; and UNMAS, "2015 Portfolio of Mine Action Projects, Democratic Republic of the Congo," undated.

⁷⁶ "Response to Committee on Article 5 Implementation request for additional information on its Article 5 deadline Extension Request," 26 September 2015; and Analysis of Ethiopia's Article 5 deadline Extension Request, 19 November 2015, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report (for calendar year 2016), p. 4; and email from Mohammad Breikat, NCDR, 10 April 2017.

⁷⁸ Email from Ibrahim Seck, Senegalese National Mine Action Center (Centre National d'Action Antimines, CNAMS), 22 August 2016.

⁷⁹ Emails from Muhabbat Ibrohimzoda, Tajikistan National Mine Action Center (TNMAC), 19 August 2016, and 22 May 2017; and from Aubrey Sutherland, NPA, 14 March 2017; and statement of Tajikistan, Mine Ban Treaty 15th Meeting of States Parties, Santiago, 30 November 2016.

⁸⁰ Email from Lt.-Col. Halil Şen, TURMAC, 21 June 2017.

⁸¹ Emails from Muhabbat Ibrohimzoda, TNMAC, 19 August 2016, and 22 May 2017; and from Aubrey Sutherland, NPA, 14 March 2017; and statement of Tajikistan, Mine Ban Treaty 15th Meeting of States Parties, Santiago, 30 November 2016.

⁸² Email from Robert Thompson, UNMAS, 19 April 2017; and UNMAS, "2017 Portfolio of Mine Action Projects: South Sudan," undated.

⁸³ Email from Lyuba Guerassimova, Programme Officer, UNMAS Libya, 28 February 2017; Implementing Partners Coordination Meeting, Tunis, 19 January 2017; emails from Lutz Kosewsky, DDG, 22 February 2017; and from Catherine Smith, Handicap International (HI), 22 February 2017; and interview with Luke Irving, Specialist Training and EOD Manager, and Nour Saleh, Project Officer, Mayday Rescue, and Majid Khalaf, EOD Liaison Officer, Syria Civil Defense (SCD), in Geneva, 5 September 2017.

⁸⁴ Emails from Rowan Fernandes, DDG Ukraine, 20 May and 17 June 2016; and from Anton Shevchenko, OSCE, 14 June 2016.

⁸⁵ Email from Feda Mohammad Oriakhil, Project Officer, DMAC, 30 September 2017.

⁸⁶ "Tchad: grève des démineurs restés 10 mois sans salaire" ("Chad: deminers strike after 10 months without pay"), *Agence de Presse Africaine*, 10 May 2017, <http://mobile.apanews.net/index.php/fr/news/tchad-greve-des-demineurs-restes-10-mois-sans-salaire>; and email from Julien Kempeneers, HI, 26 September 2017.

⁸⁷ Email from Vanessa Finson, NPA, 12 September 2017.

operations, but which nevertheless forced HALO to withdraw from the areas.⁸⁸ In South Sudan in 2016, three mine action staff were killed and three injured during shooting incidents.⁸⁹

Cyprus does not have effective control of antipersonnel mine-contaminated areas. In Palestine, Israel will not authorize clearance by Palestinians, and most mined areas are in zones controlled by Israel or under joint control. Ukraine has noted that it does not currently have access to some mined areas. In Azerbaijan, Armenian forces occupy a significant area of the country where considerable contamination exists.⁹⁰ In Georgia, there may be mined areas in South Ossetia, however, South Ossetia is effectively subject to Russian control and is inaccessible to the Georgian authorities and international NGOs.

In Western Sahara, the expulsion of civilian staff members of the UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) by Morocco resulted in the suspension of UNMAS-contracted demining activities east of the berm from 20 March to 15 September 2016.⁹¹

In Myanmar, the government said that concluding a National Ceasefire Agreement with non-state actors was a precondition for proceeding with survey and clearance.⁹²

Finally, and on a positive note, in Colombia, the peace process between the government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) gave momentum to demining planning. In 2016, as the first step in the process of implementing an agreement between the government and the FARC on demining, NPA has been leading and supervising a mine clearance project as a trust-building exercise. The Colombian army has been conducting the mine clearance as such, with NPA providing verification, while the FARC has given information on contaminated areas.⁹³ On 1 October 2017, a ceasefire agreement between the government of Colombia and the National Liberation Army (Unión Camilista-Ejército de Liberación Nacional, ELN) took effect.⁹⁴ In the agreement, the ELN has committed not use antipersonnel landmines that could endanger the civilian population.

⁸⁸ Email from Tom Griffiths, HALO Trust, 31 May 2017.

⁸⁹ Email from William Maina, DDG, 2 May 2017; and Danish Refugee Council, “Two national employees have lost their lives in South Sudan,” 12 April 2016, <http://reliefweb.int/report/south-sudan/two-national-employees-have-lost-their-lives-south-sudan>; and emails from Bill Marsden, MAG, 11 May 2017, and 21 October 2016.

⁹⁰ Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action (ANAMA), “Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action 2017,” undated, p. 5.


⁹¹ “Report of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara,” UN doc. S/2017/307, 10 April 2017, p. 8; R. Gladstone, “Morocco Orders U.N. to Cut Staff in Disputed Western Sahara Territory,” *The New York Times*, 17 March 2016, bit.ly/NYTMoroccoUNWesternS2016; and What’s in Blue: Insights on the work of the UN Security Council, “Western Sahara: Arria-formula Meeting, Consultations, and MINURSO Adoption,” 26 April 2016, bit.ly/WhatsInBlue26Apr2016.

⁹² Roger Fasth and Pascal Simon, “Mine Action in Myanmar,” *Journal of Mine Action*, Issue 19.2, July 2015.

⁹³ Email from Fredrik Holmegaard, Project Manager, Humanitarian Disarmament – Colombia, NPA, 13 June 2016.

⁹⁴ “Colombia Cease-Fire Agreement Takes Effect Sunday,” *Voice of America*, 30 September 2017, www.voanews.com/a/colombia-cease-fire-takes-effect-october-1/4050834.html.

MINE CONTAMINATION: STATUS 2017



* Argentina and the United Kingdom both claim sovereignty over Falkland Islands/Malvinas, which still contain mined areas. Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are bold. OTHER AREAS are UPPER CASE ITALICS.



Mapping a suspected mine hazard during non-technical survey training in Colombia.

© Alexis Aubin/Colombian Campaign to Ban Landmines, December 2016

CASUALTIES

OVERVIEW

High numbers of casualties were recorded in 2016, with a total of at least 8,605 people killed or injured by landmines, including improvised landmines, as well as unexploded cluster submunitions,¹ and other explosive remnants of war (ERW)—henceforth mines/ERW.²


This was another increase in the number of recorded casualties, following the sharp rise in 2015 when there were 6,967 casualties.³

This continued increase in 2016 was largely a result of more mine/ERW casualties recorded in countries experiencing armed conflict. The casualty total in 2016 is the second highest of all years in Monitor data except for 1999—the first year of Monitor recording. It also marked the highest number of casualties caused by improvised mines on record for the Monitor.

Of the total of 8,605 mine/ERW casualties the Monitor recorded for 2016, at least 2,089 people were killed and another 6,491 people were injured; for 25 casualties, it was not known if the person survived or was killed.

-
- 1 Casualties from unexploded cluster submunitions (unexploded submunitions), which are cluster munition remnants, are included in the Monitor global mine/explosive remnants of war (ERW) casualty data. Casualties occurring during a cluster munition attack are not included in this data; however, they are reported in the annual Cluster Munition Monitor report. For more information on casualties caused by unexploded submunitions and the annual increase in those casualties recorded for the year 2016, see ICBL-CMC, *Cluster Munition Monitor 2017*, www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2017/cluster-munition-monitor-2017/casualties.aspx.
 - 2 For more information on explosive items recorded in casualty Monitor data, see the table “Mine/ERW types causing casualties,” at the end of this casualties overview.
 - 3 *Landmine Monitor 2016* cited a figure of 6,461 mine/ERW casualties for 2015, however the number of casualties for 2015 and past years has been adjusted with newly available data.

Number of mine/ERW casualties per year (1999–2016)⁴



Civilians represented the vast majority of casualties compared to military and security forces,⁵ where the civilian status was known, continuing a clear trend of civilian harm over time: 78% of casualties were civilians in 2016, comparable to 79% in 2015.⁶

Declining casualty rates were recorded in Cambodia and Colombia in 2016, two States Parties that in the past were among those with the highest number of casualties. For the first time—since annual recording started for Cambodia in 1994 and since the year 2000 for Colombia—both recorded fewer than 100 casualties each.

Casualties were identified in a total of 56 states and other areas in 2016.⁷

Overall, in 2016 casualties decreased in 31 states and areas from 2015,⁸ remained the same in another four⁹ and increased in 30 states.¹⁰ Of these, five countries (Afghanistan, Libya, Myanmar, Ukraine, and Yemen) accounted for 85% of the cumulative annual increase in recorded casualties from 2015.¹¹

With continued increases in casualties each year since 2013, the total of 8,605 mine/ERW casualties recorded in 2016 mirrored the high casualty numbers documented in the early years of the Mine Ban Treaty. This is reflected in an average incidence rate of 23 mine/ERW casualties per day in 2016, compared to less than 10 casualties per day in 2013, the year for which the lowest number of annual casualties were recorded by the Monitor. In 1999, there

⁴ Previous annual totals are adjusted based on newly available data.

⁵ The category “military and security forces” includes police as well as members of non-state armed groups and militia.

⁶ For 2016, the civilian status was not recorded in data for 3,576 of the reported casualties. For 2015, the Monitor recorded 3,412 civilian casualties of 4,340 with known civilian status.

⁷ In 2016, casualties were recorded in Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Rwanda, Serbia, Somalia, South Korea, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe, and four other areas Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Somaliland, and Western Sahara. See table at the end of this chapter.

⁸ A total decrease of 1,078 from updated 2015 numbers: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Kenya, Lebanon, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Palestine, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Zimbabwe, and other areas Abkhazia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Western Sahara.


⁹ With a total of 23 casualties in 2016: Israel, Sri Lanka, and other areas Kosovo and Somaliland.

¹⁰ A total increase of 2,716 from updated 2015 numbers: Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, BiH, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Croatia, DRC, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Libya, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, South Korea, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Vietnam, and Yemen.

¹¹ These countries made up an increase of 2,316 casualties among the 2,716 total for all countries recording more casualties in 2016 than 2015.

was an average of 25 mine/ERW casualties per day. The similarity is also echoed in the many casualties not disaggregated by the mine or ERW device type.

Largest increases in mine/ERW casualties 2015–2016



In the first years of the Mine Ban Treaty, it was certain that many casualties went unrecorded. In 1999, the Monitor identified some 9,000 casualties, but estimates indicated that there were another 7,000–13,000 annual casualties that were not recorded in the available data. From 1999 through 2006 the estimated number of new mine casualties (recorded and estimated) each year was between 15,000 and 20,000. The Monitor estimated that there have been approximately 1,000 additional casualties (an additional 25–30% of the total) each year between 2009 and 2014 that are not captured in its global mine/ERW casualty statistics, with most occurring in severely affected countries and those experiencing conflict. However, with the highly irregular accessibility of data for countries experiencing conflict in 2015 and 2016, estimating the gaps has become less viable as has the ability to disaggregate casualties by device type.

The Monitor has recorded more than 110,000 mine/ERW casualties for the 17-year period since its global tracking began in 1999,¹² including at least 80,000 new survivors.¹³ Mine/ERW incidents impact not only the direct casualties—the boys, girls, women, and men who were killed, as well as the survivors—but also members of their families struggling under new physical, psychological, and economic pressures. As in previous years, there was no substantial data available on the numbers of people indirectly impacted as a result of mine/ERW casualties.

Of the total casualties in 2016, 66% (5,715) occurred in 35 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty.¹⁴

CASUALTY RECORDING FOR 2016

As in previous years, the mine/ERW casualties identified in 2016 only include recorded casualties, not estimates. It is certain that there are additional casualties each year that are not captured in the Monitor's global mine/ERW casualty statistics, with most occurring

¹² From 1999 through 2016, 112,646 mine/ERW casualties were recorded, including 28,597 people killed, 80,025 injured, and 4,024 for whom the survival or the fatal outcome of the explosive incident was not known.

¹³ A survivor is a person who was injured by mines/ERW and lived.

¹⁴ Casualties were identified in the following States Parties in 2016: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Belarus, BiH, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Kuwait, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe

in severely affected countries and those experiencing conflict. In some states and areas, numerous casualties go unrecorded; therefore, the true casualty figure is likely significantly higher in those countries.

The data collected by the Monitor is the most comprehensive and widely-used annual, and global, dataset of casualties caused by mines/ERW. The casualty total for 2016 included datasets or reporting from the following types of sources: international organizations, UN and national mine action centers, other UN agencies, humanitarian mine action operators, ICBL members, and other NGOs, as well as media scanning.¹⁵

Mines, including improvised mines, and other ERW remain a menace to civilians, often including the most vulnerable and marginalized people in their countries and communities. Their fate typically does not always make it into headlines and newsfeeds. While the monitor draws on media scanning in several languages as well as other publicly available documentation, access to a broad variety of other sources is vital when compiling a global overview of the harm caused. This is why the Monitor relies on the many sources and data providers listed above.

In 2016, significant underreporting of casualties for Iraq continued to be apparent. This seems to be exacerbated by a severe deficiency in the recording of improvised mine casualties.¹⁶

A decrease in the annual total of casualties for Syria was strongly influenced by a lack of data on persons injured by mines/ERW (survivors). For 2016 and all years since 2012, except 2015, data available is primarily from fatality counts registered in conflict recording systems. However, in 2015, for Syria the availability of data from an extensive one-time multi-country survey project including Syrian refugees, by Handicap International (HI), marked the first time since the beginning of the conflict that a substantial dataset on persons in Syria injured by mines/ERW who survived was available.¹⁷

ICRC reporting had the largest number of casualties of any source for Yemen and Libya in 2016. These casualties are reported collectively as landmines and ERW casualties without the mine/ERW types differentiated.

In Yemen, 2,037 people injured by mines/ERW were admitted into 46 ICRC-supported hospitals, among an annual total of 33,230 weapon-wounded patients treated in 2016.¹⁸ For 2015, the ICRC reported 812 persons injured by mines/ERW admitted to ICRC-supported healthcare facilities, among an annual total of 28,565 weapon-wounded patients treated.¹⁹ The ICRC data was not disaggregated by age, gender, or device causing casualties; however, the ICRC has noted that the majority of casualties were male.²⁰ Some other datasets were not disaggregated by calendar year. During 2016 and through April 2017, the Yemen Mine Action

¹⁵ The casualty total for 2016 included the following types of sources, with there often being more than one source for some casualties in a given country: international organizations (3,505); UN and national mine action centers, including reporting from humanitarian mine action operators (2,475); humanitarian mine action operators (826); Monitor media scanning including media scanning by ICBL campaign members and Monitor researchers (362); other NGOs (1,323); and other UN agencies (114). For the year 2016, the Monitor collected casualty data from 22 different national or UN mine action centers in 21 states and other areas.

¹⁶ See, *Landmine Monitor 2016* for details on the lack of reporting on improvised mine casualties in Iraq, www.the-monitor.org/LM16

¹⁷ Data on injured persons was collected by HI and partners through interviews with displaced people and refugees in Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon between June 2013 and December 2015. Casualty data from Regional Emergency Response Office on the Syrian Crisis – HI, 27 May 2016. The reporting is based on interviews with 68,049 people assessed by HI teams, of which 25,097 were injured: 14,471 in Syria, 7,823 in Jordan, and 2,803 in Lebanon. See, HI factsheet, “Syria: A mutilated future,” Brussels, May 2016, pp. 1–2, bit.ly/HISyriaMay2016; and HI, “New Report: Syrians Maimed and Traumatized by Explosive Weapons,” 20 June 2016, bit.ly/HISyriaJune2016.

¹⁸ ICRC, “Annual Report 2016,” Geneva, May 2017, p. 504, bit.ly/ICRC2016annual.

¹⁹ ICRC, “Annual Report 2015,” Geneva, 2016, p. 526; and email from Rima Kamal, ICRC Yemen, 7 June 2016.

²⁰ ICRC, “Annual Report 2015,” Geneva, 2016, p. 526; and email from Rima Kamal, ICRC Yemen, 7 June 2016.

Center's (YEMAC) office in Sanaa registered 1,020 casualties, but was unable to provide details for these casualties.²¹ The YEMAC office in Aden registered 566 casualties from March 2015 to March 2017.²²

Of the 1,610 mine/ERW casualties recorded by the Monitor for Libya in 2016, a total of 1,465 were ICRC-reported injured mine/ERW casualties admitted to hospitals it supported across Libya,²³ among 6,772 weapon-wounded patients treated in 2016.²⁴ The vast majority of mine/ERW casualties for Libya in 2015 recorded in the Libyan Mine Action Center (LibMAC) database²⁵—935 persons reported injured by ERW²⁶—were recorded during HI surveys at two hospitals in Tripoli.²⁷

Although ICRC data was not disaggregated by device type, available information from other reliable sources pointed to widespread landmine and improvised mine contamination as a threat in Libya in 2016. For example, it was reported that “ISIS [Islamic State] left behind a jungle of land mines,” in Sirt.²⁸ Two consecutive UN Secretary-Generals noted “the widespread contamination with explosive hazards, including improvised explosive devices, in the areas of Sirte and Benghazi, where the risk of injury and death to civilians and to humanitarian actors is high,”²⁹ and that it “continues to threaten civilians and humanitarian actors in areas such as Benghazi and Tripoli.”³⁰

CASUALTY DEMOGRAPHICS³¹

There were at least 1,544 child casualties in 2016, the highest annual total since the Monitor began its recording in 1999. Child casualties in 2016 accounted for 42% of all civilian casualties for whom the age group was known (3,634).³² This was similar to the 40% recorded for 2015. Children were killed (498) or injured (1,046) by mines/ERW in 36 countries and other areas in 2016.³³

²¹ Interview with Mohamed Al Osta, YEMAC Sanaa, April 2017.

²² Information provided by UNDP Aden officer, in email from Aisha Saeed, Cluster Munition Monitor, 12 April 2017. Some slightly differing casualty figures were reported for the period, accordingly: by February 2017, 566 people injured by ERW in Aden, Abyan, and Lahj governorates and by March 2017, 632 people were injured by ERW since March 2015 in Aden, Abyan, Lahj, Al-Dhale, and Taizz. At least 17 wounded by landmines, including nine by antipersonnel mines. Email from Iskander Yousef, Danish Demining Group (DDG), 12 April 2017.

²³ The ICRC supported four hospitals in Benghazi, Misrata, Sabha, and Tripoli.

²⁴ ICRC, “Annual Report 2016,” Geneva, May 2017, pp. 154 and 156, bit.ly/ICRC2016annual.

²⁵ LibMAC data for 2015 listed an additional 340 IED casualties that were not included in Monitor records, including 66 emplaced IED casualties that did not indicate if the devices were command-detonated or victim activated.

²⁶ Monitor analysis of casualty data provided by Abdullatif H.M. Abujarida, IMSMA Manager, LibMAC, 23 May 2016; and Monitor media scanning for 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2015.

²⁷ Those hospitals lacked reliable and updated databases, therefore casualty numbers were likely underreported. Hospitals made the identification of the cause of injury. Some casualties recorded as due to ERW may have been casualties of IEDs. Email from Anne Barthes, HI, 26 May 2016.

²⁸ “ISIS Fighters Are Still Lurking in Surt, Libyan Officials Warn,” *New York Times*, 11 August 2016, www.nytimes.com/2016/08/12/world/middleeast/isis-fighters-are-still-lurking-in-surt-libyan-officials-warn.html.

²⁹ UN Security Council/Ban Ki-moon, “Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Support Mission in Libya,” S/2016/1011, 1 December 2016, para. 83.


³⁰ UN Security Council/António Guterres, “Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Support Mission in Libya,” S/2017/283, 4 April 2017, para. 95.

³¹ The Monitor tracks the age, sex, civilian status, and deminer status of mine/ERW casualties to the extent that data is available and disaggregated.

³² Child casualties are defined as all casualties where the victim is less than 18 years of age at the time of the incident.


³³ In 2016, child casualties were recorded in Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Cambodia, Colombia, DRC, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Myanmar, Namibia, Pakistan, Palestine, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe, and two other areas Somaliland and Western Sahara.

Mine/ERW casualties by age in 2016




Note: This includes only the civilian casualties for which the age was known; among all casualties for which the age was known children made up 31% (1,549 of 4,976).

Mine/ERW casualties by sex in 2016



Note: This includes only the casualties for which the sex was known.

Mine/ERW casualties by civilian/military status in 2016



Note: This includes only the casualties for which the civilian/military status was known; for 3,576 casualties the civilian status was not recorded.

As in previous years, in 2016 the vast majority of child casualties where the sex was known were boys (81%).³⁴

ERW caused the most child casualties (669, or 43%), followed by improvised mines (437, or 28%). Unexploded cluster submunitions caused more child casualties (64) than antivehicle mines (61). (For more information on child casualties and assistance see the annual Monitor fact sheet on landmines/ERW and children.)

In 2016, men and boys made up the vast majority of all casualties, with 84% of all civilian casualties for which the sex was known (2,787 of 3,317). Women and girls made up 16% of all civilian casualties for which the sex was known (530).

In 2016, there were 102 casualties identified among deminers (25 deminers were killed and 77 injured) in 16 states and one area.³⁵ This represented an increase from 2015, when 42 deminer casualties were recorded in 10 states. It was however, similar to the average of 99 casualties among deminers per year recorded by

³⁴ There were 1,055 boys and 242 girls recorded as casualties in 2016; the sex of 247 child casualties was not recorded.

³⁵ In 2016, casualties among deminers occurred in Afghanistan, Angola, BiH, Cambodia, Croatia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Russia, Serbia, South Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe and other area Nagorno-Karabakh.

the Monitor since 1999. Between 1999 and 2016, the Monitor identified more than 1,750 deminers who were killed or injured while undertaking clearance operations.³⁶

Civilian casualties represented 78% of casualties in 2016 where the civilian/military status was known (3,921 of 5,029).


The country with the most recorded military casualties of mines/ERW in 2016 was Ukraine, with 435; followed by Mali, with 82 military casualties (including peacekeeping forces); and Pakistan with 81 military and combatant casualties recorded (including soldiers, militia, and militants).

MINE/ERW TYPES RESULTING IN CASUALTIES

In 2016, landmines caused at least 3,570 casualties—including factory-made antipersonnel mines (732), victim-activated improvised mines (1,805), antivehicle mines (495), and unspecified mine types (538).

Unexploded submunitions caused 114 casualties and other ERW 1,078 casualties. A total of 3,843 casualties were the result of mine/ERW items that were not disaggregated in data.

Casualties by type of mine/ERW in 2015 and 2016



The 1,805 improvised mine casualties recorded for 2016 was the highest annual total of such casualties recorded since Monitor reporting began in 1999, the next highest number in Monitor data is 1,721 recorded for 2012. Casualties from improvised mines were identified in 17 states in 2016.³⁷ Most improvised mine casualties in 2016 occurred in Afghanistan (1,180).

³⁶ There were 1,783 casualties among deminers from 1999 through 2016. Since 1999, the annual number of demining casualties identified has fluctuated greatly, making it difficult to discern trends. Most major fluctuations have been related to the exceptional availability or unavailability of deminer casualty data from a particular country in any given year, and therefore cannot be correlated to substantive changes in operating procedures, international demining standards, or demining equipment.

³⁷ Afghanistan, Algeria, Colombia, DRC, Egypt, India, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Ukraine, and Yemen.

Historically, the number of improvised mine casualties (also recorded as victim-activated IED casualties) was underreported due to their being recorded as other mine/ERW categories. Casualties in Colombia that were recorded as antipersonnel landmine casualties have been reclassified in Monitor data as improvised mine casualties. It was noted in 2017 that most such casualties in Colombia were caused by improvised antipersonnel mines and no factory-made antipersonnel mines casualties were known to have been recorded in the national casualty database. Among casualties recorded as caused by antipersonnel landmines in Myanmar, it is also extremely likely that there are casualties of improvised antipersonnel mines.

A difference in terminology between Cameroon and Nigeria was apparent, despite the same non-state armed group using improvised mines in both. Media reporting for Cameroon consistently used “mine,” while for Nigeria both “landmines” and “IEDs” were reported as causing casualties. In India, media reporting specified that improvised mines were activated by the presence of a person or vehicle, including pressure-plate activated devices, accounting for the significant increase in casualties from seven in 2015 to 79 in 2016.³⁸

Casualties recorded as caused by antipersonnel mines increased from 602 in 2015 to 732 in 2016, with casualties recorded in 23 states and areas.³⁹

In 2016, antivehicle mines caused at least 495 casualties in 19 states and other areas.⁴⁰ The states with the greatest numbers of casualties reported from antivehicle mines were Ukraine (127) and Yemen (103). In 2015, antivehicle mines caused 459 casualties.⁴¹

Casualties recorded as being due to unspecified mine types decreased to 538 in 2016 from 941 in 2015. This was mostly attributable to there being a far greater number of casualties recorded as caused by unknown mine/ERW items in 2016, which would encompass various mine types.⁴²

38 Data on improvised mine (victim-activated IED casualties) included data from among the 445 casualties of explosive incidents categorized as “victim-activated” in the Action on Armed Violence (AOAV) explosive violence data set for 2016. AOAV casualty data for 2016 provided by email from Jennifer Dathan, Researcher, AOAV, 15 September 2017; and Monitor analysis of Armed Conflict Location and Event Data project (ACLED), “ACLED Version 7 All Africa 1997–2016,” and “ACLED Asia Running File 2016,” data for calendar year 2016. Approved citation: Raleigh, Clionadh, Andrew Linke, Håvard Hegre and Joakim Karlsen. 2010. Introducing ACLED-Armed Conflict Location and Event Data. *Journal of Peace Research* 47(5) 651-660.

39 In 2016, antipersonnel mine casualties were recorded in: Afghanistan, Angola, BiH, Cambodia, Chile, Croatia, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Myanmar, Pakistan, South Korea, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine, Western Sahara, Yemen, Zimbabwe, and Somaliland.

40 In 2016, casualties from antivehicle mines were identified in the following states: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Libya, Mali, Myanmar, Pakistan, South Korea, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen, and other areas Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara.

41 The Monitor shares, cross-references, and compares data with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Antivehicle mines (AVM) project. That project recorded 423 casualties from both confirmed and suspected antivehicle mines in 22 countries in 2016. GICHD-SIPRI casualty data provided by email from Ursign Hofmann, Policy Advisor, GICHD, 24 August 2017. See also, GICHD-SIPRI, “Anti-Vehicle Mines,” undated, www.gichd.org/mine-action-topics/human-security/anti-vehicle-mines-avm-WfYW3Ygo9PY. Monitor and GICHD-SIPRI methodologies used to enter data differ, resulting in the differences in annual casualties reported. For example, Monitor data does not include casualties that occur to persons engaged in laying or emplacing mines. Monitor reporting does include politically disputed geographic “other areas” in reporting, and tends to use the definitions employed in original whole data sets when possible. In some cases, when an incident was attributed to both antivehicle mines and improvised mines in different sources, the Monitor included those as improvised mine casualties.

42 In 2016, unspecified mine casualties were recorded in Cameroon, Chad, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Somalia, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Yemen, and other area Western Sahara.

In 2016, 1,078 casualties were caused by ERW in 39 states and areas,⁴³ with 1,932 ERW casualties recorded for 2015. Children (669) made up 66% of civilian ERW casualties in 2016, when the age group was recorded.⁴⁴

In 2016, the number of casualties of unknown mine/ERW items in the Monitor global total jumped to 3,843, compared to 1,410 in 2015 and just 279 in 2014. For 2016, about half (1,943, or 51%) of all casualties of unknown mine/ERW items were recorded in Yemen, and another 39% were recorded in Libya (1,493). The overwhelming majority of casualties of such unknown items were injured persons (3,648), with most documented and reported in health facility records under a general default category of landmines and ERW.⁴⁵ The remaining 407 casualties of unknown mine/ERW items occurred in 15 countries in 2016.⁴⁶

States/areas with mine/ERW casualties in 2016

Sub-Saharan Africa	Americas	East and South Asia, and Pacific	Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia	Middle East and North Africa
Angola	Chile	Afghanistan	Armenia	Algeria
Cameroon	Colombia	Cambodia	Azerbaijan	Egypt
Chad		India	Belarus	Iran
DRC		Lao PDR	BiH	Iraq
Guinea Bissau		Myanmar	Croatia	Israel
Mali		Pakistan	Poland	Kuwait
Mozambique		Philippines	Russia	Lebanon
Namibia		South Korea	Serbia	Libya
Niger		Sri Lanka	Tajikistan	Palestine
Nigeria		Thailand	Turkey	Syria
Rwanda		Vietnam	Ukraine	Tunisia
Somalia			<i>Kosovo</i>	Yemen
South Sudan			<i>Nagorno-Karabakh</i>	<i>Western Sahara</i>
Sudan				
Uganda				
Zimbabwe				
<i>Somaliland</i>				

Note: Mine Ban Treaty States Parties indicated in **bold**; other areas in *italics*.

⁴³ In 2016, Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, BiH, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, DRC, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Pakistan, Palestine, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, and other areas Kosovo, Somaliland, and Western Sahara. In addition to other types of ERW in 2016, 114 casualties of unexploded submunitions were identified in BiH, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Serbia, South Sudan, Syria, Vietnam, and Yemen. For more information on casualties caused by unexploded submunitions and the annual increase in those casualties recorded for the year 2016, see ICBL-CMC, *Cluster Munition Monitor 2017*, www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2017/cluster-munition-monitor-2017/casualties.aspx.

⁴⁴ Of the total ERW casualties in 2016, 350 were civilian adults.

⁴⁵ They made up the vast majority of the casualties recorded for Yemen and Libya in 2016. In addition, 189 casualties of unknown mine/ERW items were killed, and for six the survival outcome was not known.

⁴⁶ Casualties from unknown mine/ERW items were recorded in 17 countries: Angola, Azerbaijan, Chad, Iran, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Myanmar, Russia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

Mine/ERW types causing casualties



Category of mine/ERW	Subcategory	Description
Mines, including improvised mines*	Antipersonnel mines	Munitions designed to exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person, and therefore prohibited under the Mine Ban Treaty
	Antivehicle mines	Also referred to as “antitank mines,” and included among mines other than antipersonnel mines (MOTAPM), are designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a vehicle as opposed to that of a person and tend to contain a larger explosive charge than antipersonnel mines. Antivehicle mines are not prohibited under the Mine Ban Treaty unless they are fitted with fuses that can be detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person
	Improvised mines	Improvised mines are types of improvised explosive devices (IEDs), which are “homemade” explosive weapons that are designed to cause death or injury. Improvised mines are victim-activated IEDs that are detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person or a vehicle. These are landmines and are sometimes referred to as artisanal mines, victim-operated IEDs (VO-IEDs), or by the type of construction, such as pressure plate IEDs (PP-IEDs). In Monitor casualty reporting, the terms “victim-activated improvised mine” or “improvised mines” are synonyms for victim-activated IEDs
	Antipersonnel improvised mines, including booby-traps; the Monitor enters all improvised antipersonnel mine casualties under the category “improvised mines”**	Antipersonnel improvised mines, including booby traps that can be detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person, fit the definition of antipersonnel landmines and are therefore prohibited under the Mine Ban Treaty. A booby trap is an antipersonnel explosive device deliberately placed to cause casualties when an apparently harmless object is disturbed or a normally safe act is performed
	Unspecified mine types	When reported as a “mine” or “landmine” incident, but the information to distinguish if it was an antipersonnel or an antivehicle mine or victim-activated IED was lacking
Unexploded cluster submunitions and bomblets	Unexploded submunitions	Submunitions or bomblets dispersed or released by, or otherwise separated from, a cluster munition and failed to explode or that have not been used and that have been left behind or dumped

Category of mine/ERW	Subcategory	Description
(Other) ERW	Unexploded ordnance (UXO)	Explosive weapons that have been primed, fused, armed, or otherwise prepared for use or used. It may have been fired, dropped, launched, or projected yet remained unexploded
	Abandoned ordnance (AXO)	Explosive weapons (not included in categories above) that have not been used during an armed conflict, that have been left behind or dumped
Unknown mine/ERW item	Victim-activated explosive items, type unknown	Unknown mine/ERW are explosive items causing casualties that were detonated by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person or a vehicle that were not attributed to a specific mine/ERW type either because it was not known what type of mine or ERW caused the casualty when information was recorded, or due to a lack of disaggregation between victim-activated explosives and ERW causing casualties within a dataset, including when mine/ERW casualties are differentiated as such from other weapon victims

Note: * The use, production, transfer, and stockpiling of victim-activated antipersonnel IEDs are prohibited under the Mine Ban Treaty. According to the Mine Ban Treaty definition, a mine is “placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area” and an antipersonnel mine is a munition “designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person...” Antivehicle mines are not prohibited under the Mine Ban Treaty unless the fuzing allows them to be activated by a person.

** In most cases, it is not possible to distinguish between antivehicle and antipersonnel improvised mines because reporting does not provide a clear means of determining the sensitivity of fuzes after an explosion. The information that is available indicates that the fuzing of most victim-activated IEDs causing casualties allows them to be activated by a person (as well as a vehicle), and therefore banned by the treaty. As a shorthand, the Monitor at times simply uses the term “improvised mine” to encompass any improvised victim-activated IED because they are likely to function as antipersonnel mines, rather than meeting the fuzing sensitivity to be strictly antivehicle.

LANDMINE, EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR (ERW), AND CLUSTER SUBMUNITION CASUALTIES IN 2016



Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are bold; OTHER AREAS are UPPER CASE ITALICS.

ORTHOPAEDIC WORKSHOP



Margaret Arach Orech asks about prostheses at the Gulu Regional Orthopaedic workshop, Uganda.

© Loren Persi Vicentic/ICBL-CMC, July 2017

VICTIM ASSISTANCE

INTRODUCTION

The 1997 Mine Ban Treaty was the first disarmament convention committing States Parties to provide assistance to the victims of a specific weapon. Twenty years on, what had started as a single paragraph in a treaty section on international cooperation has become much more.

At the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in 1997, Jody Williams, the co-laureate with the ICBL, announced the intention of the campaign to intensify its efforts to fortify the original, somewhat truncated, victim assistance provision:

...we would like stronger language regarding victim assistance. But, given the close cooperation with governments which resulted in the treaty itself, we are certain that these issues can be addressed through the annual meetings and review conferences provided for in the treaty.¹

Unquestionably, based on the evidence of many years of Monitor reporting, that is what has happened. Fifteen annual Meetings of States Parties, many more intersessional meetings, regional symposia, national seminars, and three five-year review conferences have advanced and extended the development of victim assistance. Mutually-agreed objectives further manifested States Parties' commitments, through the universally-adopted five-year action plans.

Since the emergence of victim assistance through the Mine Ban Treaty, other weapons-related conventions have adopted this rapidly emerging norm. The 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions codified the expanded principles and commitments of victim assistance into binding international law; these were introduced into the planning of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) Protocol V on explosive remnants of war (ERW) in 2008, and most recently included in the 2017 Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

A striking collection of objectives, action points, research findings, guidance, and recommendations of outcome documents, reports, and other publications has supported

¹ "Jody Williams—Nobel Lecture," Oslo, 10 December 1997, www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1997/williams-lecture.html.

the practical implementation of activities. National government focal points were appointed, and training programs implemented to build their capacity. Above all, the work was driven by the persistent efforts of states and civil society. International, national, and local organizations worked together, including representatives of the survivors' own networks.

The components of victim assistance include, but are not restricted to: data collection and needs assessment with referral to emergency and continuing medical care; physical rehabilitation, including prosthetics and other assistive devices; psychological support; social and economic inclusion; and the adoption or adjustment of relevant laws and public policies. Mine victims according to the accepted understanding of the term, includes survivors² as well as affected families and communities.³

The Monitor website includes detailed country profiles examining progress in victim assistance in some 70 countries, including both States Parties and states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions.⁴

A collection of thematic overviews, briefing papers, factsheets, and infographics related to victim assistance produced since 1999, as well as the latest key country profiles, is available through the Victim Assistance Resources portal on the Monitor website.⁵

At the halfway point of the Mine Ban Treaty's Maputo Action Plan 2014–2019, this chapter principally takes stock of the annual changes and challenges to assistance in the States Parties with significant numbers of survivors and needs. It draws from reporting on the activities and challenges of hundreds of relevant programs implemented through government agencies, international and national organizations and NGOs, survivors' networks and similar community-based organizations, as well as other service providers.

31 Mine Ban Treaty States Parties with significant numbers of survivors and needs⁶

Sub-Saharan Africa		Americas	East and South Asia, and Pacific	Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia	Middle East and North Africa
Angola	Mozambique	Colombia	Afghanistan	Albania	Algeria
Burundi	Senegal	El Salvador	Cambodia	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Iraq
Chad	Somalia	Nicaragua	Thailand	(BiH)	Jordan
Democratic Rep of the Congo (DRC)	South Sudan	Peru		Croatia	Yemen
Eritrea	Sudan			Serbia	
Ethiopia	Uganda			Tajikistan	
Guinea-Bissau	Zimbabwe			Turkey	

² A "survivor" is a person who was injured by mines/ERW and lived.

³ See, "Nairobi Action Plan 2005–2009," www.icbl.org/media/933290/Nairobi-Action-Plan-2005.pdf.

⁴ Country profiles are available on the Monitor website, www.the-monitor.org/cp. Findings specific to victim assistance in states and other areas with victims of cluster munitions are available through *Landmine Monitor 2017's* companion publication; ICBL-CMC, *Cluster Munition Monitor 2017*, bit.ly/CMM17.

⁵ See, the Monitor, "Victim Assistance Resources," www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/our-research/victim-assistance.aspx.

⁶ In addition, States Parties Mali and Ukraine, both of which have had hundreds of mine/ERW casualties in the past two years, may be considered to have significant numbers of survivors with great needs for assistance that remain unreported.

At the Mine Ban Treaty Third Review Conference held in Maputo in 2014, States Parties formally declared that they remain very much aware of their “enduring obligations to mine victims.”⁷ The actions of the Maputo Action Plan also adopted at that conference, can be summarized as follows:

- Assess the needs; evaluate the availability and gaps in services; support efforts to make referrals to existing services.
- Enhance plans, policies, and legal frameworks.
- Ensure the inclusion and full and active participation of mine victims and their representative organizations in all matters that affect them; enhance capacity.
- Increase the availability of and accessibility to services, opportunities, and social protection measures; strengthen local capacities and enhance coordination.
- Address the needs and guarantee rights in an age- and gender-sensitive manner.
- Communicate time-bound and measurable objectives annually.
- Report on measurable improvements in advance of the next review conference.

The plan also affirms the need for States Parties to continue carrying out the actions of the previous Cartagena Action Plan in order to make assistance available, affordable, accessible, and sustainable.⁸

ASSESSING THE NEEDS

States Parties commit to assess needs for victim assistance—including through sex- and age-disaggregated data—and gauge the availability of services required.⁹ They should also use this assessment activity as an opportunity to make referrals to existing services. Most states did not report large-scale needs assessments for 2016–2017, although many collected data disaggregated by age and gender through casualty recording systems.

A project to support the demining sector in Chad started a victim identification and needs assessment survey in two pilot regions in September 2016, to be completed in 2018. In Cambodia, the Quality of Life Survey continued reaching survivors and persons with disabilities in mine-affected areas of the country. In Albania, a socio-economic and medical needs assessment of marginalized ERW victims was conducted in three phases from 2013 through 2016, which included referrals and useful information for further planning. The victim assistance department of Yemen’s mine action program screened more than 4,000 survivors in 2016, more than 10% of whom received some direct support.

In most countries where NGO services providers operated, they made efforts to understand the needs of beneficiaries or affected populations as well as the barriers that they face in accessing services. However, this information was not always shared widely and, in some cases, due to a lack of capacity to store or process the information in the relevant ministries’ departments, did not reach national mechanisms. Mine action operators that collected information on casualties sometimes also provided referrals or direct support to survivors.

FRAMEWORKS FOR ASSISTANCE

The Maputo Action Plan calls for activities addressing the specific needs of victims and also emphasizes the need to simultaneously integrate victim assistance into other frameworks including disability, health, social welfare, education, employment, development, and poverty reduction.¹⁰ It also recognizes that in addition to integrating victim assistance, States Parties need to, in actual fact, “ensure that broader frameworks are reaching mine victims.”

⁷ “MAPUTO +15,” Declaration of Mine Ban Treaty States Parties, adopted 27 June 2014, www.apminebanconvention.org/eu-council-decision/maputo-15.

⁸ “Cartagena Action Plan 2010–2014: Ending the Suffering Caused by Anti-Personnel Mines,” Cartagena, 11 December 2009, bit.ly/MBTCartagenaPlan.

⁹ Maputo Action Plan Action #12, bit.ly/MaputoActionPlan.

¹⁰ Maputo Action Plan Actions #12 to #18.

Many of these frameworks have their own representative international administrations, guidance documents, plans, and objectives that may also be reflected in national-level activities that can reach survivors, families, and communities. *(For more information about national legal frameworks and new laws, see the section at the end of this chapter.)*

The following frameworks are among those that have particular relevance to the implementation of victim assistance actions:

United Nations coordinated approach to victim assistance

Within the UN system, an expanded UN Policy on Victim Assistance in Mine Action adopted in 2016 “intends to generate a renewed impetus and commitment from the United Nations in support of mine and ERW victims.”¹¹

World Health Organization plans and guidance

The World Health Organization (WHO) Global Disability Action Plan 2014–2021 was developed and revised with broad input, including a joint contribution by ICBL members and participating survivor networks. The plan reflects many of the most important concerns raised by survivor networks, such as ensuring access to rehabilitation in rural and remote areas, as well as participation and inclusion.

In 2017, the WHO recommendations on health-related rehabilitation were released. They comprise a 2030 perspective linked to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The WHO also has a comprehensive mental health action plan 2013–2020. In addition, although less recently, the WHO community-based rehabilitation (CBR) guidelines were promoted among victim assistance actors from States Parties.¹²

Humanitarian disarmament settings

In November 2016, on the margins of the Mine Ban Treaty Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance, and the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, together with the Mine Ban Treaty Victim Assistance Committee, launched guidance publications. These were, respectively: the “Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance: by States for States,” undertaken with technical support from Handicap International,¹³ and the “Guidance on Victim Assistance Reporting,” developed with a technical expert on victim assistance, that applies to commitments made by States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and the Convention on Conventional Weapons Protocol V.¹⁴

Also, at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties, the delegation of Italy proposed to have the Convention on Cluster Munitions coordinators’ guidance on an “Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance” mentioned in the meeting’s final report document.



Guidance publications launched at the Fifteenth Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty in Santiago, Chile.

© Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit, November 2016

11 “The United Nations Policy on Victim Assistance in Mine Action (2016 Update),” undated, bit.ly/UNMineActionVA2016; and UNMAS, “Issues: Victim Assistance,” undated, www.mineaction.org/issues/victimassistance.

12 The WHO CBR Guidelines were the subject of focused training for government victim assistance focal points at the Mine Ban Treaty Tenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2010; a victim assistance experts’ program was dedicated to their Geneva launch and training on their practical application, bit.ly/MBT10MSPVA.

13 “Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance: By States for States,” 30 November 2016, www.clusterconvention.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/here.pdf.

14 “Guidance on Victim Assistance Reporting,” undated but 2016, www.apminebanconvention.org/fileadmin/APMBC/Guidance-on-Victim-Assistance-Reporting.pdf.

Some debate over the appropriateness of the reference to the Convention on Cluster Munitions followed. Subsequently, the final report included a mention of the ultimately synergistic goals of the collaboration between the treaty-machinery victim assistance coordination bodies:¹⁵

The Meeting also took note of the conclusions of the Committee on Victim Assistance, with particular reference to encouraging the exchange of information and experiences, where applicable, regarding how victim assistance is dealt with under different conventions.¹⁶

Sustainable Development Goals

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are highly complementary to the aims of victim assistance under the Mine Ban Treaty, and they offer opportunities for bridging between relevant frameworks. The SDGs, a set of 17 aspirational goals with corresponding targets and indicators that all UN member states are expected to use to frame policies and stimulate action for positive change in 2015–2030, are designed to address the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Their emphasis is on reaching the most marginalized persons, commonly phrased as “leaving no-one behind.”¹⁷

Transitional justice mechanisms and reparations funds

In many post-conflict countries, national mechanisms to compensate or assist victims of armed conflict are a major source of support that can benefit survivors and their families and communities. Governments have established transitional justice mechanisms to provide compensation and benefits. The Monitor has identified states with war reparations mechanisms or similar legislation that are reported to provide assistance by various means to mine/ERW victims among other conflict victims. These include Afghanistan, Albania, BiH, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Serbia, and Turkey. Chile is a new addition to this list as in 2017, after a years-long process, it adopted legislation to provide reparations for mine/ERW survivors.

Similarly, specific international funding for conflict victims can also benefit mine/ERW survivors and other victims. For example, in northern Uganda the International Criminal Court’s Trust Fund for Victims (VTF) supports health and rehabilitation activities for conflict victims, including mine/ERW survivors. In Afghanistan, the Third Afghan Civilian Assistance Program (ACAP III) provides targeted immediate assistance to victims of conflict—including mines/ERW—, strengthens existing services, and contributes to the development of national authorities’ capabilities to provide assistance to civilian victims of conflict.

Rights of persons with disabilities

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) is the international human rights legal instrument that has been most discussed in relation to the implementation of victim assistance. Victim assistance is often included in international and national CRPD coordination structures of countries that are party to both the Mine Ban Treaty and the CRPD. State reporting under the CRPD has sometimes also mentioned victim assistance

¹⁵ Australia, the Netherlands, and Belgium supported the inclusion of the text proposed by Italy, while Chile welcomed the guidance and encouraged further work between the coordinators with the objective to support victim assistance as one of the most important aims of both conventions. Brazil, Greece, and Turkey took the floor to speak against the proposal.

¹⁶ “Final Report, Fifteenth Meeting Santiago, 28 November–1 December 2016,” APLC/MSP.15/2016/10, 14 December 2016, para. 29, bit.ly/MBTMSP15Final.

¹⁷ Persons with disabilities are referred to directly in the SDGs: education (Goal 4), employment (Goal 8), reducing inequality (Goal 10), and accessibility of human settlements (Goal 11), in addition to including persons with disabilities in data collection and monitoring (Goal 17). With an emphasis on poverty reduction, equality, and inclusion, the SDGs also recognize the need for the “achievement of durable peace and sustainable development in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations.”

and landmine survivors.¹⁸ Only five States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty with significant numbers of survivors are not party to the CRPD: Chad is a signatory, while Eritrea, Somalia, South Sudan, and Tajikistan have not signed the CRPD.

In progressive orientation toward disability rights-based assistance by international actors, in early 2017, the ICRC's Special Fund for the Disabled (created in 1983) became the MoveAbility Foundation. With increased international attention on issues of disability attributable to the CRPD, the change reflects the international organization's broader adjusted operational orientation since 2014, which is specifically inclusive of the needs of all persons with disabilities.¹⁹

Conflict and humanitarian emergencies

In 2016–2017, activities continued to raise awareness of, or improve, responses to the needs and rights of persons with disabilities in armed conflicts and fragile situations that could potentially benefit mine survivors and their communities.

The charter on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities into Humanitarian Action was adopted at the World Humanitarian Summit in Turkey in May 2016.²⁰ An Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Team on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action was established in 2016 to develop and adopt implementation guidelines by the end of 2018. Co-chairs are from UNICEF, the International Disability Alliance, and Handicap International. They lead a large task team consisting of 48 individuals from 35 various organizations, including many that are involved in victim assistance or contribute to the wellbeing and rights of survivors.²¹

Two States Parties with significant numbers of survivors and ongoing conflict, Iraq and Yemen, had a Level-3 IASC system-wide response activated in 2016–2017. Such an activation occurs when a humanitarian situation suddenly and significantly changes and it is clear that the existing capacity to coordinate and deliver humanitarian assistance and protection does not match the scale, complexity, and urgency of the crisis.²²

Other States Parties where conflict and unstable security situations impacted implementation of victim assistance included Afghanistan, DRC, South Sudan, Somalia, and Turkey.

Regional mechanisms for the rights of persons with disabilities

The Maputo Action Plan highlights regional opportunities for the fulfillment of relevant actions. Also, it affirms that each state will take into account “its own local, national and regional circumstances.”²³ Regional mechanisms for the rights of persons with disabilities are among the relevant instruments providing such opportunities, but to date few States Parties have made the connection in their reporting on victim assistance. These mechanisms include the following:²⁴

- Continental Plan of Action for the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities 2010–2019.

¹⁸ The 26 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty with significant numbers of survivors that are also States Parties to the CRPD are: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, BiH, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, DRC, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

¹⁹ ICRC, “Special Appeal 2016: Disability and Mine Action,” Geneva, December 2015, www.icrc.org/sites/default/files/topic/file_plus_list/disability_mine2016_rex2015_651_final.pdf.

²⁰ “Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action,” undated but 2016, <http://humanitariananddisabilitycharter.org/>.

²¹ IASC, “2017 Progress Report—IASC Task Team on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action,” 10 March 2017, bit.ly/IASCProgress17.

²² Based on an analysis of five criteria: scale, complexity, urgency, capacity, and reputational risk. IASC, “L3 IASC System-wide response activations and deactivations,” 4 April, 2017, bit.ly/IASCL3.

²³ Maputo Action Plan Action #15.

²⁴ The Arab Decade of Disabled Persons (2003–2012) was not renewed.

- Asian and Pacific Decade of Persons with Disabilities for the period 2013 to 2022 and its implementing framework with indicators, the Incheon Strategy to “Make the Right Real” for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific.
- Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities.
- Council of Europe Strategy on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities—Human Rights: A Reality for All 2017–2023.

ENHANCING PLANS AND POLICIES

At the national level and within the community of the Mine Ban Treaty, the Maputo Action Plan provides a framework that allows States Parties to make qualitative assessments of progress in victim assistance. It calls for activities addressing the specific needs of victims, while integrating victim assistance into other frameworks by incorporating relevant actions into the appropriate sectors. These include disability, health, social welfare, education, employment, development, and poverty reduction.²⁵ States Parties commit to addressing victim assistance objectives “with the same precision and intensity as for other aims of the Convention.”²⁶

States Parties committed to have time-bound and measurable objectives to implement national policies and plans that will tangibly contribute to the main goals of victim assistance.²⁷ In 2016, 13 of the 31 States Parties had victim assistance or relevant disability plans in place, and another two had draft plans.²⁸ In 2016–2017, broad disability plans with relevance to mine/ERW survivors were adopted in Albania and BiH.

In 2016, 20 of the 31 States Parties had active victim assistance coordination mechanisms or disability coordination mechanisms that considered the issues relating to the needs of mine/ERW survivors.²⁹ Coordination of victim assistance in BiH restarted and a new coordination mechanism was adopted through the national mine action center in Turkey.

Among the States Parties with active victim assistance coordination in 2016, most active national coordination mechanisms either collaborated with,³⁰ or were included as part of,³¹ a disability coordination mechanism.

INCLUSION AND ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF MINE VICTIMS

States Parties should ensure the “full and active participation of mine victims and their representative organizations in all matters that affect them.”³² In 2016, survivors and their representative organizations, including survivor networks and disabled persons’ organizations, participated in coordination activities in at least 17 of the 20 States Parties with active mechanisms.³³ In Colombia, after years of advocacy, landmine survivors won the right to join in Victim’s Participation Roundtables (VPRs) as a specific category of victims, thus ensuring them a spot at each table at all community levels.

²⁵ Maputo Action Plan Actions #12 to #18.

²⁶ “Maputo Action Plan,” Maputo, 27 June 2014, p. 3.

²⁷ Maputo Action Plan Action #13.

²⁸ Albania, Angola, BiH, Cambodia, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Tajikistan, and Thailand. Algeria and Sudan had plans pending approval or formal adoption.

²⁹ The states with coordination mechanisms were: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, BiH (restarted), Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Turkey (new).

³⁰ In Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, BiH, Burundi, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, and Turkey.

³¹ In Cambodia, Iraq, South Sudan, and Tajikistan.

³² Maputo Action Plan Action #16.

³³ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, BiH, Burundi, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Thailand.



AVAILABILITY OF AND ACCESSIBILITY TO SERVICES

States Parties committed to “increase availability of and accessibility to appropriate comprehensive rehabilitation services, economic inclusion opportunities and social protection measures...including expanding quality services in rural and remote areas and paying particular attention to vulnerable groups.”³⁴ The following changes, progress, and challenges were reported for 2016 in the 31 States Parties with significant numbers of survivors and needs:

Medical care

Medical care services for mine/ERW survivors were strengthened in some countries in the Sub-Saharan Africa region, including in Burundi, Chad, and Mozambique. However, access to medical care remained limited in the DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal, and Zimbabwe, with survivors having to travel long distances in order to access services, or being unable to access primary healthcare services at all. In Somalia, ongoing conflict damaged health facilities and continued to weaken an already fragile health system. In Sudan and South Sudan, emergency healthcare services were mainly provided by international organizations and NGOs.

In Afghanistan, where ongoing conflict resulted in continued high-demand for medical care, there were fewer resources available for mine/ERW survivors in 2016 compared with 2015.

In Croatia, cooperation between a pharmacy and a national foundation resulted in the donation of products for treating the health problems of people affected by mines/ERW.

Some healthcare services for persons with disabilities were available in Iraq, but have decreased over time. International organizations continued to provide much needed assistance in conflict affected areas. In Yemen, health facilities were damaged and the ongoing conflict further weakened the health system.

Rehabilitation including prosthetics

Sustained efforts to improve the availability of physical rehabilitation services were reported in Burundi, Guinea-Bissau, Eritrea, South Sudan, and Sudan. Shortage of raw materials and financial resources were an obstacle to the development of the physical rehabilitation sector in Angola, Senegal, and Zimbabwe. Moreover, such services were often only available in major cities. Survivors in Angola, Chad, DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Senegal, and Zimbabwe struggled to access physical rehabilitation and orthopedic services because the number of facilities providing these services were limited, and sometimes costly. Ongoing conflict and insecurity also hindered access to rehabilitation services in the DRC and Somalia.

In Afghanistan, three new physical rehabilitation centers were established in as many provinces, however at least seven more such centers were still planned and needed. Authorities also acknowledged that it would be unrealistic to consider the government capable of ensuring the required rehabilitation services itself. Due to a severe funding problem, physical rehabilitation was significantly reduced at centers run by an NGO in two provinces. In Cambodia, a national NGO was forced to stop providing services including wheelchairs and assistive devices due a lack of funding and donor constraints from July 2015 through May 2016, and production was severely reduced throughout 2016. A draft curriculum for a physiotherapy school was developed. No significant progress in aligning rehabilitation reporting systems or handover of centers to government management was reported, but such plans were developed and adjusted.

In Albania, the quality of services provided at the National Prosthetic Center remained inadequate, creating greater demand at the rehabilitation center in the area where most

³⁴ Maputo Action Plan Action #15.

survivors live. In BiH and Serbia, while provision of orthopedic devices is mandated by law, associated regulations were not adequately enforced thus limiting access. In Croatia, few changes were identified in the availability of or access to services and programs by mine/ERW survivors. In Tajikistan, the renovation of the branch of the national prosthetics center in a mine-affected region was completed.

The coverage of physiotherapy care was extended through home visits in El Salvador, while in Nicaragua the health ministry hired additional technicians for the national rehabilitation center and satellite centers. A critical situation for prostheses supply in Colombia was reported, with access through the state health system taking between one year and one-and-a-half years, while in rural areas inadequate availability and quality of prosthesis sometimes resulted in health complications for survivors.

In Algeria, mine/ERW survivors and other persons with disabilities continued to have access to most prosthetic and assistive devices free-of-charge. Iraq increased the capacity-building of physiotherapists, but fewer prostheses were provided to mine/ERW survivors in 2016 than in 2015. In Yemen, material support to physical rehabilitation centers increased to respond to higher demand. The availability of rehabilitation increased in Jordan.

Socio-economic inclusion

Projects to encourage the economic inclusion of survivors were rare and under-resourced in Angola, Ethiopia, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, and Uganda. In 2016, socio-economic inclusion activities decreased sharply in Senegal and South Sudan, and were nearly nonexistent in Somalia. In Zimbabwe, only 15% of the population was engaged in formal employment, which drastically limited opportunities for persons with disabilities. Some economic and social inclusion programs were reported in Burundi, Chad, DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Ethiopia, Senegal, South Sudan, and Sudan. In Burundi, the program included a range of levers, such as occupational training, microloans, membership of a community mutual support group, and business start-up kits. In Guinea-Bissau, there was an emphasis on social inclusion through sports. Vocational training programs were implemented in Ethiopia, Senegal, South Sudan, and Sudan.

In Albania, some NGO-led economic and social inclusion programs were reported, however governmental social services agencies were often unable to implement them due to a lack of funding. The number of available economic inclusion activities and beneficiaries declined rapidly in BiH.

In Iraq, there was a lack of statistics on access by persons with disabilities to work opportunities, but the Ministry of Labor provided some flexible low-interest loans for conflict survivors. Socio-economic inclusion activities were nearly nonexistent in Yemen, where livelihood activities by the survivor network stopped due to lack of funding.

Education

In 2016–2017, inclusive education programs were being implemented in Algeria, Burundi, Chad, DRC, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Zimbabwe. However, despite ongoing efforts, the Ministry of Education of DRC estimated that it was educating too few children with disabilities. The education systems in Eritrea and Mozambique were not inclusive, with separate schools for children with disabilities, while school buildings in Mozambique were inaccessible to persons with disabilities. In Guinea-Bissau, civil society noted that persons with disabilities experienced neglect in their community and throughout the education system.

Psychosocial support

The provision of psychosocial services increased in 2016 in DRC and Eritrea. In Eritrea in particular, these services were deployed to four regions that had previously not been reached. Psychological support however remained one of the biggest challenges in mine/ERW victim assistance in Sub-Saharan Africa. Such services were extremely limited, or non-existent, in Angola, DRC, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda, and

Zimbabwe. There was a decrease in the availability of psychosocial services in Mozambique and Senegal.

Afghanistan and Cambodia required planning and structures to make available psychosocial support, including making peer support more available and sustainable.

In Colombia, peer support would have to be recognized formally in the universal health coverage system in order for survivors' organizations to access resources for implementation through universal coverage, as they do with other victim assistance-related services.

Psychological support remained among the most serious needs of survivors in Albania. One survivors' organization in BiH continued to integrate peer support provided by survivors themselves into government-run services. No significant changes were reported for Croatia, where it was previously found that social, psychological, and peer support remained neglected areas of rehabilitation.

The availability of psychological support and follow-up trauma care in Iraq, including for internally displaced persons, was inadequate to meet needs. In Yemen, international NGOs increased mental health and psychosocial support activities across the country in response to massive trauma and the increasing need for services.

GUARANTEEING RIGHTS IN AN AGE- AND GENDER-SENSITIVE MANNER

The Maputo Action Plan speaks of “the imperative to address the needs and guarantee the rights of mine victims, in an age- and gender-sensitive manner.”³⁵

Gender considerations

While men and boys are the majority of reported casualties, women and girls may be disproportionately disadvantaged as a result of mine/ERW incidents and suffer multiple forms of discrimination as survivors. To guide a rights-based approach to victim assistance for women and girls, States Parties can apply the principles of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).³⁶ Implementation of CEDAW by States Parties to that convention should ensure the rights of women and girls and protect them from discrimination and exploitation.³⁷

In Ethiopia, the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities expressed concern at the lack of inclusive education opportunities, especially for girls with disabilities. The number of projects for children with disabilities in Senegal decreased due to the unreasonable length and difficulty of administrative processes under the Committee for the Protection of the Child that now channeled funding from UNICEF. In DRC, a project was implemented that promoted the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities—in particular women and girls.

Support was given to the training of health professionals in Colombia in order to raise awareness about addressing gender- and age-related needs of survivors. Increases in the limits for the granting of loans to women beneficiaries in El Salvador aimed at providing the opportunity for greater gender-sensitive development.

Afghanistan's mine action gender mainstreaming strategy 2014–2016 upon expiry was replaced with a new mine action gender and diversity policy.

In Croatia, a project included unemployed women from mine-affected communities

³⁵ Maputo Action Plan Action #17.

³⁶ Of the 31 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, all except Somalia and Sudan are also States Parties to CEDAW.

³⁷ The Committee of CEDAW General Recommendation 30 on women in conflict prevention, conflict, and post-conflict situations, and General Recommendation 27 on older women and protection of their human rights are also particularly applicable.

who were among the most marginalized, including social welfare beneficiaries living in underprivileged areas, members of ethnic minorities, women with disabilities, and survivors of domestic violence.

In Yemen, women faced additional challenges accessing medical care due to the lack of gender-sensitive services, including a lack of female rehabilitation professionals.

Age considerations


Child survivors have specific and additional needs in all aspects of assistance. In 2016 and 2017, inclusive education and age-sensitive assistance were far from adequate in most countries. In this regard, the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) is particularly relevant to the implementation of victim assistance with a rights-based approach.³⁸

The annually updated Monitor factsheet on the Impact of Mines/ERW on Children contains more details on issues pertaining to children, youth, and adolescents.³⁹

COMMUNICATING OBJECTIVES AND REPORTING IMPROVEMENTS

Victim assistance objectives should be updated, their implementation monitored, and progress reported annually. Each year, “plans, policies, legal frameworks” should be adapted and improved according to the States Parties’ evidence-based objectives. Budgets should also be reported.⁴⁰

As in the previous year, more than half of the most-affected 31 States Parties included some information on victim assistance activities in their Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 reports covering calendar year 2016.⁴¹ Eleven States Parties reported on progress and on victim assistance activities conducted during the previous year.⁴² Less than half of the most-affected 31 States Parties included in their victim assistance reporting existing, or newly adopted, national policies, plans, and legal frameworks.⁴³ When reporting on national policies, plans, and legal frameworks, about a third of those States Parties reported on victim assistance plans, a third on disability policy,



José lost his leg in a landmine accident at the age of 18 and today works with landmine survivors in Colombia.

© J.M. Vargas/Handicap International, March 2017

³⁸ Some of the resources on children and victim assistance include: Sebastian Kasack, *Assistance to Victims of Landmines and Explosive Remnants of War: Guidance on Child-focused Victim Assistance* (UNICEF, November 2014), www.mineaction.org/resources/guidance-child-focused-victim-assistance-unicef; Austria and Colombia, “Strengthening the Assistance to Child Victims,” Maputo Review Conference Documents, June 2014, www.maputoreviewconference.org/fileadmin/APMBC-RC3/3RC-Austria-Colombia-Paper.pdf; and Republic of Colombia, “Guide for Comprehensive assistance to boys, girls and adolescent landmine victims – Guidelines for the constructions of plans, programmes, projects and protocols,” Bogota, 2014, bit.ly/ColombiaLandmineVA2014.

³⁹ These factsheets, produced since 2009, can be accessed at the Monitor, “Victim Assistance Resources,” www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/our-research/victim-assistance.aspx.

⁴⁰ Maputo Action Plan Actions #13 and #14.

⁴¹ The States Parties that provided some updates on victim assistance were: Afghanistan, Albania, BiH, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Algeria submitted identical reporting to the previous year and Burundi reported on information from 2012.

⁴² Afghanistan, Albania, BiH, Cambodia, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Senegal, Thailand, Turkey, and Yemen reported directly on victim assistance activities and progress.

⁴³ The States Parties that mentioned national policies, plans and legal frameworks in their Article 7 report were: Afghanistan, Albania, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Jordan, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Zimbabwe.

and the remaining third on both. Inclusive education was noted in some reporting, but assistance under other frameworks was not cited.

There is no detailed or specific format for reporting on victim assistance under the Mine Ban Treaty, however suggestions and guidelines have been presented over time.⁴⁴ The “Guide to Reporting”⁴⁵ submitted by the President of the Mine Ban Treaty Fourteenth Meeting of States Parties indicates that victim assistance activities, policies, and plans could be reported on a sequential form marked, G.⁴⁶ Yet, the majority of the 31 most-affected States Parties used other forms, the voluntary form J,⁴⁷ as well as F(1) and H(2) to report on victim assistance.

Although States Parties made a political commitment to communicate time-bound and measurable objectives, such objectives were almost always absent from Article 7 reports. Only Thailand reported directly on measurable national objectives. Afghanistan, Albania, Cambodia, and Croatia also reported some measurable activities that aligned with objectives. Most states that reported focused on implementation and monitoring of services rather than enhancements to plans and frameworks as called for in the Maputo Action Plan.

LEGAL FRAMEWORKS AND NEW LAWS

According to the Maputo Action Plan, States Parties collectively agree that victim assistance should be integrated into broader national policies, plans, and legal frameworks and that they will make “enhancements” to the legal frameworks in effect as a means of operationalizing the integration. Some new plans and policies were adopted in the reporting period, and several more had been drafted and were pending endorsement.

As the CRPD is implemented in Ethiopia, many new policies and guidelines have been issued to localize the provisions of the convention that also benefit mine/ERW survivors. South Sudan launched the National Disability and Inclusion Policy in 2016, which was yet to have funding allocated. The Sudan Persons with Disabilities Act 2017 was adopted and signed.

El Salvador incorporated new policies for granting credits with a gender focus and consideration of the extent of vulnerability of beneficiaries.

The process of amending discriminatory national disability legislation in Afghanistan was completed.

In Croatia, the ministry responsible for war veterans announced a new law on civilian war victims, including mine/ERW survivors. Tajikistan, which is not party to the CRPD, approved a National Program on Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities, covering physical rehabilitation services and social inclusion and protection.

Often the process for adopting legislation remained under review pending formal adoption for extensive time periods. In some cases, the pace of policy development was so sluggish that the strategic approaches being articulated became outdated or irrelevant before they were adopted.

The results of a 2010 survey in Angola that was intended to inform victim assistance policy were yet to be translated into programming by 2016. The application decree for the

⁴⁴ See, ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance (Prepared for the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, Socio-economic Reintegration and Mine Awareness), “Draft Suggestion for Use of Form J to Report on Victim Assistance,” December 2000, bit.ly/FormJSuggestions2000; and see the more recent Mine Ban Treaty, “Guide To Reporting,” October 2015, bit.ly/2MBTReportingGuide2015.

⁴⁵ Mine Ban Treaty, “Guide to Reporting,” October 2015, bit.ly/2MBTReportingGuide2015.

⁴⁶ Of the 31 most-affected States Parties, only Cambodia, Colombia, Thailand, and Yemen used form G to report on victim assistance activities.

⁴⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, BiH, Burundi, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Peru, and South Sudan. Mine Ban Treaty States Parties have been previously encouraged to use Form J of the Article 7 reporting format “in particular to report on assistance provided for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims.” Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 Report, Form J, Reporting Format.

domestic law protecting the rights of persons with disabilities in Chad remained pending the president's signature to make it a law. A proposal for a new disability rights law in DRC was drafted in 2012, but the draft had not been approved by the end of 2016. In 2011, Eritrea announced the development of a national disability policy, which remains in draft status. In 2015, Somalia announced that the prime minister had "ratified" the CRPD, however, it had not been deposited as of October 2017. Zimbabwe has ratified the CRPD, but is yet to domesticate the law or revise existing legislation accordingly.


In Nicaragua, veterans protested that the 2013 law that regulates assistance for basic necessities and socio-economic reintegration to former combatants including those with disabilities, was not implemented.

A national disability and physical rehabilitation strategic plan for the health sector for 2016–2020 in Afghanistan was drafted and in approval stages.

Regulations concerning the rights of persons with disabilities in BiH lack the legal mechanisms necessary for their actual implementation and enforcement. In Serbia, a strategy for improvement of the situation of persons with disability by 2024 had been drafted and was awaiting the view of the European Commission as of March 2017.

A review in 2016 recommended Iraq's law on the care of persons with disabilities and special needs should be revised to ensure full compliance with the CRPD.

LANDMINE, EXPLOSIVE REMNANTS OF WAR (ERW), AND CLUSTER SUBMUNITION CASUALTIES IN 2016





The Second International Pledging Conference for the Implementation of the Convention was held on 28 February 2017 in Geneva.

© Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit, February 2017

SUPPORT FOR MINE ACTION

Article 6 of the Mine Ban Treaty on international cooperation and assistance recognizes the right of each State Party to seek and receive assistance from other States Parties in order to fulfill its treaty obligations. This chapter focuses on financial support for mine action provided for calendar year 2016 by affected countries and international donors. Cooperation and assistance, however, is not only limited to financial assistance. Other forms of assistance can include the provision of equipment, expertise, and personnel, as well as the exchange of experience, know-how, and best-practice sharing.

2016 FIGURES AND TRENDS

- Thirty-two donors and 11 affected states reported contributing US\$564.5 million in international and national support for mine action in 2016¹; this is \$39.3 million more than the revised 2015 amount (a 7% increase).
- **International contributions** accounted for 85% of overall support for mine action in 2016, while states' contributions to their own national mine action programs accounted for the remaining 15% of global funding.
- **Donors** contributed \$479.5 million in international support for mine action to 40 affected states and three other areas. This represents an increase of \$85.5 million from 2015 (a 22% increase).
- **National contributions:** The Monitor identified 11 affected states that provided \$85 million in contributions to their own national mine action programs, \$46.2 million less than in 2015 (a 35% decrease), when 14 affected countries reported contributing \$131.2 million.
- Contributions from the top five donors—the United States (US), the European Union (EU), Japan, Germany, and Norway—amounted to more than \$335 million and accounted for 70% of all international funding.

¹ This figure represents reported government contributions under bilateral and international programs for calendar year 2016, as of November 2017. All dollar values presented in this chapter are expressed in current dollars. Mine action support includes funding specifically related to landmines, cluster munitions, and explosive remnants of war (ERW) but is rarely disaggregated as such. State reporting on contributions is varied in the level of detail and some utilize a fiscal year other than the calendar year. The total amount of international support for 2015 was revised to include contributions from Canada, the United States (US), and the European Union (EU) that were not previously reported by the Monitor.


- The top five recipient states—Iraq, Afghanistan, Croatia, Cambodia, and Lao PDR—received a combined total of nearly \$259 million, representing 54% of all international contributions.
- International funding was distributed among the following sectors: clearance and risk education (72% of all funding), victim assistance (4%), capacity-building (2.5%), and advocacy (0.5%). The remaining 21% was not disaggregated by the donors.

INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN 2016

In 2016, 32 donors contributed \$479.5 million in international support for mine action in 40 affected states and three other areas, an increase of \$85.5 million (22%) from the revised \$394 million reported in 2015.²

After three years of declining support (a 26% decrease was recorded between 2012 and 2015), total international support provided in 2016 represents the third-highest level of the past decade—after the \$498.9 million provided in 2012, and the \$480.4 in 2010.

International support for mine action: 2006–2016



PLEDGES IN 2016 AND 2017

At the Maputo Review Conference in June 2014, States Parties committed to complete their respective time-bound obligations by 2025. This commitment has led to a number of initiatives and announcements aiming at strengthening international cooperation and assistance, and promoting the need for predictable adequate funding in order to meet the goal of a mine-free world by 2025.

In 2016, mine action donors reiterated their commitments to provide resources to support mine action efforts in the coming years through three pledging conferences:³

- The International Pledging Conference for the Implementation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, hosted by Chile in Geneva in March;

² Data for 2016 on international support to mine action is based on reviews of Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 reports, Convention on Cluster Munitions Article 7 reports, Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) Amended Protocol II Annual Reports, ITF Enhancing Human Security Annual Report 2015, UNMAS Annual Report 2015, and answers from donors to questionnaires. Sixteen of the 25 States Parties documented in this chapter reported international funding for mine action in a Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 report for 2016, compared to 13 out of 27 States Parties in 2015.

³ See Monitor factsheet, “Extraordinary Pledges to Support Mine Action in 2016,” 22 November 2016, www.the-monitor.org/media/2388355/2016-Pledging-Conferences-fact-sheet_final.pdf.

- The Pledging Conference in support of Iraq, co-hosted by Canada, Japan, Germany, Kuwait, the Netherlands, and the US in Washington, DC, in July; and
- The Global Demining Initiative for Colombia ministerial-level meeting, co-hosted by Norway and the US in New York City in September.

In addition to these pledging conferences, New Zealand and the US both announced significant increases in their funding for clearance and survey efforts in Lao PDR.

In 2017, some donors also renewed their commitment to providing financial resources:

- In February, 36 States Parties, two states not party, the EU, as well as non-governmental and international organizations attended the Second Pledging Conference for the Implementation of the Mine Ban Treaty, hosted by Austria in Geneva. In total, 19 States Parties⁴ made pledges to the treaty's Implementation Support Unit and sponsorship program.
- In March, Canada pledged new funding to support risk education, clearance, and capacity-building activities in Iraq, Ukraine, and Sri Lanka for a combined total of \$5.8 million.⁵
- In April, the United Kingdom (UK) announced a £100 million (\$124 million) aid package to support landmine clearance projects in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Somalia, and South Sudan over the next three years.⁶ This represents a tripling in its contribution to mine action.⁷ That same month, the Netherlands also pledged €2 million (US\$2.1 million) for training and the deployment of local demining teams in liberated areas of Syria.⁸
- In November, Germany renewed its support to clearance operations in newly liberated areas of Iraq with a contribution of €7 million (some \$8 million).⁹

These pledging conferences and announcements seem to indicate a political commitment from some donors to fund mine action in select heavily affected countries in the future. But, while an increase has been recorded in mine action funding in 2016, it is too early to determine if this will be sustained.

DONORS IN 2016

In 2016, 25 Mine Ban Treaty States Parties, two states not party, the EU, and four international institutions¹⁰ contributed a total of \$479.5 million to mine action.

⁴ Algeria, Australia, Austria, Canada, Belgium, Estonia, France, Finland, Germany, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom (UK). Mine Ban Treaty, Second Pledging Conference, 28 February 2017, bit.ly/MBT2ndPledgeConf.

⁵ Government of Canada, "Canada's support for demining efforts," 3 April 2017, www.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/news/2017/04/canada_s_supportfordeminingefforts.html. Exchange rate for March 2017: C\$1.3437=US\$1. US Federal Reserve, "Foreign Exchange Rates (monthly)," 1 May 2017, www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g5/20170501/.

⁶ Department for International Development (DFID), "UK triples support for action against landmines on 20th anniversary of Princess Diana's iconic Angola visit," Press release, 4 April 2017, bit.ly/UKtriplesMA. Average exchange rate for April 2017: £1=US\$1.2639. US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Monthly)," 3 July 2017, www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g5/20170703/.

⁷ In comparison, from 2013–2015 the Landmine Monitor reported that the UK contributed a total of £32.7 million (\$51.3 million).

⁸ Government of the Netherlands, "Extra support for demining in Syria," 5 April 2017, www.government.nl/latest/news/2017/04/05/extra-support-for-demining-in-syria. Average exchange rate for April 2017: €1=US\$1.0714. US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Monthly)," 3 July 2017, www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g5/20170703/.

⁹ UNMAS, "The Government of Germany continues to support the clearance of explosive hazards in the newly retaken areas of Iraq," 5 November 2017, www.reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/UNMAS_EN.pdf. Average exchange rate for October 2017: €1=US\$1.1755. US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Monthly)," 1 November 2017, www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g5/current/default.htm.

¹⁰ South Korea and the US are the two states not party. The four international institutions are the Organization for the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) Fund for International Development (OFID), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), United Nations Association (UNA)-Sweden, and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

The majority of the funding came from just a few donors, with the top five donors contributing a total of \$335.6 million, or 70% of all international funding for 2016. The US remained the largest mine action donor with \$152.1 million and alone provided about one-third of all international mine action support in 2016. The EU ranked second with \$73.8 million, or 15% of all contributions, while the next three donors—Japan, Germany, and Norway—provided more than \$30 million each. Another 11 donors contributed less than \$1 million each, compared to 16 in 2015.

Support from States Parties in 2016 accounted for half of all donor funding, with 25 countries providing some \$246 million. This represents an increase from the \$190 million recorded in 2015.

Contributions by donors: 2012–2016¹¹

Donor	Contribution (US\$ million)					Total
	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	
US	152.1	159.4	113.1	113.4	134.4	672.4
EU	73.8	40.8	66.8	39.6	60.7	281.7
Japan	40.7	49.3	49.1	64.0	57.6	260.7
Germany	37.3	15.2	17.5	22.1	23.8	115.9
Norway	31.7	22.3	41.8	49.6	48.4	193.8
Netherlands	25.2	22.1	25.9	23.4	24.1	120.7
UK	24.9	15.4	13.1	22.8	22.0	98.2
Switzerland	16.6	17.4	18.1	20.6	18.4	91.1
Canada	13.3	10.8	7.7	7.9	6.8	46.5
New Zealand	12.5	3.2	7.5	6.7	5.4	35.3
Australia	11.1	4.1	6.6	14.5	24.0	60.3
Denmark	10.2	9.2	12.1	9.3	8.7	49.5
Sweden	6.5	6.1	7.8	12.9	14.1	47.4
OCHA	4.1	0.4	0	0	0	4.5
Ireland	3.3	3.6	4.5	4.1	3.6	19.1
France	3.2	1.1	1.3	2.1	2.0	9.7
Belgium	2.9	0.3	3.2	3.1	7.2	16.7
Italy	2.8	3.0	2.2	1.5	2.8	12.3
South Korea	2.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	3.3
Luxembourg	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.2	7.5
Austria	1.1	0.02	0.02	1.2	2.3	4.6
Other donors*	2.4	8.4	11.8	19.6	31.2	73.4
Total	479.5	394.0	411.8	440.4	498.9	2224.6

* Other donors in 2016 included: Andorra, Czech Republic, Estonia, Liechtenstein, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, the Organization for the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) Fund for International Development, Sudan Humanitarian Fund, and United Nations Association (UNA)-Sweden; OCHA = Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

¹¹ The amount for each donor has been rounded to the nearest hundred thousand. The total amount of international support for 2013 was revised to include a contribution from the EU to the Philippines that was not previously reported by the Monitor. Totals for 2012 and 2011 have also been rectified as a result of database clean-up.



Iraq's foreign minister addresses the 2016 pledging conference hosted in Washington, DC.

© US Department of State, July 2016

In 2016, the EU and its member states¹² contributed a total of \$194 million and accounted for 40% of the total international support, up from \$113.5 million provided in 2015 (33% of the total international funding for that year).

Twenty donors contributed more in 2016 than they did in 2015; including a \$33 million increase from the EU and a \$22 million increase from Germany. Additionally, Norway, the UK, and New Zealand increased their assistance by more than \$9 million each. Two new donors were also identified in 2016: the Sudan Humanitarian Fund, and UNA-Sweden.

In contrast, seven donors decreased their funding, led by Japan (down \$8.6 million) and the US (down \$7.3 million). Five donors from 2015 did not report any contribution to mine action in 2016: Finland, Lithuania, Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and the UN Development Programme (UNDP).

In contrast, seven donors decreased their funding, led by Japan (down

Summary of major changes in 2016

Change	Donors	Combined Total
Increase of more than \$10 million	Germany, and the EU	\$55.1 million increase
Increase of less than \$10 million	Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, the UK, OCHA, and OPEC Fund for International Development	\$54.1 million increase
New donors in 2016	Sudan Humanitarian Fund and UNA-Sweden	\$0.6 million provided in 2016
Decrease of more than \$1 million	Japan and the US	\$15.8 million decrease
Decrease of less than \$1 million	Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Slovenia, and Switzerland	\$1.8 million decrease
Donors from 2015 that did not report new support in 2016	Finland, Lithuania, CEB, OSCE, and UNDP	\$6.7 million provided in 2015

As shown in the table below, changes in the exchange rates between national currencies and the US dollar affected the US dollar value of some contributions. For instance, Japan's contribution dropped by 17% in US dollar terms during 2016, despite decreasing by 26% in national currency terms.

¹² Sixteen EU member states provided funding in 2016: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the UK.

Similarly, whereas Canada, Norway, and the UK reported increases in their mine action contributions in 2016, after conversion into US dollars, increases were less pronounced, although they remain significant in most instances.

Select changes in mine action funding in national currency terms and US\$ terms¹³

Donors	Amount of decrease/increase (national currency)	% change from 2015 (national currency)	Amount of decrease/increase (US\$)	% change from 2015 (US\$)
Australia	-\$9.4 million	+173%	+7 million	+170%
Belgium	+€2.3 million	+867%	+2.6 million	+865%
Canada	+C\$3.8 million	+27%	+2.5 million	+23%
Denmark	+DKK6.8 million	+11%	+1 million	+11%
EU	+€29.9 million	+81%	+33 million	+81%
France	+1.9 million	+193%	+2.1 million	+193%
Germany	+€20 million	+146%	+22.1 million	+145%
Ireland	-€0.3 million	-9%	-0.4 million	-10%
Italy	-€0.2 million	-9%	-0.2 million	-7%
Japan	-¥1,537 million	-26%	-8.5 million	-17%
Netherlands	+€2.9 million	+14%	+3.1 million	14%
New Zealand	-NZ\$13.3 million	+288	+9.2 million	+287%
Norway	+NOK86.2 million	+48%	+9.4 million	+42%
Sweden	+SEK3.6 million	+7%	+0.3 million	+5%
Switzerland	-CHF0.4 million	-2%	-0.8 million	-5%
UK	+£8.3 million	+83%	+9.6 million	+62%

FUNDING PATHS

Donors contributed to mine action through several trust fund mechanisms, notably the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action (VTF) administered by UNMAS and ITF Enhancing Human Security (established by the government of Slovenia and formerly known as the International Trust Fund).

In 2016, contributions to the VTF totaled \$63 million from 21 donors, compared to some \$52.6 million from 19 donors in 2015.¹⁴ Several small donors used the VTF to contribute to mine action.¹⁵ Seven donors and the OPEC Fund for International Development allocated \$8.2 million in 2016 through the ITF for mine action programs in nine states and one area, as well as for global activities.¹⁶

¹³ Average exchange rates for 2016: A\$1=US\$0.7445; C\$1.3243=US\$1; DKK6.7276=US\$1; €1=US\$1.1096; ¥108.66=US\$1; NZ\$0.6976=US\$1; NOK8.3936=US\$1; £1=US\$1.3555; SEK8.5541=US\$1; and CHF0.9848=US\$1. US Federal Reserve, "List of Exchange Rates (Annual)," 4 January 2017, www.federalreserve.gov/releases/G5a/current/default.htm.

¹⁴ UNMAS, "Annual Report 2016," March 2017, p. 30, www.mineaction.org/sites/default/files/publications/UNMAS_2016_web_1.pdf.

¹⁵ The small donors included Andorra, Liechtenstein, Poland, and OCHA, as well as the Sudan Humanitarian Fund and UNA-Sweden.

¹⁶ ITF Enhancing Human Security, "Annual Report 2016," April 2017, pp. 24–25, www.itf.si/upload/publications/itf_ar_2016.pdf.

RECIPIENTS

A total of 40 states and three other areas received \$426.8 million from 31 donors in 2016. A further \$52.7 million, designated as “global” in the table below, was provided to institutions, NGOs, trust funds, and UN agencies without a designated recipient state or area.

Iraq received the largest amount of funding (\$79.7 million) from the largest number of donors (16). Eleven states and one area, or 28% of all recipients, had only one donor.¹⁷

As in previous years, a small number of countries received the majority of funding. The top five recipient states—Iraq, Afghanistan, Croatia, Cambodia, and Lao PDR—received 54% of all international support in 2016.

List of international support recipients in 2016

Recipients	Amount (US\$ million)	Recipients	Amount (US\$ million)
Iraq	79.7	Myanmar	6.3
Afghanistan	57.3	Dem. Republic of the Congo	6.2
Global	52.7	Yemen	5.3
Croatia	50.7	Zimbabwe	4.9
Cambodia	35.9	Angola	4.8
Lao PDR	35.1	Sri Lanka	4.6
Colombia	26.2	Palestine	4.0
Syria	19.2	Tajikistan	2.2
Lebanon	16.9	<i>Western Sahara</i>	2.0
Vietnam	12.3	Sudan	1.7
Somalia	10.9	Albania	1.5
Ukraine	8.8	Mali	1.4
Libya	7.9	Thailand	1.1
Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)	7.4	Other recipients*	6.0
South Sudan	6.5		
		Total	479.5

Note: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are indicated in **bold**; other areas are indicated by *italics*.

* Other recipients in 2016 included: Azerbaijan, **Benin**, **Central African Republic**, **Chad**, Georgia, **Jordan**, *Kosovo*, Marshall Islands, **Mozambique**, **Palau**, **Peru**, **Philippines**, **Senegal**, **Serbia**, **Solomon Islands**, and *Somaliland*. Each received less than \$1 million.

In 2016, 32 states and areas experienced a change of more than 20% in funding compared to 2015, including 13 recipients receiving less support and six recipients receiving no new support. Croatia was the recipient with the largest increase, receiving \$50.7 million more than in 2015, following the disbursement of EU funds for clearance activities at the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) as well as a project on mine clearance of agricultural

¹⁷ Albania, Azerbaijan, Benin, Central African Republic, Chad, Croatia, Marshall Islands, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Solomon Islands, and other area Somaliland.

land running until 2020.¹⁸ While being the fifth largest recipient of international support in 2016, Lao PDR was the recipient with the largest decrease, receiving \$7.4 million less than in 2015.¹⁹ These fluctuations may be a reflection of shifts in donor priorities and changes in local situations.

While donor funding frequently is used for national activities, implementation is often carried out by an array of partnering institutions, NGOs, trust funds, and UN agencies. Organizations that received a significant proportion of contributions in 2016 included HALO Trust (\$25.2 million), Norwegian People's Aid (\$20.6 million), Mines Advisory Group (\$20.5 million), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) (\$15.2 million), the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (\$10.9 million), DanChurchAid (\$10.7 million), and Handicap International (\$10 million).

FUNDING BY THEMATIC SECTOR

In 2016, 72% of mine action funding supported clearance and risk education activities, while support to victim assistance represented 4% of the total international support to mine action.

“Various” funding represented 21% of all international support to mine action. This includes contributions not disaggregated by the donors, as well as funding not earmarked for any sectors.

Contributions by thematic sector in 2016²⁰

Sector	Total contribution (US\$ million)	% of total contribution	No. of donors
Clearance and risk education	343.2	72%	24
Various	100.4	21%	24
Victim assistance	21.0	4%	15
Capacity-building	12.4	2.5%	15
Advocacy	2.5	0.5%	10
Stockpile destruction	0	0%	0
Total	479.5	100%	N/A

Note: N/A = not applicable.

Clearance and risk education

In 2016, \$343.2 million, or 72% of all reported support for mine action, went toward clearance and risk education activities. This represents an increase of more than \$91 million from 2015.

¹⁸ In 2016, the EU reported contributing a total of €45.8 million (\$50.7 million) in mine action funding in Croatia: €5.8 million (\$6.4 million) for demining activities along the border with BiH, €5 million (\$5.6 million) for a demining program in war affected areas, and €34.9 million (\$38.7 million) for a project on mine clearance of agricultural land. Response to Monitor questionnaire by Frank Meeussen, Disarmament, Non-Proliferation and Arms Export Control, European External Action Service, 30 September 2017.

¹⁹ The sharp decrease in international support for mine action in Lao PDR in 2016 is the result of changes in donors' contributions, notably Japan which provided less than \$600,000 in 2016 (in comparison from 2012–2015 Japan contributed an average of \$12 million annually).

²⁰ In 2015, international support was distributed among the following sectors: clearance and risk education (\$251.6 million, or 64% of total international support), victim assistance (\$19.7 million, or 5%), advocacy (\$2.2 million, or 0.5%), capacity-building (\$6.7 million, or 2%), stockpile destruction (\$2.5 million, or 0.5%), and various activities (\$111.3 million, or 28%). The “0” in stockpile destruction in 2016 does not mean states expended no funds for that activity, but rather that no new international support was identified as distributed.

Five of the 10 largest donors—the US, the EU, Norway, Germany, and the UK—provided nearly three-quarters of all support to clearance and risk education (\$256 million).

Many donors reported clearance and risk education as a combined figure. Twenty-two donors did, however, indicate contributions specifically for clearance activities, providing a total of \$169.3 million in 31 countries and other areas (19 States Parties, one signatory, nine states not party, and two other areas).

Thirteen donors reported contributions totaling \$6 million specifically for risk education projects in 11 countries. Myanmar received the most risk education-specific funding with \$1.4 million.

Victim assistance

Direct international support for victim assistance activities remained below the level of most previous years, and decreased significantly as a percentage of total mine action funding. Based on information available as of November 2017, in 2016, \$21 million was reported, up slightly from \$19.7 million in 2015. This represents just 4% of all reported support for mine action, compared to some 5% or 6% in 2015, 2014, and 2013.

Fifteen²¹ donors reported contributing to victim assistance projects in nine States Parties, five states not party, and one other area.²² Most mine-affected countries did not receive any direct international support for victim assistance. Funding for victim assistance activities, however, is especially difficult to track because many donors report that they provide support for victims through more general programs for development and for the rights of persons with disabilities. Since such contributions are not disaggregated, it is not possible to include them in Monitor reporting.

The top three victim assistance donors—Germany, New Zealand, and Switzerland—provided 64% (\$13.5 million) of all victim assistance funding in 2016.

Nine donors reported contributing \$13.3 million, half of all support to victim assistance in 2016, through the ICRC or national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies.

Advocacy & capacity-building

In 2016, less than 1% of all reported support for mine action went toward advocacy activities (\$2.5 million). Of the 32 donors reporting international contributions to mine action, 10 reported supporting advocacy activities.

Ten donors provided \$12.4 million—2.5% of all international support—to support capacity-building activities in eight States Parties, and three states not party.

NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN 2016

While there has been more transparency from affected states, overall national contributions to mine action continue to be under-reported. Few States Parties report national funding in their annual Article 7 reports.²³ States Parties such as Algeria²⁴ and Iraq, as well as states not party India, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam—all mine-affected states with significant contamination and major clearance operations, usually conducted by the army—have never reported annual expenditures.

²¹ Victim assistance donors included: Australia, Austria, Germany, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the OFID. Data for 2015 was also revised—based on new figures that no longer detailed dedicated victim assistance funding—resulting in a decrease from the \$24.2 million recorded in *Landmine Monitor 2016*.

²² States Parties recipients of international assistance for victim assistance were: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Mozambique, Somalia, South Sudan, and Ukraine. States not party that received international assistance for victim assistance were: Lao PDR, Myanmar, Palestine, Syria, and Vietnam. Kosovo was the sole other area that received victim assistance funding.

²³ Only four of the 11 affected states analyzed in this chapter reported national funding for mine action in a Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 report for 2016: Lebanon, Mauritania, Sudan, and Zimbabwe.

²⁴ Algeria reported completion of mine clearance in 2017.

National support: 2016

States	Contribution (US\$ million)
Croatia	26.4
Angola	24.5
BiH	10.7
Lebanon	9.0
Chile	5.8
Chad	2.8
Mauritania	2.4
Sudan	2.0
Lao PDR	0.8
Zimbabwe	0.5
Ecuador	0.1
Total	85.0

Eleven affected states reported \$85.0 million in contributions to mine action from their national budget in 2016, \$46.2 million less than the \$131.2 million reported in 2015 (a 35% decrease).²⁵ As in 2015, this decrease is largely the result of less support provided by Angola to its mine action program, with a total contribution amounting to \$24.5 million in 2016 (60% less than the \$60 million provided in 2015). Nevertheless, Angola still accounted for approximately 30% of all national funding for 2016.

In 2016, three states completely funded their own mine action program: Chile, Ecuador, and Mauritania. Additionally, three States Parties reported funding more than half of their own mine action programs: BiH (59% of total program cost), Chad (97%), and Sudan (54%).

FIVE-YEAR SUPPORT TO MINE ACTION 2012–2016


Over the past five years (2012–2016), total support to mine action amounted to some \$3 billion, an average of about \$603 million per year.

Although data about national support remains incomplete, such support has accounted for about one-quarter of total mine action funding over the period, and amounted to approximately \$794.8 million.

International support totaled \$2.2 billion, an average of \$445 million per year, and represented 74% of all support. Three donors—the US, the EU, and Japan—contributed \$1.2 billion, more than 50% of total international support. Three other donors—Norway, the Netherlands, and Germany—contributed more than \$100 million each. Support from States Parties accounted for 55% of all international funding with \$1.2 billion provided.


Between 2012–2016, the top four recipients—Afghanistan (\$310.2 million), Iraq (\$234.8 million), Lao PDR (\$192 million), and Cambodia (\$148.7 million)—received 40% of all international contributions.

Summary of contributions: 2012–2016



²⁵ Angola, BiH, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Sudan, and Zimbabwe.

SUPPORT FOR MINE ACTION: 2016



Notes:
 The European Union as an entity provided US\$73.8 million in international support for mine action.
 The Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs provided US\$4.1 million to mine action in 2016.
 Other international donors contributing less than US\$3 million each included the OPEC Fund for International Development, Sudan Humanitarian Fund, and UNA-Sweden.
 International donors provided an additional US\$52.7 million without designating recipient state(s).
 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty are **bold**. Signatory is *italics*. *OTHER AREAS* are *UPPER CASE ITALICS*.



Marta Maurás, the chair of the 15th Meeting of States Parties, takes questions from the media during a trip for delegates to demonstrate mine issues in northern Chile.

© Mary Wareham, November 2017

STATUS OF THE CONVENTION

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) and succession is indicated below with (s).

As of 30 November 2017 there were 162 States Parties.

STATES PARTIES

Afghanistan 11 Sep 02 (a)	Belize 27 Feb 98; 23 Apr 98
Albania 8 Sep 98; 29 Feb 00	Benin 3 Dec 97; 25 Sep 98
Algeria 3 Dec 97; 9 Oct 01	Bhutan 18 Aug 05 (a)
Andorra 3 Dec 97; 29 Jun 98	Bolivia 3 Dec 97; 9 Jun 98
Angola 4 Dec 97; 5 Jul 02	Bosnia and Herzegovina 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 98
Antigua and Barbuda 3 Dec 97; 3 May 99	Botswana 3 Dec 97; 1 Mar 00
Argentina 4 Dec 97; 14 Sep 99	Brazil 3 Dec 97; 30 Apr 99
Australia 3 Dec 97; 14 Jan 99	Brunei Darussalam 4 Dec 97; 24 Apr 06
Austria 3 Dec 97; 29 Jun 98	Bulgaria 3 Dec 97; 4 Sep 98
Bahamas 3 Dec 97; 31 Jul 98	Burkina Faso 3 Dec 97; 16 Sep 98
Bangladesh 7 May 98; 6 Sep 00	Burundi 3 Dec 97; 22 Oct 03
Barbados 3 Dec 97; 26 Jan 99	Cambodia 3 Dec 97; 28 Jul 99
Belarus 3 Sep 03 (a)	Cameroon 3 Dec 97; 19 Sep 02
Belgium 3 Dec 97; 4 Sep 98	Canada 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97

Cape Verde 4 Dec 97; 14 May 01
 Central African Republic 8 Nov 02 (a)
 Chad 6 Jul 98; 6 May 99
 Chile 3 Dec 97; 10 Sep 01
 Colombia 3 Dec 97; 6 Sep 00
 Comoros 19 Sep 02 (a)
 Congo, Rep 4 May 01 (a)
 Cook Islands 3 Dec 97; 15 Mar 06
 Costa Rica 3 Dec 97; 17 Mar 99
 Côte d'Ivoire 3 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00
 Croatia 4 Dec 97; 20 May 98
 Cyprus 4 Dec 97; 17 Jan 03
 Czech Republic 3 Dec 97; 26 Oct 99
 Dem Rep of Congo 2 May 02 (a)
 Denmark 4 Dec 97; 8 Jun 98
 Djibouti 3 Dec 97; 18 May 98
 Dominica 3 Dec 97; 26 Mar 99
 Dominican Republic 3 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00
 Ecuador 4 Dec 97; 29 Apr 99
 El Salvador 4 Dec 97; 27 Jan 99
 Equatorial Guinea 16 Sep 98 (a)
 Eritrea 27 Aug 01 (a)
 Estonia 12 May 04 (a)
 Ethiopia 3 Dec 97; 17 Dec 04
 Fiji 3 Dec 97; 10 Jun 98
 Finland 9 Jan 12 (a)
 France 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98
 Gabon 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 00
 Gambia 4 Dec 97; 23 Sep 02
 Germany 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98
 Ghana 4 Dec 97; 30 Jun 00
 Greece 3 Dec 97; 25 Sep 03
 Grenada 3 Dec 97; 19 Aug 98
 Guatemala 3 Dec 97; 26 Mar 99
 Guinea 4 Dec 97; 8 Oct 98
 Guinea-Bissau 3 Dec 97; 22 May 01
 Guyana 4 Dec 97; 5 Aug 03
 Haiti 3 Dec 97; 15 Feb 06
 Holy See 4 Dec 97; 17 Feb 98
 Honduras 3 Dec 97; 24 Sep 98
 Hungary 3 Dec 97; 6 Apr 98
 Iceland 4 Dec 97; 5 May 99
 Indonesia 4 Dec 97; 16 Feb 07
 Iraq 15 Aug 07 (a)
 Ireland 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97
 Italy 3 Dec 97; 23 Apr 99
 Jamaica 3 Dec 97; 17 Jul 98
 Japan 3 Dec 97; 30 Sep 98
 Jordan 11 Aug 98; 13 Nov 98
 Kenya 5 Dec 97; 23 Jan 01
 Kiribati 7 Sep 00 (a)
 Kuwait 30 Jul 07 (a)
 Latvia 1 Jul 05 (a)
 Lesotho 4 Dec 97; 2 Dec 98
 Liberia 23 Dec 99 (a)
 Liechtenstein 3 Dec 97; 5 Oct 99
 Lithuania 26 Feb 99; 12 May 03
 Luxembourg 4 Dec 97; 14 Jun 99
 Macedonia FYR 9 Sep 98 (a)
 Madagascar 4 Dec 97; 16 Sep 99
 Malawi 4 Dec 97; 13 Aug 98
 Malaysia 3 Dec 97; 22 Apr 99
 Maldives 1 Oct 98; 7 Sep 00
 Mali 3 Dec 97; 2 Jun 98
 Malta 4 Dec 97; 7 May 01
 Mauritania 3 Dec 97; 21 Jul 00
 Mauritius 3 Dec 97; 3 Dec 97
 Mexico 3 Dec 97; 9 Jun 98
 Moldova 3 Dec 97; 8 Sep 00
 Monaco 4 Dec 97; 17 Nov 98
 Montenegro 23 Oct 06 (s)
 Mozambique 3 Dec 97; 25 Aug 98
 Namibia 3 Dec 97; 21 Sep 98
 Nauru 7 Aug 00 (a)
 Netherlands 3 Dec 97; 12 Apr 99
 New Zealand 3 Dec 97; 27 Jan 99
 Nicaragua 4 Dec 97; 30 Nov 98
 Niger 4 Dec 97; 23 Mar 99
 Nigeria 27 Sep 01 (a)
 Niue 3 Dec 97; 15 Apr 98
 Norway 3 Dec 97; 9 Jul 98
 Oman 20 Aug 14 (a)
 Palau 18 Nov 07 (a)
 Panama 4 Dec 97; 7 Oct 98
 Papua New Guinea 28 Jun 04 (a)
 Paraguay 3 Dec 97; 13 Nov 98
 Peru 3 Dec 97; 17 Jun 98
 Philippines 3 Dec 97; 15 Feb 00
 Poland 4 Dec 97; 27 Dec 12
 Portugal 3 Dec 97; 19 Feb 99
 Qatar 4 Dec 97; 13 Oct 98
 Romania 3 Dec 97; 30 Nov 00
 Rwanda 3 Dec 97; 8 Jun 00
 Saint Kitts and Nevis 3 Dec 97; 2 Dec 98

Saint Lucia 3 Dec 97; 13 Apr 99
 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 3 Dec 97;
 1 Aug 01
 Samoa 3 Dec 97; 23 Jul 98
 San Marino 3 Dec 97; 18 Mar 98
 São Tomé & Príncipe 30 Apr 98; 31 Mar 03
 Senegal 3 Dec 97; 24 Sep 98
 Serbia 18 Sep 03 (a)
 Seychelles 4 Dec 97; 2 Jun 00
 Sierra Leone 29 Jul 98; 25 Apr 01
 Slovak Republic 3 Dec 97; 25 Feb 99
 Slovenia 3 Dec 97; 27 Oct 98
 Solomon Islands 4 Dec 97; 26 Jan 99
 Somalia 16 Apr 12 (a)
 South Africa 3 Dec 97; 26 Jun 98
 South Sudan 11 Nov 11 (s)
 Spain 3 Dec 97; 19 Jan 99
 Sudan 4 Dec 97; 13 Oct 03
 Suriname 4 Dec 97; 23 May 02
 Swaziland 4 Dec 97; 22 Dec 98
 Sweden 4 Dec 97; 30 Nov 98
 Switzerland 3 Dec 97; 24 Mar 98
 Tajikistan 12 Oct 99 (a)
 Tanzania 3 Dec 97; 13 Nov 00
 Thailand 3 Dec 97; 27 Nov 98
 Timor-Leste 7 May 03 (a)
 Togo 4 Dec 97; 9 Mar 00
 Trinidad and Tobago 4 Dec 97; 27 Apr 98
 Tunisia 4 Dec 97; 9 Jul 99
 Turkey 25 Sep 03 (a)
 Turkmenistan 3 Dec 97; 19 Jan 98
 Tuvalu 13 September 2011 (a)
 Uganda 3 Dec 97; 25 Feb 99
 Ukraine 24 Feb 99; 27 Dec 05
 United Kingdom 3 Dec 97; 31 Jul 98
 Uruguay 3 Dec 97; 7 Jun 01
 Vanuatu 4 Dec 97; 16 Sep 05
 Venezuela 3 Dec 97; 14 Apr 99
 Yemen 4 Dec 97; 1 Sep 98
 Zambia 12 Dec 97; 23 Feb 01
 Zimbabwe 3 Dec 97; 18 Jun 98

SIGNATORY

Marshall Islands 4 Dec 97

NON-SIGNATORIES

Armenia	Morocco
Azerbaijan	Nepal
Bahrain	Pakistan
Burma/Myanmar	Palestine
China	Russian Federation
Cuba	Saudi Arabia
Egypt	Singapore
Georgia	Sri Lanka
India	Syria
Iran	Tonga
Israel	United Arab Emirates
Kazakhstan	United States
Korea, North	Uzbekistan
Korea, South	Vietnam
Kyrgyzstan	
Lao PDR	
Lebanon	
Libya	
Micronesia	
Mongolia	

MINE BAN TREATY

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 fulfilment 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.

LANDMINE MONITOR 2017



Landmine Monitor 2017 provides a global overview of efforts in 2016, and into November 2017 where possible, to universalize and fully implement the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty, and more generally assess the international community's response to the global landmine and explosive remnants of war problem. It covers developments in the areas of antipersonnel landmine use, production, stockpiling, mine action, casualties, victim assistance, and mine action funding.

This report was prepared by Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor, the unprecedented civil society initiative providing research and monitoring for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC). Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor has reported on the international community's response to the global landmine problem and its solutions since 1999.

Cover: Full excavation by female deminer in Sri Lanka with mineline shown by yellow sticks. © Helaine Boyd/HALO Trust, May 2017

Top left: Destruction of the last retained anti-personnel mines in Algeria on 18 September 2017. © Youcef Rafai/ICBL, Sept 2017

Top right: Representatives of governments and civil society gather at the "Broken Chair" in Geneva to commemorate 20 years since the adoption of the Mine Ban Treaty. © Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit, June 2017

Cover Design: Lixar I.T. Inc.

Printed and bound in Austria.

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor is coordinated by the Monitoring and Research Committee, a standing committee of the Governance Board of the ICBL-CMC.

Research team leaders, ICBL-CMC staff, and expert representatives of the following organizations comprise the committee: Danish Demining Group, Handicap International, Human Rights Watch, and Mines Action Canada



LANDMINE & CLUSTER MUNITION
MONITOR

www.the-monitor.org

ISBN 978-2-9701146-2-8



9 782970 114628 >