

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

APLC/MSP.4/2002/1  
27 September 2002

ENGLISH  
Original: ENGLISH/SPANISH

---

Fourth Meeting  
Geneva, 16-20 September 2002

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

**FINAL REPORT**

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

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

Annexes:

- Annex I           List of Documents
- Annex II          President's Paper on the Intersessional Work Programme
- Annex III         President's Paper on Article 7 Reporting
- Annex IV         President's Paper on Developing a Process to Prepare for the Convention's First Review Conference
- Annex V           Final Reports of the Standing Committees
- Annex VI          President's Action Programme
- Annex VII         Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit
- Annex VIII        Managua Appeal
- Annex IX          Declaration of the Human Security Network on Promoting the Universalization of the Convention

## **PART I**

### **ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF THE FOURTH MEETING**

#### **A. Introduction**

1. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction provides in article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2, that:

“The States parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention, including:

- (a) The operation and status of this Convention;
- (b) Matters arising from the reports submitted under the provisions of this Convention;
- (c) International cooperation and assistance in accordance with article 6;
- (d) The development of technologies to clear anti-personnel mines;
- (e) Submissions of States parties under article 8; and
- (f) Decisions relating to submissions of States parties as provided for in article 5”; and,

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

2. At its fifty-sixth session, the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 56/24 M requested the Secretary-General, “in accordance with article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention in Geneva, from 16 to 20 September 2002, and, on behalf of States parties and according to article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the Meeting as observers”.

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

4. The first meeting of the Standing Committee was held on 1 February 2002. During the meeting, participants considered a number of issues relating to the organization of the Fourth Meeting, including a draft provisional agenda, a draft programme of work, draft rules of procedure and provisional estimated costs for convening the Fourth Meeting. No objections were raised in connection with the proposals made with respect to the draft rules of procedure, draft provisional agenda, draft programme of work and the venue for the Fourth Meeting, and it was agreed that they, along with all other conference documents with the exception of reports submitted under article 7 of the Convention, would be finalized in all six languages of the Convention to be put before the Fourth Meeting. It was also agreed that the record of work of the four Standing Committees would be communicated to the Fourth Meeting in the form of final reports prepared by the Co-Chairs of each Standing Committee.

5. The second meeting of the Standing Committee was held on 27 and 31 May 2002. During the meeting, no objections were made with respect to the provisional estimated costs, and it was agreed that they would be put before the Fourth Meeting.

6. The opening of the Fourth Meeting was preceded by a ceremony at which statements were delivered by the President of the Swiss Confederation, Mr. Kaspar Villiger, and Her Royal Highness, Princess Astrid of Belgium. This ceremony also illustrated, through an interpretative dance piece performed by Nomades, the daily terror of landmines faced by thousands throughout the world, and featured testimonies provided by landmine survivors Ms. Felicidade Maria de Jesus from Angola and Mr. Marick Ngueradjim from Chad.

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

7. The Fourth Meeting was opened on 16 September 2002 by the Vice-President of the Republic of Nicaragua, Mr. José Rizo Castellón, on behalf of the President of the Third Meeting of the States Parties, who also presented the Conference with the “Managua Appeal” which was adopted in Managua on 28 August 2002 at the Conference on Progress in Demining in the Americas (contained in Annex VIII). The Fourth Meeting elected by acclamation Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium as its President in accordance with rule 7 of the draft rules of procedure.

8. At the opening session, a message addressed to the Fourth Meeting by the Secretary-General of the United Nations was read by Under-Secretary-General and High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello, and a statement was made by Jody Williams, 1997 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and Ambassador for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. In addition, a message of the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross was read by Mr. Jean de Courten.

9. At its first plenary meeting on 16 September 2002, the Fourth Meeting adopted its agenda as contained in document APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.1. On the same occasion, the Fourth Meeting adopted its rules of procedure as contained in document APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.3, the estimated costs for convening the Fourth Meeting as contained in document APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.4, and its programme of work as contained in document APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.2.

10. Also at its first plenary meeting, representatives from Australia, Canada, Croatia, Germany, Honduras, Norway, Thailand and Yemen were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the Fourth Meeting.

11. The Meeting unanimously confirmed the nomination of Ambassador Christian Faessler of Switzerland as the Secretary-General of the Meeting. The Meeting also took note of the appointment by the United Nations Secretary-General of Mr. Enrique Roman-Morey, Director of the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, as Executive Secretary of the Meeting, and the appointment by the President of Mr. Kerry Brinkert, Manager of the Implementation Support Unit, as the President's Executive Coordinator.

### **C. Participation in the Fourth Meeting**

12. Eighty-nine States parties participated in the Meeting: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Macedonia (former Yugoslav Republic of), Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova (Republic of), Monaco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

13. Five States that had ratified or acceded to the Convention, but for which the Convention had not yet entered into force, participated in the Meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1 of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: Afghanistan, Angola, Cameroon, Comoros and Democratic Republic of Congo.

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

15. A further 27 States not parties to the Convention participated in the Meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1 of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Central African Republic, Cuba, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Iraq, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, and Yugoslavia.

16. Delegation information submitted in accordance with rule 4 of the rules of procedure of the Meeting was received from 132 States mentioned in paragraphs 12 to 15 above.

17. The Meeting took note of the delegation information of the representatives of all of the States mentioned in paragraphs 12 to 15 above.

18. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the rules of procedure, the following international organizations and institutions, regional organizations, entities and non-governmental organizations attended the Meeting as observers: European Commission, European Parliament, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Committee of the Red Cross, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Order of Malta, Organization of American States, International Labour Office, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNICEF, United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), and the World Health Organization (WHO). In accordance with rule 1, paragraph 4, the following organizations attended the Meeting as observers at the invitation of the Meeting: Canadian International Demining Corps (Canada), Emergency Life Support for Civilian War Victims (Italy), HAMAP Demineurs - Halte aux Mines Antipersonnel (Switzerland), International Committee for the Respect and Application of the African Charter on Human and People's Rights (Switzerland), International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (Slovenia), Mine Action Information Centre, James Madison University (United States), NAMSA - the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (Luxembourg), PRIO - International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (Norway), Solidest (Switzerland), South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa), VERTIC - the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (United Kingdom).

19. A list of all delegations to the Fourth Meeting is contained in documents APLC/MSP.4/2002/INF.2 and APLC/MSP.4/2002/INF.2/Add.1.

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

20. The Fourth Meeting held eight plenary meetings from 16 to 20 September 2002.

21. The first, second, third and fifth plenary meetings were devoted to the general exchange of views under agenda item 10. Delegations of 50 States parties, 14 observer States and 5 observer organizations made statements in the general exchange of views, including rights of reply.

22. At the fourth plenary meeting, on 18 September 2002, the Meeting reviewed the general status and operation of the Convention, expressing satisfaction that 126 States have ratified or acceded to the Convention. The Meeting also expressed satisfaction that the new international norm established by the Convention is taking hold as demonstrated by the behaviour of many States not parties to the Convention. In addition, the Meeting expressed satisfaction that efforts to implement the Convention are making a difference, that 88 States parties no longer possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, that considerable areas of mined land have been cleared over

the past year, that casualty rates have been reduced in several of the world's most mine-affected States, and that more and better efforts are being undertaken to assist landmine victims. The Meeting also heard of efforts in the area of universalization, including the action taken by the Human Security Network, the Declaration of which can be found in Annex IX.

23. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, States parties took note of the challenges that remain in achieving the Convention's core humanitarian aims, expressing their will to work tirelessly to ensure that mined areas are cleared and stockpiles destroyed within the time limits contained in the Convention, to further assist landmine victims for as long as assistance is required, and to vigorously promote formal acceptance of the Convention, particularly by those States that continue to produce and/or use anti-personnel mines.

24. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, and in the context of a subsequent discussion on assistance and cooperation, it was recalled that States parties in a position to do so committed themselves on a long-term basis to sustain the process of achieving the Convention's humanitarian aims, and that States parties should continue to give high priority to mine action within their development and humanitarian policies, particularly with a view to the Convention's 10-year time frame for mine clearance.

25. Also in the context of reviewing the general status and operation of the Convention, the delegations of Austria, Canada, Germany and Norway expressed interest in hosting the Review Conference of the Convention in 2004.

26. At the fourth plenary meeting, on 18 September 2002, the Meeting considered the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention. The President notified the Meeting that he had not been informed that any State wished to make such a request at the Fourth Meeting. The Meeting took note of this.

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

28. In addition, within the framework of the sixth and seventh plenary meetings, the Meeting held informal consultations on international cooperation and assistance in accordance with article 6 on the following topics: resource mobilization, mine clearance and related technologies; victim assistance, socio-economic reintegration and mine awareness; and the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines. These consultations involved a review of the work of the relevant Standing Committees, as recorded in their reports contained in Annex V, with a focus on the actions recommended by the Committees.

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

29. At its fourth plenary meeting, on 18 September 2002, the Meeting considered matters arising from and in the context of reports to be submitted under article 7, including matters pertaining to the reporting process. States parties expressed their continued satisfaction with the technical ways and means of circulating reports as adopted at the First Meeting and as amended

at the Second Meeting. On the basis of suggestions contained in the President's Paper on article 7 reporting as contained in Annex III, the Meeting encouraged States parties to maximize the potential of the reporting format as an important tool to measure progress and communicate needs and, in this context, expressed their appreciation for and agreed to act upon, as appropriate, the suggestions made in the President's Paper. This would include submitting reports electronically and, as relevant, using the suggested cover page.

30. Further to the recommendations made by the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Meeting recognized the continuing importance of the Intersessional Work Programme and expressed that on the basis of the President's Paper on the Intersessional Work Programme as contained in Annex II, the Programme in the lead-up to the Convention's First Review Conference should focus with even greater clarity on those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention. In addition, States parties expressed that the Intersessional Work Programme should proceed in a manner consistent with the principles that have well served the Programme to date, particularly the informal, inclusive and cooperative nature of the process.

31. Further to a proposal made by the President, States parties agreed to change the name of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies. Pursuant to extensive consultations, States parties also identified the following States parties as the Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the Fifth Meeting of the States parties:

- Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Belgium and Kenya (Co-Chairs); Cambodia and Japan (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Colombia and France (Co-Chairs); Australia and Croatia (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Stockpile Destruction: Romania and Switzerland (Co-Chairs); Guatemala and Italy (Co-Rapporteurs);
- General Status and Operation of the Convention: Austria and Peru (Co-Chairs); Mexico and the Netherlands (Co-Rapporteurs).

32. Further to a proposal made by the President, States parties agreed to set the dates of the 2003 meetings of the Standing Committees from 3 to 7 February and from 12 to 16 May.

33. States parties again recognized the value and importance of the Coordinating Committee in the effective functioning and implementation of the Convention and for operating in an open and transparent manner, requested that the Coordinating Committee, in a manner consistent with its mandate, continue to be practical-minded and apply the principle of flexibility with respect to the format of Standing Committee meetings, and their sequencing and respective time allocation, continue with its practice to make available summary reports of its meetings on the web site of the GICHD, and, requested the President, as Chair of the Coordinating Committee, to continue to report on the Coordinating Committee's functioning.

34. The Meeting noted the Director of the GICHD's report on the activities of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), contained in Annex VII. States parties expressed their appreciation to the GICHD for the prompt manner in which it established the ISU and for its ongoing support for the Intersessional Work Programme, and to the ISU for quickly demonstrating its effectiveness and value to States parties.

35. The Meeting again noted the work undertaken by interested States parties through the establishment of a sponsorship programme, which had helped to ensure more widespread representation at meetings of the Convention and of the intersessional meetings. States parties expressed their appreciation of the sponsorship programme and of the efficient management thereof by the GICHD.

36. On the basis of the President's Paper on Developing a Process to Prepare for the Convention's First Review Conference as contained in Annex IV, the Meeting agreed to mandate the President to facilitate consultations leading to consideration of a variety of matters at the Fifth Meeting on preparations for the Convention's First Review Conference.

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

38. At its final plenary meeting, on 20 September 2002, the Meeting agreed that the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties would be held, in accordance with the provisions of article 11 of the Convention, from 15 to 19 September 2003 in Bangkok, Thailand.

39. At the same plenary, the Meeting adopted the Declaration of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties, which is contained in Part II of this report. In addition, the Meeting warmly welcomed the President's Action Programme, contained in Annex VI, as a practical means of facilitating implementation of the Convention in accordance with the recommendations made by the Standing Committees.

#### **F. Documentation**

40. A list of documents of the Fourth Meeting is contained in Annex I to this report.

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

41. At its eighth and final plenary meeting, on 20 September 2002, the Meeting adopted its draft Final Report, contained in document APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.5.



## **PART II**

### **DECLARATION OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES**

1. We, the States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, along with other States, international organizations and institutions and non-governmental organizations, gathered in Geneva, reaffirm our unwavering commitment to the total eradication of anti-personnel mines and to addressing the insidious and inhumane effects of these weapons. We commit ourselves to intensify our efforts in those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention.
2. We celebrate the growing support for the Convention, ratified by 116 States and acceded to by another 12. With an additional 17 countries having signed, but not yet ratified the Convention, the number of States parties and signatories now totals 145, including more than 40 mine-affected States. We call upon those that have not done so, to ratify or accede to the Convention. We also call upon all States in the process of formally accepting the obligations of the Convention, to provisionally apply the terms of the Convention.
3. We recognize that the new international norm established by the Convention is being demonstrated by the successful record of implementation of the Convention, including the conduct of many States not party to the Convention respecting the provisions therein. A total of 88 States parties no longer possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, including 34 which have completed stockpile destruction since the entry into force of the Convention. A further 22 State parties are in the process of destroying their stockpiles. Furthermore, over US\$ 1 billion has been allocated since the Convention was negotiated to address the global landmine problem, in addition to the resources being allocated by mine-affected countries themselves.
4. We feel encouraged by the fact that over the past year, a considerable amount of land was cleared of anti-personnel mines, that casualty rates in several of the world's most mine-affected States have again decreased, that landmine victim assistance has improved, and that our cooperative efforts continue to contribute to this progress.
5. While recognizing the success of the Convention, we remain deeply concerned that anti-personnel mines continue to kill, maim and threaten the lives of countless innocent people each day, that the terror of mines prevents individuals from reclaiming their lives and that the lasting impact of these weapons denies communities the opportunity to rebuild long after conflicts have ended.
6. We deplore any use of anti-personnel mines. Such acts are contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and exacerbate the humanitarian problems already caused by the use of these weapons. We urge all those who continue to use, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain and/or transfer anti-personnel landmines, to cease immediately and to join us in the task of eradicating these weapons. We particularly call upon the States outside the Convention, which have recently used anti-personnel mines and/or continue to produce to stop these activities.

7. We expect those States, which have declared their commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention and which continue to use anti-personnel mines, to recognize that this is a clear violation of their solemn commitment. We call upon all States concerned to respect their commitments.

8. Recognizing the need to secure full compliance with all obligations of the Convention, we reaffirm our commitment to effectively implement the Convention and to comply fully with its provisions. We do so in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration that has characterized this process. In the event of serious concerns of non-compliance with any of the obligations of the Convention, we acknowledge our responsibility to seek clarification of these concerns, in this cooperative spirit.

9. We recall that the four-year maximum time period for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines is less than one year away for those States which became parties in 1999. We also recall that as soon as possible, but not later than 10 years after the entry into force of this Convention, each State party must undertake to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control. We encourage continuing national, regional and international initiatives aimed at fulfilling these obligations. At the same time, we congratulate those States parties that have already destroyed their stockpiles of anti-personnel mines and those that have made substantial progress in clearing mined areas.

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

11. We recognize that to achieve the promise of this unique and important humanitarian instrument, we must continue working tirelessly in all parts of the world to end the use of anti-personnel mines, to destroy stockpiles, to cease development, production and transfers of these weapons, to clear mined areas to free land from its deadly bondage, to assist victims to reclaim their lives with dignity and to prevent new victims.

12. We reaffirm that progress to free the world from anti-personnel mines would be promoted by the commitment by non-State actors to cease and renounce their use in line with the international norm established by this Convention. We urge all non-State actors to cease and renounce the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines according to the principles and norms of International Humanitarian Law.

13. We warmly welcome the substantial progress made during the intersessional work programme. This programme continues to focus and advance the international community's mine action efforts, it greatly assists in our collective aim to implement the Convention and it provides a forum for mine-affected and other States to share experiences, acquire knowledge and enhance efforts to implement the Convention. We express our satisfaction that the intersessional

work programme has been carried out in the Convention's tradition of partnership, dialogue, openness and practical cooperation. We welcome the increasing participation of mine-affected States in the intersessional work programme and the valuable contribution of the Sponsorship Programme.

14. To further enhance the intersessional process, we commit ourselves to intensify our efforts in those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention. We recommit ourselves to proceed with our work in a manner consistent with the principles that have well served the intersessional programme to date, particularly informality and cooperation. We furthermore call upon all States parties and other interested actors to continue to participate actively in the work of the Standing Committees.

15. We acknowledge the positive work of the Coordinating Committee tasked with the coordination of the intersessional work programme, and its role in the strengthening of the intersessional process. We thank the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) for its essential support and its commitment to the intersessional process. And we express our appreciation to the GICHD for the prompt manner in which it established the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) in accordance with the decision taken by the States parties at the Third Meeting of the States Parties and to the ISU for quickly demonstrating its effectiveness and value to States parties.

16. We acknowledge the contributory role of the United Nations agencies involved in Mine Action.

17. We express our gratitude to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and other relevant non-governmental organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and to regional and national organizations and agencies for their important and substantive contribution to the intersessional process and to the overall implementation and consolidation of the Convention.

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

## **Annex I**

### **LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Title</b>
APLC/MSP.4/2002/1	Final Report of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.1	Draft Provisional Agenda
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.2	Draft Programme of Work
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.3	Draft Rules of Procedure
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.4	Estimated Costs for Convening the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.5	Draft Report, Part II - Declaration of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.4/2002/L.6/Rev.1	Draft Report, Annex VI - President's Action Programme
APLC/MSP.4/2002/SC.1/1	Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies - Final Report 2001-2002
APLC/MSP.4/2002/SC.2/1	Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-economic Reintegration - Final Report 2001-2002
APLC/MSP.4/2002/SC.3/1	Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction - Final Report 2001-2002
APLC/MSP.4/2002/SC.4/1/Rev.1	Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention - Final Report 2001-2002
APLC/MSP.4/2002/INF.1	Summary of Reports on Transparency Measures
APLC/MSP.4/2002/INF.2	List of Participants
APLC/MSP.4/2002/INF.2/Add.1	Addendum to the List of Participants
APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.1	Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit

<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Title</b>
APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.2	President's Paper on the Intersessional Work Programme
APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.3	President's Paper on Article 7 Reporting
APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.4	President's Paper on Developing a Process to Prepare for the Convention's First Review Conference
APLC/MSP.4/2002/CRP.5	Draft Report, Part I - Organization and Work of the Fourth Meeting
APLC/MSP.4/2002/MISC.1	Excerpt from the Report of the Secretary-General (1998): Assistance in mine clearance
APLC/MSP.4/2002/MISC.2	Provisional List of Participants

## **Annex II**

### **PRESIDENT'S PAPER ON THE INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAMME**

#### **Purpose of this paper**

Three years have passed since the Intersessional Work Programme was established and a great deal has been accomplished. With only two years before the Conference to review the operation and status of the Convention, much remains to be done. At this time, therefore, States parties and key partners may wish to reflect upon how the Intersessional Work Programme has contributed to the effective implementation of the Convention and how the Programme could contribute from this point forward. Through a review of our efforts to date and some lessons learned, this paper suggests certain key principles for future work, consistent with the original and still valid objectives agreed to by State parties in 1999.

#### **Background**

In 1999, the First Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention in Maputo established the Intersessional Work Programme to ensure the systematic, effective implementation of the Convention through a more regularized programme of work based on a President's Paper, which noted that the programme's objectives were:

- To “engage a broad international community for the purpose of advancing the achievement of the humanitarian objectives of the Convention”;
- To “facilitate in-depth considerations of mine action issues by all interested parties at meetings which complement and build upon each other in a structured and systematic way”; and,
- “To organize the work within the framework of the Convention in a way which promotes continuity, openness, transparency, inclusiveness and a cooperative spirit.”

The Intersessional Work Programme has been successful in raising awareness, reaching common understanding on diverse issues, identifying best practices, sharing experiences and information on broad means available to address the landmine problem, as well as providing the opportunity for different actors involved in mine action issues to meet and discuss ideas.

Closely related to the accomplishments of the Intersessional Programme has been the establishment by the States parties of both the Coordinating Committee of Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees and the Implementation Support Unit within the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD).

## **Lessons learned regarding the intersessional process**

The Intersessional Work Programme has demonstrated the importance of a number of principles that have contributed to an effective work programme. These principles provide a sound basis for ensuring the Programme's ongoing effectiveness:

- Coherence is important in terms of how individual Standing Committees are part of a greater whole, requiring that they work together in identifying needs, developing agendas, and focusing on the humanitarian objectives while recognizing the distinct nature of the issues of each Committee.
- Flexibility has proven valuable in the ability of the Intersessional Programme to evolve to meet changing needs;
- Partnership, with respect to the essential contribution of international and non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention, has been key in the success of this process;
- Informality has ensured openness and a richness of dialogue;
- Continuity ensures that efforts build upon the progress of the past and point to how challenges can be overcome in the future; and,
- Effective preparation contributes to the maximum benefit of all attending the meetings.

## **Current needs and opportunities**

The purpose of the Intersessional Work Programme is as relevant today as it was in 1999. At this stage in the life of the Convention and given the achievements to date, with the aim of effective implementation of all provisions of the Convention, it is important to focus with greater clarity on those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention:

- To destroy anti-personnel mines that remain in stockpiles;
- To clear areas containing anti-personnel mines;
- To provide assistance to landmine survivors;
- To ensure universal acceptance of the ban on anti-personnel mines.

More effective focus on the Convention's humanitarian aims by the Intersessional Work Programme requires the full and active participation of States parties. Notwithstanding the Convention's unique spirit of partnership involving non-governmental and international organizations, the responsibility of implementing the Convention rests with States parties.

Therefore, a greater emphasis should be placed on hearing from States parties with respect to their plans and needs for assistance and from States parties in a position to provide assistance with respect to their intentions and requirements for information.

A renewed emphasis on achieving the Convention's humanitarian core objectives should include an ongoing overall assessment of the Convention's implementation and operation. By 2004, progress in some areas will be essential (e.g., the completion of stockpile destruction by many State parties and significant advances made in clearing mined land). In other areas progress will be expected (e.g., improvement in the well-being of landmine survivors and advances towards the universalization of the Convention). The Intersessional Programme can contribute significantly in this regard by providing a forum where existing needs, means available to meet those needs, progress being made, and remaining work are identified.

## **Conclusion**

The Intersessional Work Programme has been a valuable tool in the success of the Convention and the lessons learned should continue to guide our efforts. Likewise, the existing four Standing Committees remain valid, as does informal manner of operating.

Moreover, we may derive ongoing benefit from the Intersessional Programme by more effectively focusing our attention on the humanitarian aims of the Convention and progress in our collective effort to implement provisions of the Convention most directly related to these aims. This can be done by increasing the participation of States parties, strengthening dialogue among relevant actors, comprehensively assessing progress, diligently identifying needs and the means to answer those needs, and promoting the universalization of the Convention.

With the agreement of States parties, this Paper could provide the basis for the work of the Intersessional Work Programme between 2002 and the Review Conference.



### **Annex III**

## **PRESIDENT'S PAPER ON ARTICLE 7 REPORTING**

### **Background**

The Convention requires *each State party to 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* (art. 7.1). The Convention also requires that *the information provided in accordance with article 7 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* (art. 7.2).

In addition to reports on national implementation measures (art. 9) and mines retained and transferred in accordance with article 3, much of that which States parties must report on relates to the implementation of measures to address the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel mines. This information is of potential value in facilitating cooperation and assistance. Therefore, it is in the interest of all States parties to ensure that the reporting rate is high and that the full potential of the reports is taken advantage of.

This theme was discussed throughout the 2001-2002 Intersessional Work Programme, where the relationship between article 7 reporting and implementation of the Convention was highlighted. It was noted that the process of assistance and cooperation could be enhanced if there was a clearer indication of challenges, plans, progress and needs of mine-affected countries, as well as the contributions and resources of State parties. It was also noted that article 7 has a key role in providing important humanitarian information needed to ensure that the matching of needs and resources occurs. The article 7 reporting rate stands now at around 80 per cent.

The challenges identified with respect to article 7 reporting relate to finding ways both to increase the reporting rate and to ensure that the information contained in the reports can be used effectively in the cooperative process to facilitate implementation.

At the 31 May 2002 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Coordinator of the article 7 Contact Group presented a paper which served as a basis for discussion on these matters. Several delegations welcomed the elements included in the non-paper and noted the importance of article 7 reporting, not only as a Convention obligation, but also as an important tool to measure progress in the implementation of the Convention and for mine-affected States parties to communicate their needs to other States parties.

The purpose of this paper is to consolidate the ideas made with respect to article 7 reporting during 2001-2002 with a view to putting forward suggestions that may be used by States parties to assist them in increasing the reporting rate and ensuring that the information contained in the reports can be used effectively.<sup>a</sup>

## Suggestions

### 1. *Ensuring information on article 7 obligations is well known*

Through the work of the article 7 Contact Group, the development of a reporting guide by VERTIC with the support of the Government of Belgium and the input of several States parties and the ICBL, and reminders being sent to States parties, a great deal has been done to encourage timely reporting. However, the annual nature of article 7 reporting means that awareness of this obligation must constantly be promoted. In this regard, the President of the Meeting of the States parties as well as the United Nations should continue to remind States parties of upcoming reporting deadlines. The President of the MSP and the coordinator of the article 7 Contact Group should also continue to promote tools developed to assist States parties in preparing reports.

### 2. *Taking full advantage of the opportunity to provide “supplementary information”*

States parties are not required to report on anything more than what is prescribed by article 7 (although States parties are encouraged to volunteer information in Form J). However, simply providing the location of mined areas and details on the types of the mines in these areas means forgoing the opportunity to take full advantage of the article 7 reporting as a State party's official voice in communicating with other States parties on broader implementation matters. States parties may wish to use the opportunity to provide “supplementary information” in the article 7 reporting format. For example, States parties may find it in their interest to use this portion of the reporting format to provide: (a) an overview of the impact of the mine problem; (b) plans to address the problem; (c) progress made; and, (d) assistance requirements. In addition, States parties may wish to consider how to maximize the opportunity to provide “supplementary information” with respect to stockpile destruction.

Providing such information could help facilitate cooperative efforts to assist in implementation: More and better information could provide a better basis for effective action. In a similar sense, making more effective use of this information could provide a greater incentive to report on a timely basis. (Note: These suggestions do not imply a change in the reporting format. Rather what is being suggested is that States parties, if they wish to do so, may take greater advantage of the existing format. If States parties find reporting such matters too difficult or confusing, they could seek assistance in a manner consistent with article 6.1 of the Convention.)

### 3. *Using the IMSMA to assist in reporting*

The Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) has been or will be deployed in over a dozen States parties affected by anti-personnel mines. The IMSMA is designed to serve as a first-rate database and mine action decision-making support tool. In this regard, where it has been deployed, the IMSMA may be of assistance in facilitating the provision of information on matters such as the impact of mined areas and progress in addressing this impact.

4. *Making better use of Form J*

While reporting on matters related to the provision of care, rehabilitation and reintegration of landmine survivors is not required under article 7, the potential to do so exists through Form J. To date, Form J has been used to indicate resources dedicated to the problem.

However, Form J also can serve as an important voice for States parties in elaborating challenges in meeting the needs of landmine survivors, plans to address these challenges, progress made and requirements for assistance. In this regard, States parties may wish to note the discussions within the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration on how affected States parties could make use of Form J as well as the set of questions distributed by the Co-Chairs at the January 2002 meeting.

5. *Facilitating timely reporting*

For States parties without stockpiled AP mines or mined areas, completing article 7 reports is an easy process that must, however, be undertaken on an annual basis. The process for these States parties and their national authorities could be made easier - and could lead to an increased reporting rate - if States parties added a cover sheet when submitting their reports.

At the First Meeting of the States Parties, standard reporting formats were adopted in order to ease reporting requirements, to promote comparability, and to facilitate the circulation of reports by the United Nations. This approach, proposed by Austria, is both efficient and cost-effective. In this same spirit, if on a voluntary basis States parties submitted a cover page like the proposed attached sample (see Appendix), States parties could simply indicate if information was unchanged relative to the previous year's forms.

The concept for the cover page is as follows: the reporting format is comprised of 10 individual forms (A to J). Each form contains specific data and information that might change from year to year, that might remain unchanged over several reporting periods or that is not applicable because the reported activity has ceased or never existed. Instead of submitting year after year empty non-applicable forms or repeatedly unchanged information and data, States parties could simply indicate on a cover page if information was unchanged relative to the previous year's report. Forms that do not contain any data or remain unchanged would not have to be submitted. In other words, only those forms within which there was new information will be submitted.

**Practical steps**

States parties are reminded that, thanks to the support of the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs (DDA), reports provided under article 7 can be found on the Internet at the following site: <http://disarmament.un.org/MineBan.nsf>.

States parties are also advised to submit their report by e-mail to the officer responsible of the DDA, Ms. Tamara Malinova (e-mail: malinova@un.org; tel: + 212 963 81 99) and to confirm officially by fax (+ 212 963 11 21) or by note verbale to the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs when reports are submitted.

## **Conclusion**

Article 7 remains an important Convention obligation in terms of providing transparency in implementation. However, article 7 reporting can be viewed as more than a transparency mechanism in that it can be, in its current form and using its current format, a tool for mine-affected States to draw donors' attention to their needs with a view to facilitating cooperation and assistance. In addition, to ensure a high rate of reporting by all States parties, mechanisms like a cover page and assistance that could be provided by IMSMA may be useful.

## **Note**

<sup>a</sup> Note: These ideas do not suggest that the reporting format needs to be amended or that changes to the article itself should be contemplated.

**Appendix**

**COVER PAGE OF THE ANNUAL ARTICLE 7 REPORT**

**NAME OF STATE [PARTY]:** \_\_\_\_\_

**REPORTING PERIOD:** \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
(dd/mm/yyyy) (dd/mm/yyyy)

<p><b>Form A: National implementation measures:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy)</p>	<p><b>Form F: Programme of APM destruction:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>
<p><b>Form B: Stockpiled anti-personnel mines:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>	<p><b>Form G: APM destroyed:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>
<p><b>Form C: Location of mined areas:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>	<p><b>Form H: Technical characteristics:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>
<p><b>Form D: APMs retained or transferred:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>	<p><b>Form I: Warning measures:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>
<p><b>Form E: Status of conversion programmes:</b> changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>	<p><b>Form J: Other Relevant Matters:</b>  changed unchanged (last reporting: yyyy) non applicable</p>

Notes on using the cover page:

1. The cover page could be used as a **complement** to submitting detailed forms adopted at the First and Second Meetings of the States parties in instances when the information to be provided in some of the forms in an annual report is the same as it would be in past reports. That is, when using the cover page, only forms within which there is new information would need to be submitted.

2. The cover page could be used as a **substitute** for submitting detailed forms adopted at the First and Second Meetings of the States parties only if all of the information to be provided in an annual report is the same as in past reports.
3. If an indication is made on the cover sheet that the information to be provided with respect to a particular form would be unchanged in relationship to a previous year's form, the date of submission of the previous form should be clearly indicated.

## **Annex IV**

### **PRESIDENT'S PAPER ON DEVELOPING A PROCESS TO PREPARE FOR THE CONVENTION'S FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE**

#### **The need to prepare**

The Convention's First Review Conference, which shall be convened in 2004 in accordance with the provisions of article 12 (1), presents a unique opportunity to focus the world's attention on the enormous accomplishments made since the Convention was established. It also provides an opportunity to intensify efforts to universalize the Convention. Based on the review of the Convention's accomplishments, the Review Conference would need to assess and further strengthen commitments on cooperation and assistance deemed necessary to achieve the Convention's humanitarian objectives and universality. It will also need to consider how to improve the structure of the Convention's intersessional work programme as well as its meetings of States parties to achieve its agreed objectives and meeting its legal obligations by 2009, at the time of the Second Review Conference.

To enable us to address these substantive elements, consideration of a number of matters pertaining to a preparatory process for the Review Conference is important. At the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (5MSP), decisions may, therefore, be required on matters related to such a process.

#### **A way forward**

To facilitate this work in 2002-2003, it would be useful to provide the President of the 4MSP with the mandate to undertake informal open-ended consultations on matters related to a Review Conference preparatory process, which could be considered by States parties at the 5MSP. These consultations could cover all areas related to actions to be considered by the States parties with respect to a preparatory process for the Review Conference, particularly:

##### **A. The timing, duration and venue of the Review Conference**

The purpose of the Review Conference is set out in article 12 (2) of the Convention. Given the nature of the issues to be addressed in accordance with the purpose of the Review Conference, the timing and duration of the Conference could be similar to a meeting of States parties. The venue of the Review Conference also needs to be finalized. Facilitated by informal open-ended consultations by the President of the 4MSP, States parties need to consider these issues and work towards a decision to be taken thereon at the 5MSP. This could contribute to practical preparations for the Review Conference to be undertaken in an efficient and timely manner.

### **B. Actors to facilitate the preparatory process and preside over the Review Conference**

At the 5MSP States parties may wish to designate a President and Vice-President(s) for the Review Conference. It could also be desirable to articulate the role of the President-designate with respect to the preparatory process. In addition, given the widespread interest amongst States parties to ensure the success of the Review Conference, consideration could be given to engaging all the actors in work related to the preparations for the Conference.

### **C. The timing and duration of the formal preparatory process**

States parties may wish to consider taking a decision at the 5MSP on the timing, duration and venue of the formal preparatory process. The formal preparatory meeting(s) for the Review Conference could also be chaired by the President-designate. As in the case with preparatory meetings of other conventions, such a meeting(s) would need to consider procedural issues such as the agenda, programme of work, budget and rules of procedure of the Review Conference. A discussion could also be held at the formal preparatory meeting(s) on the anticipated outcome of the Review Conference.

In the interest of efficiency and cost-effectiveness and given the nature of the issues to be discussed, formal preparatory meeting(s) could be held back-to-back with the meetings of the Standing Committees in 2004.

### **D. Intersessional work programme**

The outcome of the work of the Standing Committees could have a substantial impact on the outcome of the Review Conference, especially in relation to the overview of the implementation of the Convention in key areas such as victim assistance, stockpile destruction and clearance of mined areas. In addition, consideration would have to be given to the role the intersessional work programme needs to fulfil between the First and Second Review Conference. It is important therefore to consider how the intersessional work programme in 2003 and 2004 would interface with the Review Conference.



## **Annex V**

### **FINAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES**

#### **1. STANDING COMMITTEE ON MINE CLEARANCE, MINE AWARENESS AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES**

##### **Final Report\***

**2001-2002**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of Meetings of the States parties, met in Geneva on 29-30 January 2002 and 28-29 May 2002. These meetings were convened by the Standing Committee's Co-Chairs, Mr. Al Azi Mansour of Yemen and Mr. Erich Riedler of Germany, with support of their Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Michael Oyugi of Kenya and Mr. Marc Acheroy of Belgium.

Representatives of more than 80 States parties, 30 other States (Signatories and non-Signatories), the relevant United Nations bodies, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). Interpretation for French and Spanish was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

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

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

The ICBL's Mine Action Working Group (MAWG) provided the Standing Committee with a comprehensive global overview of the status of implementation as far as it pertains to mine clearance. This overview came to the conclusion that interested actors lack sufficient data and information in order to assess the global situation, to undertake rational targeted mine action activities and to build a strategic plan which donors could stick to in order to prioritize funding.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Germany and Yemen. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2001-2002 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

Further to the identification of this information need, a follow-up presentation proposed that there be a clearer understanding of mine-affected States, based not only on the number of victims, but also on other factors, including access to land and infrastructure, types of mines/UXO, and other social and economic aspects. In addition, it was suggested that three levels of decreasing priority be identified: regions of mine impact reduction (high level); mine impact free areas (medium level); and mine free areas (low level).

In assessing the overall status of implementation, it was noted considerable progress has been achieved. Examples were highlighted: The quality of operations has increased, effective information management tools have been developed, International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) are now available, and better and more appropriate technologies are emerging. However, it was also noted that mine clearance is still a very slow and expensive process.

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

The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for updates on implementation plans and progress by mine-affected States parties. Several States parties took advantage of these opportunities. In addition, the Standing Committee gave attention to two in-depth country presentations:

#### **A. Afghanistan**

It was reported that if funds materialize as expected, priority regions in Afghanistan will be cleared within seven years. However, important needs for the Afghanistan programme were identified, including: the improvement of data collection; the importance of landmine impact surveys; direct and indirect mine awareness training; and the completion of, and support for, the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA). Various strengths of the programme were highlighted, including: the structure of the programme; its integrity and strict neutrality; the successful use of dogs; the continuous ability to innovate; and continuous evaluation. Challenges faced by the programme include: that new mines have recently been laid; the danger posed by cluster ammunition; security; a lack of resources, including resources to replace destroyed and obsolete equipment; a need to increase management by national authorities; and a lack of local participation.

#### **B. Mozambique**

It was reported that actions have been undertaken to place the Mozambican demining programme under national authority, to provide it with a national identity, and to increase national capacity. It was stressed that, based on the Mozambican experience, mine action must be seen as part of a development oriented approach, the affected country itself must set its priorities and that mine action needs to be integrated into a national plan in the context of the fight against poverty. In addition, it was emphasized that in mine-affected countries, a mine action centre (MAC) should be created as soon as possible, that an impact survey at the country level is a prerequisite to obtaining a clear picture of the extent of the mines/UXO problem, and that all activities should be conducted according to international standards and Convention obligations. An important aspect was the necessity and benefit of intensified cooperation and information exchange between mine-affected countries.

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

The Co-Chairs provided opportunities for interested States parties to give updates on assistance and cooperation. Several States parties and relevant organizations took advantage of these opportunities. In addition, the Standing Committee paid special attention to the assistance and cooperation role of the United Nations.

##### **A. United Nations**

UNMAS reported that the United Nations mine action strategy for the period between 2001 and 2005 was presented to the Fifty-sixth Session of the United Nations General Assembly and that this strategy highlighted elements of the United Nations Programme, support for an emergency response capability, an emphasis on the necessity for impact surveys, and updates on quality management and resource mobilization.

UNDP reported on the importance it places on capacity-building and the socio-economic aspects of mine action. It also noted its support for impact survey and stockpile destruction.

UNICEF reported that its 2002 work plan includes the integration of a mine risk education section into IMAS, supporting the integration of mine risk considerations into IMSMA, monitoring mine risk education to assess its impact, and the development of manuals and training packages for mine awareness managers.

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

##### **A. Mine risk education**

It was reinforced that mine risk education is an integral part of mine action, because it saves lives, helps to collect data for future surveys and clearance, and mobilizes public opinion in favour of acceding to the Convention if a mine-affected country has not yet done so. It was emphasized that for a variety of reasons successful mine clearance is very difficult without a mine risk education component. These reasons include the need to build confidence in mine-affected communities where mine clearance work is being undertaken, and the need to ensure that individuals in these communities keep a safe distance between themselves and mine clearance activities. The inclusion of mine risk education within the Standing Committee responsible for mine clearance was welcomed unanimously.

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

It was highlighted that the development of mine action technologies often takes place with no coherent strategy, with little coordination and on the basis of needs assumed by developers rather than real needs. It was argued that this has resulted in a duplication of efforts, decreased efficiency, and led to a slow-down in the transfer of new technologies to the users. It was also noted that the market for mine action technology is small, inefficient, and shrinking. It was highlighted that technology must be user-oriented, field driven and, even more importantly, affordable.

In response to these points, the Standing Committee identified the following points:

- an international coordinated approach is needed;
- users should better define and communicate their requirements to the research and development (R & D) community;
- a peer review system should be put in place to identify relevant current technology needs and those that might be required in the long-term;
- the R & D community should involve users from the concept stage, avoid duplication, and set sensible aims for unit costs and deadlines into service and stick to them; and
- in this context the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP) has a very important role to play.

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

It was reiterated that the IMAS provides common, agreed levels of performance in mine action, demonstrates agreement and consensus in the mine action community, facilitates the exchange of information and enhances cost effectiveness and safety. It was reported that a total of 23 standards have been completed, new standards are being prepared, and an outreach programme has been established to discuss and explore the IMAS practical application, to identify further changes that may be needed, to assist national mine action authorities to develop or amend their own national standards and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to reflect the IMAS, and to develop a broad political and technical consensus for the IMAS. It was noted that the translation of the IMAS into user languages should be done on a needs-driven basis.

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

The cases of Kosovo and Yemen were highlighted as good examples of how the IMSMA could be used both for managerial purposes and as a database. In addition, it was demonstrated that the IMSMA could be an effective tool to support data collection and Convention reporting, according to article 5 (2) and article 7 (1-2) of the Convention.

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

A total of 26 States parties have reported mined areas. According to the Landmine Monitor, a further 14 States parties - countries that either have not submitted article 7 reports or have not yet had to submit article 7 reports - suffer from the impact of mined areas. In addition, two States parties have reported that they suffer from the impact of unexploded ordnance (UXO). In order to facilitate international cooperation with a view to assisting these 40 or more States parties with their Convention obligations, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Standing Committee in 2002-2003 provide these States parties with sufficient opportunities to effectively inform the Standing Committee of their mine action plans and needs. Similarly, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties and others in a position to do so be provided with sufficient opportunities to share with the Standing Committee their plans for assistance.

During 2001-2002, the claim was made within the Standing Committee that high impact mined areas could be cleared in the 10-year time frame of the Convention if a global strategy is defined. To ensure that action proceeds in a manner that takes into consideration the 10-year time frame of the Convention, the Co-Chairs recommend that the ICBL, UNMAS, donors, mine-affected States and other interested actors continue to collaborate to gather reliable information on progress in clearing mined land, identify challenges that remain and the resources that will be required to overcome these challenges.

Finally, the Standing Committee identified various thematic areas that warrant follow-up over the next year. These include:

- ensuring that lessons learned from experiences in mine-affected countries can be used in other affected countries;
- ensuring that the most recent lessons learned and progress made with respect to mine risk education are shared with the Standing Committee;
- ensuring that the Standing Committee continues to be a forum for promoting best practices, like those contained in the IMAS;
- disseminating information on tools to support mine action or on enhancements to these tools, like the IMSMA; and,
- sharing information on new developments in mine action technologies, as long as these technologies are cost effective, meet user needs and are ready to be, or are close to being, put into the field.

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

### **Final Report\***

**2001-2002**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of Meetings of the States Parties, met in Geneva on 28-29 January 2002 and 27-28 May 2002. These meetings were convened by the Standing Committee's Co-Chairs, Ms. Gracibel Bu-Figueroa of Honduras and Ms. C. Mélanie Régimbal of Canada, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Thomas Wagner of France and Ms. Fulvia Benavides-Cotes of Colombia.

Representatives of more than 80 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining. Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

The Co-Chairs expressed the wish at both meetings that the Standing Committee explore how best it could contribute to progress and live up to its mandate. In addition, the Co-Chairs expressed their desire that the Standing Committee identify practical means to assist States in meeting their obligations under article 6.3 of the Convention in view of achieving progress by 2004 and beyond.

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

Through presentations made by the Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Coordinator, the Standing Committee received overviews of the status of implementation, trends and methodologies used to measure progress. It was reported that, in response to concerns pertaining to the lack of adequate information on measuring progress in implementation, the Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Coordinator had developed a questionnaire to assist affected States to present better information on their victim assistance capacities and needs. It was noted that this questionnaire could be used to help guide mine-affected States parties in completing the article 7 reporting format's voluntary "Form J". With respect to the use of Form J in 2002, an increase was noted vis-à-vis 2001, with 28 States parties having used Form J in 2002 to report on victim assistance, including 11 mine-affected States parties.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Canada and Honduras. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2001-2002 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

In order to ensure that the work of the Standing Committee continues to better assist States in the implementation of article 6.3, the Standing Committee launched a consultative process designed to: articulate a focused and concise set of critical issues in the field of victim assistance; identify concrete progress that can be made by 2004 and beyond; and, most pertinently, identify the Standing Committee's particular role in contributing to progress. The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) was asked to coordinate the consultative process, as it has no vested interest in any aspect of victim assistance and impartiality was considered key to the success of the consultative process.

While it was too early for the process to have defined priorities, it was reported that preliminary trends indicated that States parties and experts had identified the following four items as desired areas of focus for the Standing Committee: national planning by States parties; prosthetics services; emergency medical care; and economic reintegration. The Co-Chairs stressed the importance of the continued participation of States parties in the consultative process to ensure that its findings continue to reflect their priorities.

Given recent efforts - such as those initiated by Handicap International - undertaken to assist States in South-East Asia to meet the needs of landmine survivors, a special emphasis was placed on that region. The Standing Committee received an overview of the methodology used in Cambodia, Laos, Viet Nam, and Thailand to build national planning capacity for victim assistance projects. It was stressed that national ownership of these plans is key to the development and effective implementation of projects pertaining to victim assistance. Standing Committee participants expressed a desire to see similar regional exercises, which would take into consideration various unique regional characteristics and needs.

Finally with respect to the status of implementation, the Standing Committee was presented with the results of a global survey conducted by the World Health Organization, on the United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities. It was noted that rehabilitation services are provided in the majority of countries, but often do not extend their reach to mine-affected areas or provide the range of services necessary to be most effective.

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

#### **A. Physical rehabilitation, including matters pertaining to prosthetics**

The Standing Committee identified the need for further analysis of the quality of prosthetics services, particularly the need to better consider users' perspectives. It was argued that in mine-affected countries a better understanding of the problems in this field and the steps needed to ameliorate them would be welcome. In addition, it was reiterated that good quality prostheses at no or minimal cost to users should be available for all needing them. And it was noted that prosthetic services should be developed with as much local input and control as possible, and that training of prosthetics technicians is critical to the sustainability of services.

From experiences in South-East Asia, Africa and Latin America, progress and challenges in the development of prosthetics and orthotics programmes were highlighted by State parties and local organizations of the above-mentioned regions. Points of progress focused on the strengthening of the participation of persons with disabilities at the local level and the provision of holistic rehabilitation services to survivors in order to assist them in reintegration into their communities. The Standing Committee was also presented with a collaborative non-governmental paper further illustrating that access to appropriate prosthetics services is a precondition for many landmine survivors' rehabilitation. As such, it was suggested that the Standing Committee could contribute significantly to the improvement in prosthetics services in mine-affected countries by using its collective influence to facilitate change.

### **B. Psychosocial rehabilitation**

The necessity to incorporate psychological issues into the planning and implementation of services for landmine survivors and other survivors of trauma was demonstrated to the Standing Committee. It was noted that a singular focus on physical rehabilitation has proven to be a mistake and has in some ways impaired the development of the full range of services necessary to lead to the recovery of landmine survivors. In addition, it was emphasized that a psychosocial approach engenders concern with the realities of complex, individual human beings with their specific economic, cultural and political conditions, and that a need for such an approach to treating landmine survivors should never be compromised.

The Standing Committee was presented with the findings from a qualitative field study on survivors' recovery process. The study highlighted the following needs: to ensure the economic necessities; to provide comprehensive and coordinated care; to create opportunities to be a productive member of society; and, to assist in re-establishing social relationships with family, community and society.

Through an exploration of psychosocial rehabilitation efforts in South-East Europe and Latin America, the Standing Committee was reminded that the rehabilitation of child survivors cannot be complete without addressing the needs of both survivors and their families. An overview of efforts highlighted the value of interactions with peers, with an emphasis on emotional healing and where it is possible, on involvement with recreation activities and the arts.

### **C. Human rights of persons with disabilities**

The Standing Committee received an update on ongoing efforts being undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations regarding initiatives to create a convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. It was emphasized that understanding and linking mine victim assistance issues and broader disability issues to the international human rights framework is fundamental to advancing the rights of landmine survivors and all persons with disabilities. The Standing Committee received an overview of various national and international legal instruments and mechanisms currently in place for promoting disability and human rights issues, and their inadequacies with regard to persons with disabilities. The Standing Committee requested that it be kept informed of current and future efforts and expressed the view that the rights of landmine survivors should be promoted in the context of these ongoing actions.



#### **D. Socio-economic reintegration**

Rehabilitation professionals, landmine survivor advocates and other experts reiterated to the Standing Committee that socio-economic reintegration is a priority issue. It was stressed that the right to income generation and gainful employment is a basic fundamental human right and is key to complete reintegration. These experts/survivors: highlighted the modification of employment rights for soldiers with disabilities; advocated for the inclusion of mine survivor issues in community development; spoke for equal opportunities and rights of women with disabilities; and, noted the importance of including mine survivors in the planning and development of mine action programmes.

#### **E. Medical care**

Various challenges in providing effective medical care in zones of armed conflict were outlined to the Standing Committee. Based upon experiences in Central Asia, it was highlighted that the epidemic of landmine injuries is exacerbated during the return of refugees or displaced populations, that the epidemic of landmine injuries creates a challenge for entire health systems and that effective management of mine injuries depends on the adequate functioning and coordination of all aspects of the system, including transportation to services, training of surgeons, and related services such as physical rehabilitation. As a result of these experiences, it was argued that the coordination of humanitarian assistance to war victims can only be accomplished in situ, involving all humanitarian actors present and that a long-term commitment from donors, implementing agencies and national authorities is a necessity.

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

The Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Coordinator reported that according to Landmine Monitor findings only 10-15 per cent of mine action funding is allocated to victim assistance programmes and that funding for victim assistance appears to be declining. A variety of donors took advantage of the opportunity to update the Standing Committee on plans and priorities for programming in victim assistance, with some elaborating on how landmine victim assistance does not always appear in mine action-funding totals because it is integrated into other assistance programmes. Nevertheless, the Standing Committee called on donors to provide further information on assistance and cooperation plans and policies in future meetings.

### **V. AN ASSESSMENT OF PRIORITY AREAS IN MEETING THE NEEDS OF LANDMINE SURVIVORS**

The Standing Committee was enlightened by the participation of two groups of survivors from Africa who were taking part in the "Raising the Voices" initiative. The Standing Committee expressed its appreciation for the eloquent and effective manner in which the survivor advocates outlined their priorities for victim assistance. A priority area which the survivors from Africa chose to bring to the Standing Committee's attention was accessibility, including access to medical and rehabilitation services, access to prosthesis services, physical access to buildings and transportation, and access to literacy training, which is often a prerequisite to other forms of education and skill training.

The Standing Committee voiced its appreciation both for the efforts of the Landmine Survivors Network for coordinating the Raising the Voices initiative and for the contribution made by the initiative to the entire Intersessional Work Programme. The Standing Committee offered its encouragement for the initiative's ongoing success.

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

The work of the Standing Committee in 2001-2002 succeeded both in furthering understanding of progress in implementing the provisions of the Convention related to victim assistance and in highlighting the extent of the challenges that remain. Through the work of Landmine Monitor, it was noted that there are approximately 43 States parties that may require assistance in helping to meet the care, rehabilitation and reintegration needs of landmine survivors. It was emphasized that the challenge of meeting these needs is compounded by the fact that some of the countries with the greatest numbers of mine victims are also some of the world's poorest countries. And it was highlighted that the need to assist landmine survivors does not have a time limit - like 4 or 10 years - but rather exists for as long as there are landmine survivors.

Based upon the work of the Standing Committee during 2001-2002, it is the view of the Co-Chairs that the principal challenge that lies before the Standing Committee is the ability to continue providing the necessary guidance and appropriate tools to States parties, in particular the 43 affected States to enhance and facilitate the implementation of article 6.3 while simultaneously strengthening the voice of landmine survivors. The Co-Chairs believe that the voice of landmine survivors and their communities should be at the core of all of the Standing Committee's activities.

To address this great challenge, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Standing Committee in 2002-2003 take note of the findings of the Consultative Process, which was designed with a view to identifying the Standing Committee's particular niche in contributing to progress in the area of victim assistance and socio-economic reintegration. It is now well understood that there is a coexistence of the matter known as "landmine victim assistance" within fields such as emergency and ongoing medical care, physical and psychological rehabilitation, human rights, and social and economic reintegration. Therefore, processes, such as that facilitated by UNMAS, could help the Standing Committee better understand what its useful role could be and identify priority areas for action.

The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties take full advantage of a variety of mechanisms and tools that have been developed such as the establishment of Victim Assistance Focal Points, the article 7 reporting format's Form J and the ICBL's advice to both mine-affected and donor States parties on how to complete Form J.

During 2001-2002, the Standing Committee noted that regional exercises, like those facilitated by Handicap International in Southeast Asia, have proven useful in enhancing the effectiveness of national approaches to victim assistance. The Co-Chairs recommend that further initiatives be undertaken in other regions, partly in order that the Standing Committee gains a better understanding of progress and challenges in implementing the Convention.

Finally, to ensure that the Intersessional Work Programme can be maximized as a vehicle for assistance and cooperation, the Co-Chairs encourage ongoing participation in the work of the Standing Committee by landmine survivors and key actors involved in fields that relate to meeting the needs of landmine victims (e.g., the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization, et cetera). It is the Co-Chairs' view that such participation enhances the Standing Committee's ability to address priority areas.

### **3. STANDING COMMITTEE ON STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION**

#### **Final Report\***

**2001-2002**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of the meetings of the States parties, met in Geneva on 31 January 2002 and 30 May 2002. The meetings were supported by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and interpretation was provided thanks to the European Commission. They were convened by the Standing Committee's Co-Chairs, Mr. Vice Skracic of Croatia and Mr. Peter Truswell of Australia, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. René Haug of Switzerland and Mr. Radu Horumba of Romania.

Representatives of more than 80 States parties, more than 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee.

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

At the Standing Committee meetings States parties gave updates on progress in stockpile destruction, and some States not parties presented information on their stockpiles. The Co-Chairs stressed that this exchange of information was the most significant part of the Standing Committee meetings and strongly encouraged all States parties and interested States not parties to continue to provide updates at future Standing Committee meetings.

The following 26 States parties gave updates on their stockpile destruction programmes during the meetings:

- Albania, Brazil, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Nicaragua, Moldova, Mozambique, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda and Yemen.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Australia and Croatia. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2001-2002 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

The following 9 States not parties made statements concerning stockpile destruction:

- Acceded but not yet State party: Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Signatories: Cyprus, Greece, Indonesia and Ukraine.
- Non-signatories: Belarus, Central African Republic, Turkey and Yugoslavia (Federal Republic of).

All information from States not parties was warmly welcomed, particularly the presentations from Greece and Turkey on their stockpiles which also outlined their plans to accede to the Convention simultaneously in due course.

In addition to these statements the ICBL Landmine Monitor gave overviews of the global situation regarding stockpile destruction at both Standing Committee meetings.

At the meetings of the Standing Committee the Co-Chairs distributed a chart presenting an up-to-date picture of the implementation of article 4 of the Convention (Destruction of Stockpiles) on the basis of information from a variety of sources including article 7 reports and updates at Intersessional meetings. The Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs will continue to update and circulate updated versions of this chart including at the September Fourth Meeting of States Parties. Up-to-date versions of the chart will also be available on the GICHD web site.

The chart distributed at the May meeting showed that 76 States parties had completed destruction of their AP mines in accordance with article 4 or did not possess AP mines. Around 45 States parties had yet to complete their stockpile destruction, of whom around 20 had not yet begun stockpile destruction. It should be noted that some States parties have never declared whether they possess AP mines, but are not believed to stockpile them. In that context it was highlighted that adherence to the reporting provisions contained in article 7 of the Convention is essential for assessing progress and identifying needs for assistance.

Between the May 2001 and May 2002 meetings of the Standing Committee, Albania, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Peru, Sweden and Yemen completed the destruction of their stockpiles.

The updates made by States parties showed that the implementation of article 4 is generally proceeding well. However, the Co-Chairs assessed, based on current trends and on updates from States parties and article 7 report information, that a number of States parties would have difficulty destroying their stockpiles on time during 2003.

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

The Co-Chairs emphasized that with deadlines fast approaching it was timely to focus assistance and cooperation efforts on those with pressing needs and deadlines.

### **A. Africa**

The Standing Committee was presented with the conclusions of the stockpile destruction workshop held in Tunis in January 2002 - conclusions which included: that there are still considerable stockpiles in Africa; that there is insufficient information on exact location, number, type and condition of these stockpiles; that information exchanges on these stockpiles through article 7 reports or through other means should be a priority in Africa; and, that for a number of States parties in Africa deadlines in 2003 were fast approaching. France declared a willingness to share its technical expertise in Africa.

### **B. The Americas**

The Standing Committee was presented with an update on efforts related to the Managua Challenge by the Organization of American States (OAS). The aim of the Managua Challenge was to encourage parties in the region to destroy remaining stockpiles by the Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP). It was noted that while not all States parties in the Americas had completed stockpile destruction by the 3MSP, the Challenge was essentially a success. Many had completed stockpile destruction, and many others were well advanced in their programmes. Over 500,000 AP mines had been destroyed in the region. It was emphasized that an approach similar to the Managua Challenge could be applied in other regions.

### **C. Europe**

The Standing Committee received updates on the activities of the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe Reay Group in the field of stockpile destruction in the region. The Reay Group offered an excellent example of a regional mechanism that was assisting States to fulfil their Convention obligations, including their stockpile destruction obligations.

The Standing Committee also received updates on the role of NATO and its Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) in stockpile destruction within the framework of the Partnership for Peace (PfP). It has successfully concluded a programme in Albania and has future programmes in Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia. The Standing Committee was briefed on an October 2001 PfP workshop in Athens which focused its attention on several States in the region. The availability of assistance for PfP countries through a PfP trust fund was stressed.

The Standing Committee was briefed on the challenge posed by the destruction of large stocks of PFM mines in countries of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union and on the safety risks posed by specific construction features and toxic substances PFM mines contain. Also the conclusions of two GICHD studies on PFM mines were reported. They highlighted the risk of continued storage and explosive degradation of such mines as this type of mine approaches the end of its shelf life. It was noted that the objective of the GICHD studies is to develop a funding and technological approach to PFM stockpile destruction applicable to interested countries.

Two States in the region that are not yet parties to the Convention, Ukraine and Belarus, stressed that without assistance they would have difficulty destroying their stockpiles which impeded their ratification of the Convention. Both these States have large numbers of PFM mines.

#### **D. South-Eastern Asia**

The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) reaffirmed its willingness to coordinate stockpile destruction within ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) countries. It stressed that there was a need for a coordinated and comprehensive approach in the ASEAN region that takes advantage of synergies, information exchange and past experiences. With respect to South-Eastern Asia it was noted that in May 2002 a regional seminar was held in Bangkok which highlighted the issue of stockpile destruction.

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

#### **A. Better use of article 7 reports**

The Standing Committee suggested that article 7 reports might be a useful tool for providing more detailed information on stockpile destruction programmes and for seeking or offering technical assistance. It was proposed that States parties could use the reporting formats "Form B" and "Form F" to provide more detailed information on their destruction programmes and to indicate specific technical and other needs for the completion of their stockpile destruction. It was noted that potential donors countries could use "Form J" to indicate specific expertise and technical advice that they are willing to share with other countries.

#### **B. Focal point for technical assistance and cooperation**

The Standing Committee appreciated the offer by Implementation Support Unit (ISU, Kerry Brinkert, Manager) to serve as a focal point on information related to sources of assistance for stockpile destruction and direct requesting parties to these sources.

#### **C. Stockpile Destruction Management Course**

The Standing Committee was informed of a three-day AP Mine Destruction Management Training Course for French speaking specialists in Martigny, Switzerland in June 2002.

#### **D. UNMAS web site**

UNMAS reported that it was in the process of updating its "e-mine" web site to include new functions and more comprehensive information on stockpile destruction.

#### **E. Contact Group**

The Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs decided that a Contact Group of States parties interested in ensuring that article 4 (Stockpile Destruction) obligations were met, and in providing assistance if possible, would meet in the margins of future Intersessional meetings and

meetings of States parties. Such an initiative would be timely in view of the approaching stockpile destruction deadlines, and it would concentrate on discussing the situation of those States parties with difficulties in meeting their article 4 obligations and with close deadlines.

#### **F. Safety and storage of stockpile destruction**

The Standing Committee received presentations on general principles and measures with respect to the safe and secure storage of AP mines and ammunition, and on various measures and methods for the management and use of mines retained under article 3. The importance of reviewing such matters was underscored by presentations on recent incidents in Africa and South-East Asia where casualties and devastation resulted from explosions of stockpiled munitions. The Co-Chairs expressed the opinion that discussion of the issue was important: firstly, because limited stockpiles kept for training need to be carefully stored, and secondly, because many States considering joining the Convention have very large stockpiles.

#### **G. Industrial disposal of AP mines**

The Standing Committee received a presentation on industrial disposal of AP mines and other types of ammunition. It was emphasized that for large stockpiles there is often no environmentally and economically acceptable alternative to industrial-scale disposal and recycling of materials for civilian purposes. Several examples of industrial destruction were highlighted, including the recently completed stockpile destruction programme in Albania. Italy, which has nearly completed the destruction of around 7 million AP mines, offered to share its expertise in this area.

#### **H. Basic elements of stockpile destruction**

The Standing Committee was reminded of the basic elements, rules and techniques of stockpile destruction. It was pointed out that stockpile destruction is often more economically efficient and safer than storing old ammunition and propellants that degrade rapidly.

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

The Standing Committee in 2001-2002 marked impressive progress in the efforts of States parties to cooperate and assist each other in meeting the obligations outlined in article 4 of the Convention. After three years of intersessional work, it is clear that the destruction of AP mines has become one of the Convention's success stories. However the Convention's first deadlines - those related to the obligation of each State party to destroy its stockpiled AP mines within four years of entry into force - are only months away. The deadline for having completed the destruction of stockpiled mines in accordance with article 4 is 1 March 2003 for the first 45 States parties for which the Convention entered into force.

#### **A. Follow-up in 2002-2003**

While most States parties that have stockpiles to destroy are proceeding well in their destruction activities, there is a need to focus on identifying the assistance needs of a few cases that may have difficulty in meeting close deadlines. There is a need to be innovative with



respect to cooperation and assistance, and not to be complacent with respect to the urgency of the task. With these factors in mind, the Co-Chairs would make the following recommendations for follow-up in 2002-2003:

- Increased attention should be given to identifying the needs of States parties whose stockpile destruction deadlines fall within 2003.
- States parties whose deadlines fall within 2003 should provide updates to the Standing Committee and Co-Chairs on their plans and progress, and communicate any needs for assistance at their earliest convenience.
- Coordination should be carried out among donors to identify priorities for stockpile destruction assistance and relevant actors should consider taking advantage of the offer made by the ISU to act as a focal point on this matter. An informal contact group established by the Co-Chairs should continue to be used by those interested in encouraging full implementation by those whose deadlines are approaching.
- A regional approach to stockpile destruction should continue to be taken with regions for particular focus in the near term being Central Asia and Africa.

#### **B. Follow-up on thematic issues**

Finally, the Standing Committee in 2001-2002 identified various broader thematic areas that warrant follow-up over the next year. The Co-Chairs made the following recommendations:

- Given that the safe storage of stockpiles is important for prospective and existing States parties in the process of destroying stockpiles and for those retaining some AP under article 3, a study should be undertaken on accidents involving stockpiled AP mines to clarify the scope of problems that may exist.
- Attention should continue to be focused on those mines, the detonation of which can have toxic side effects, such as the PFM1 type of AP mine, and attention should be focused on identifying ways of destroying such mines in an environmentally sound manner.
- States parties should continue to be encouraged to utilize the UNMAS stockpile destruction database (<http://www.stockpiles.org>), including by contributing information on new stockpile destruction technologies, national policies and case studies.
- States parties should use the article 7 reporting formats “Form B” and “Form F” to provide more detailed information on their destruction programmes and to indicate specific technical and other needs for the completion of their stockpile destruction. States parties in a position to do so should use “Form J” to indicate specific expertise and technical advice that they are willing to share with other countries.

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

##### **Final Report\***

**2001-2002**

##### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, established in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of meetings of the States parties, met in Geneva on 1 February 2002, and 27 and 31 May 2002. These meetings were convened by its Co-Chairs, Ambassador Virasakdi Futrakul of Thailand and Ambassador Steffen Kongstad of Norway, with the support of its Co-Rapporteurs, Mr. Alexander Kmentt of Austria and Mr. Gustavo Laurie of Peru.

Representatives of more than 80 States parties, 30 States not parties, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and numerous other international and non-governmental organizations participated in the work of the Standing Committee. The meetings were held in Geneva with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. Interpretation was provided thanks to the support of the European Commission.

##### **II. OVERVIEW OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING MATTERS RELATED TO ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION**

The Standing Committee was provided with an overview of the general status of implementation of the Convention, particularly the status of progress in achieving the core humanitarian aims of the Convention. This overview, which was warmly welcomed by the Standing Committee, both underscored the extraordinary progress that has been made since the Convention's entry into force and highlighted a variety of challenges that remain regarding destroying stockpiled mines, clearing mined areas, assisting victims and generating the necessary resources to undertake these tasks.

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

It was noted that universalization remains crucial to the achievement of the Convention's humanitarian aims. In this context, warm welcome was given to the formal acceptance of the Convention by Nigeria, Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Suriname, and to the interest expressed by several States not parties in joining the Convention.

---

\* This report has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee, Norway and Thailand. This report is the Co-Chairs' summary of the breadth of work undertaken by the Standing Committee during the 2001-2002 Intersessional period. It remains the responsibility of the Co-Chairs and is not a negotiated document.

The Coordinator of the Universalization Contact Group, Ms. Shannon Smith of Canada, presented reports on the activities of the Group. These reports noted a continued effort to identify specific tasks and concrete actions, the possibility of reaching 130 ratifications before the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP), and that the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) could enhance the work of the Group. In addition it was reported that the Contact Group had identified ongoing needs including: an increased military to military dialogue; ensuring that universalization goals are part of the agendas of regional organizations; strategic funding and technical partnerships; European States parties playing a leading role in universalization in Europe; and categorizing the remaining States not parties according to their concerns and reasons for not acceding to the Convention.

The Standing Committee also received updates on universalization activities, such as the January 2002 seminar for North African countries in Tunis and the May 2002 conference *Landmines in Southeast Asia* in Bangkok. Support for regional seminars was expressed and the value of the partnership with the ICBL and ICRC on universalization efforts was noted.

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

##### **A. Coordinating Committee**

As requested by the States parties at their Third Meeting (3MSP), Nicaragua, as Chair of the Coordinating Committee (CC) reported on the activities of the CC, noting that it had met regularly with its principal focus being to prepare for the two sessions of Standing Committee meetings in 2002. From the reports on the CC's activities, it was evident that three broad accomplishments had been made: First, the work of the Intersessional Programme focused with even greater clarity on the achievement of the Convention's core humanitarian aims. Second, enhanced preparations were undertaken in advance of meetings of the Standing Committees. And third, the CC operated with great openness and transparency, in part by producing and ensuring the access to the President's Notes from CC meetings on the GICHD web site.

The Standing Committee welcomed the important contributions of the Coordinating Committee to the effective operation of the Intersessional Work Programme and to preparations for meetings of the States parties. In addition, the Standing Committee expressed its appreciation for the manner in which the Coordinating Committee was performing its tasks in accordance with the decisions taken at meetings of the States parties.

##### **B. Implementation Support Unit**

The Director of the GICHD, Ambassador Martin Dahinden, reported that, further to the decision of the States parties at the 3MSP, an agreement between the President of 3MSP and the GICHD was signed in November 2001 to establish the Implementation Support Unit (ISU). In addition, it was reported that a budget had been established, a voluntary trust fund set up, and a Manager, Mr. Kerry Brinkert, appointed.

At the second meeting of the Standing Committee it was reported that the ISU had already made a positive impact by assisting the Coordinating Committee in its rigorous preparations for the Intersessional week, by serving as an information resource for all States parties and others, and by beginning preparations to set up a documentation resource facility. It was noted that the ISU provides “value-added” services with regard to the implementation of the Convention, without replacing the efforts of individual States parties.

### **C. Sponsorship Programme**

The Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, Mr. Peter Sagar of Canada, reported on the Programme’s efforts to facilitate participation by States parties from mine-affected countries, States not parties which are interested in joining the Convention and expert speakers for Standing Committee meetings. It was noted that over 70 individuals benefited from the Sponsorship Programme at each of the two series of Standing Committee meetings. Several States parties pledged support for the Programme and appreciation was extended to the Programme, its Coordinator and the GICHD for its role in administering the Programme.

### **D. Intersessional Work Programme**

On the basis of a non-paper introduced by Ms. Cecilia Sanchez Reyes of Nicaragua, representing the Presidency of the 3MSP, the Standing Committee reflected on the Intersessional Work Programme to date and considered current needs and opportunities. The timeliness of the paper was welcomed. In addition, overwhelming support for the main elements of the paper was noted, in particular that the objectives that were established for the Intersessional Programme continue to be relevant and that at this stage in the Convention’s life it is important to focus with even greater clarity on areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention. Support was also noted for the principles that have served the Intersessional Programme well to date, particularly the informal nature of the process.

With respect to new Co-Rapporteurs, it was noted that in keeping with past practice, the Co-Chairs, with a view to identifying a list of nominees, had undertaken consultations with interested States parties. It was reported that these consultations - which had been undertaken with the aim of ensuring a regional balance, a balance between mine-affected and donor States parties and between the need for rotation and the need for continuity - were ongoing and that a list of nominations would be presented to all States parties as soon as possible, for consideration at the 4MSP.

### **E. Preparations for the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP)**

In keeping with past practice, the first meeting of the Standing Committee expressed its support for a Draft Provisional Agenda, a Draft Programme of Work, and Draft Rules of Procedure for the 4MSP. The Standing Committee also noted that all documents be issued in the six languages of the Convention, except for the reports under article 7, which are accessible on the UNDDA web site, and information documents. The Standing Committee also voiced its support for the designation of Switzerland as Secretary-General of the 4MSP in order to

undertake the role of coordinating the opening ceremony and a number of side events. As well, pursuant to past practice and the draft rules of procedure, it was agreed that the United Nations Secretary-General nominate an Executive Secretary for the 4MSP.

At its second meeting, the Standing Committee expressed satisfaction with revised Cost Estimates for the 4MSP and noted the designation of Enrique Roman-Morey of the United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs Office in Geneva as Executive Secretary and the nomination of Ambassador Christian Faessler of Switzerland as Secretary-General.

#### **F. Preparations for the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties**

At the first meeting of the Standing Committee, Thailand recalled its offer to host the 5MSP and asked that this offer be conveyed to the States parties for consideration.

#### **G. Preparations for the Convention's First Review Conference**

The Standing Committee indicated that consideration be given to clarifying a process to prepare for the Review Conference, that this process should be transparent and inclusive, and that all States parties should be provided with the opportunity to participate in discussions on this process. It was noted that it would be prudent for States parties to begin - as early as the 4MSP - to discuss the options that exist for a preparatory process and that the current and incoming Presidencies should keep this point in mind and ensure sufficient preparations for such a discussion at the 4MSP.

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

#### **Article 1**

It was recalled that interest existed over recent years to hold further discussions of understandings of the word "assist" in article 1 (c) of the Convention. In this context, States parties were invited to share information on how, in operational terms, article 1 is being implemented. Some States parties took advantage of this opportunity to inform the Standing Committee on their application of the article, particularly in instances wherein they may be participating in joint operations with States not parties to the Convention. It was noted that an increasing number of national views was bringing greater clarity to this matter. The ICBL provided examples of recent situations where clarity with respect to States parties' understanding of the word "assist" would be desirable. In addition, it argued that a common understanding of this matter would strengthen the Convention.

#### **Article 2**

The attention that matters related to article 2 has received over recent years was recalled and it was noted that the President's Action Programme of the 3MSP suggested a continuing dialogue on these matters. Taking advantage of this dialogue, several States parties shared their experiences and points of view regarding the application and understanding of article 2. The ICRC and Human Rights Watch introduced background papers regarding article 2 to assist States

parties in preparations for discussions on this article. The ICRC stressed the necessity, without prejudging the legal interpretation, to identify practical steps to move beyond the legal debate. The ICBL expressed the wish that more States parties would present their State practices and argued that legal interpretation is less important than actual State practice.

### **Article 3**

It was recalled that the President's Action Programme of the 3MSP stated that "to further clarify the reasons why mines are retained for training and development under article 3 and, in particular, to reaffirm the common understanding as regards the amount of mines that can be retained in a manner consistent with article 3, the Co-Chairs ... will continue to ensure that this topic is raised during future meetings of the Standing Committee". In this context, several States parties provided updates on mines retained in accordance with article 3.

The ICBL and others, including States parties, reaffirmed the understanding that the number of mines retained under article 3 should be in the hundreds or thousands, but not in the tens of thousands. It urged States parties to re-evaluate their need to retain mines for training, given that it appears that very few retained mines have actually been used. The ICBL also stressed that it would be useful if States parties included in their article 7 reports information on the intended purpose and actual use of mines retained.

### **Article 7**

The Coordinator of the article 7 Contact Group, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, reported on the status of article 7 reporting and reminded the Standing Committee of the 30 April deadline for submitting annual updates. It was noted that the importance given to article 7 by all Standing Committees may have contributed to an increase in the number of article 7 reports submitted. Ambassador Lint, on behalf of the Contact Group, also introduced a non-paper, which included some specific suggestions regarding article 7 reporting. Support was expressed for the suggestions and elements included in the non-paper, including using Forms B and D to share information on progress and needs.

The ICBL noted the progress in the submission of initial article 7 reports but also expressed concern about the 2002 reporting rate. VERTIC reminded the Standing Committee that the article 7 Reporting Handbook had been translated into the six languages of the Convention and was available from the United Nations.

### **Article 8**

It was recalled that Canada had been requested to work with interested parties on a dialogue on means to facilitate the clarification of concerns about compliance and on the operationalization of article 8. At the Standing Committee's first meeting, Canada presented a non-paper, which identified a set of questions for the continuation of a dialogue on this issue. These questions included viewing compliance, at least in part, in the context of cooperation to facilitate implementation. It was the sense of the Standing Committee that discussions on this issue should continue. The offer made by Canada to continue with its role on this subject was welcomed.

At the Standing Committee's second meeting, Canada introduced a paper which provided an update on activities since the first meeting. It noted that considerable progress had been made on this matter and, that while there is growing agreement on the need to continue with efforts to cooperate and to offer assistance in order to ensure full implementation of the Convention, divergent views persist on the advisability of and willingness to establish new mechanisms to deal with compliance matters.

France's national commission for the elimination of anti-personnel mines (CNEMA) provided an extensive briefing on preliminary findings of work undertaken on lessons learned from international humanitarian law and environmental law. VERTIC briefed the Standing Committee on a guide it is preparing on article 8. The ICBL stated that the matter of the operationalization of article 8 should be dealt with a sense of urgency and that States parties should be prepared to invoke article 8 should a serious breach of the Convention occur. The ICRC reported on its approach to responding to allegations of violations of international humanitarian law, including violations of international instruments such as the Convention.

### **Article 9**

Overviews were provided of efforts to establish national implementing legislation in accordance with article 9 and several States parties provided updates on their individual efforts. The ICRC reminded States parties of its National Implementing Legislation Kit, which is available in several languages, and pointed out that it is preparing a model law for use by Common Law States. It noted that 43 States parties have adopted or are in the process of establishing national implementing legislation and it reiterated its offer to provide assistance with respect to article 9.

## **VI. OTHER MATTERS**

### **A. Compliance**

Further to preliminary views shared at the 3MSP about some allegations of possible non-compliance, the Standing Committee was provided with an opportunity for further discussions. One State party used this opportunity to address allegations of production and use of AP mines, which were reported in the 2001 issue of *Landmine Monitor*. Comments made by this State party and the approach taken by it with respect to the allegations were welcomed by several Standing Committee participants, including the ICBL. However, the ICBL also noted an additional concern about compliance by another State party and expressed the view that States parties should take steps to seek clarifications.

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

An opportunity was provided to share steps taken, and to discuss possible approaches including best practices, to reduce the humanitarian impact of mines that may pose similar risks to civilian populations as AP mines. The ICRC provided context to this discussion by recalling attempts that had been made to agree on a common approach on how to deal with such mines

and that it had hosted an experts meeting in March 2001 in order to identify practical steps to this end. In addition, it was noted that the President's Action Programme of the 3MSP had invited States parties to review their inventories and to report on "best practices" of how to reduce the humanitarian impact of mines that may pose similar risks to civilian populations as AP mines.

Several States parties took advantage of the opportunity to provide greater clarity on this matter. Some States parties noted that the humanitarian objectives of the Convention provided relevance for this discussion while others noted that the CCW would provide the appropriate framework for such matters. The ICRC suggested that States parties use, on a voluntary basis, a reporting format that had been presented in an ICRC paper and that the Co-Chairs compile information provided. The ICBL welcomed the information provided by States parties but expressed concern that there had not been a wider exchange.

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

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

At the Standing Committee's second meeting, the Presidency effectively highlighted that, by the Convention's first Review Conference in 2004, further progress in the achievement of the Convention's humanitarian aims will be required in some areas and expected in others. With this in mind, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties and relevant organizations remain as committed as they have in the past in part by taking the necessary steps now to ensure that by the Review Conference a significant renewal of commitments is made to finish the job of eliminating the terror of AP mines.

Given the importance of consolidating the international norm being established by the Convention, thereby promoting its humanitarian objectives, the Co-Chairs would recommend that the Universalization Contact Group continue cooperative efforts to encourage formal acceptance of the Convention and that it continue with identifying means to meet the needs identified by the Group in 2001-2002. In addition, the Co-Chairs recommend that all States parties, interested organizations and the Presidency play an active role in promoting the Convention and acceptance of it.

### **B. The general operation of the Convention**

States parties can rightfully be proud of the mechanisms that they have established to assist them in the general operation and implementation of the Convention. In a manner consistent with their individual mandates, the Intersessional Work Programme, the Coordinating Committee and the Implementation Support Unit have all been instrumental in assisting States parties in their efforts to achieve the humanitarian aims of the Convention. In addition, mechanisms like the Sponsorship Programme, which have emerged on an informal basis, have also contributed to effective operation and implementation of the Convention.

The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties express their appreciation for the value and importance of the Coordinating Committee in the effective functioning and implementation of the Convention, and for operating in an open and transparent manner. In addition, the Co-Chairs



recommend that States parties express their appreciation to the GICHD for the prompt manner in which it established the ISU and for its ongoing support for the Intersessional Work Programme, and to the ISU for quickly demonstrating its effectiveness and value to States parties. Moreover, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties express their appreciation for the manner in which the Sponsorship Programme has helped ensure more widespread representation at meetings of the Convention.

With respect to the Intersessional Programme during 2001-2002, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties again endorse and express satisfaction with the work of the Standing Committees, and warmly welcome their reports. In addition, given the usefulness of the Presidency's 27 May 2002 overview in providing a broad understanding of progress and challenges regarding key provisions of the Convention, and in setting the scene for more intensive dialogue during the course of the week of Standing Committee meetings, the Co-Chairs recommend that Coordinating Committee pursue a similar practice in 2002-2003. Furthermore, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Coordinating Committee, in a manner consistent with its mandate continue to be practical-minded and apply the principle of flexibility with respect to the format of Standing Committee meetings, and their sequencing and respective time allocations.

Concerning the schedule for the Intersessional Work Programme between the 4MSP and the 5MSP, the Co-Chairs recommend that Standing Committee meetings be held the weeks of 27-31 January 2003 and 12-16 May 2003. In addition, given the support expressed in May 2002 for the main elements in the Presidency's non-paper on the Intersessional Programme, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Intersessional Work Programme in 2002-2003 focus with even greater clarity on those areas most directly related to the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention and take due note of the principles that have served the Intersessional Programme to date, particularly the informal and cooperative nature of the process.

With respect to the Meetings of the States parties, the Co-Chairs recommend that the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties take place in Bangkok from 15 to 19 September 2003. As well, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties begin a dialogue at the 4MSP on a process to prepare for the First Review Conference, with a view to providing the Presidency with a mandate to undertake consultations leading to consideration by States parties at the 5MSP of pertinent matters related to a preparatory process.

### **C. The articles of the Convention**

Given the increasing clarity that has emerged to date with respect to States parties' understandings of the word "assist" in **article 1 (c)** of the Convention, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to share information, in an informal and voluntary manner in meetings of the Standing Committee, on how, in operational terms, article 1 is being implemented.

The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to share information in an informal and voluntary manner in meetings of the Standing Committee on their experiences in applying **article 2** of the Convention and pursue consultations with a view to achieving a convergence of views on outstanding issues.

To further clarify the reasons why mines are retained for training and development under **article 3** and, in particular, to reaffirm the common understanding regarding the maximum number of mines that should be retained in a manner consistent with the article, the Co-Chairs recommend that this topic be raised during future meetings of the Standing Committee.

The Co-Chairs recommend that States parties continue to give due regard to the annual reporting provisions contained in **article 7** of the Convention and that the article 7 Contact Group, individual States parties, the Presidency and relevant organizations continue to promote these provisions and means to assist States parties in complying with them. In addition, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties maximize the potential of the existing reporting format as an important tool to measure progress in the implementation of the Convention and for mine-affected States parties to communicate their needs to other States parties. In particular, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties express their appreciation for and act upon, as appropriate, the suggestions made by the Coordinator of the Contact Group in the non-paper introduced by him on 31 May 2002.

On matters related to **article 8**, given the general feeling expressed by the Standing Committee, the Co-Chairs recommend that the dialogue on facilitation and compliance should continue in an open-ended format and that Canada should continue in its role in facilitating this dialogue. In addition, while progress is being made regarding assistance to States parties in implementing the Convention, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties consider the need to further clarify actions to be taken in the event that serious allegations of non-compliance are made.

With respect to **article 9**, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties express their needs should they require assistance in developing implementing legislation and to make use of, as necessary, tools such as the ICRC-developed "Information Kit on the Development of National Legislation". In addition, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties provide updates in an informal and voluntary basis at meetings of the Standing Committee on efforts taken with respect to the provisions of article 9.

#### **D. Other matters**

In view of the dangers of mines that may pose similar risks to civilians as anti-personnel mines, the Co-Chairs recommend that States parties consider and implement, as appropriate, best practices such as those identified in the report of the ICRC-hosted Expert Meeting on anti-vehicle mines with sensitive fuses or with sensitive anti-handling devices (13-14 March 2001), to provide updates in an informal and voluntary basis at meetings of the Standing Committee on such practices, and to continue dialogue on this issue.

## **Annex VI**

### **PRESIDENT'S ACTION PROGRAMME**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Together we have achieved a great deal in implementing the Convention and promoting its universal acceptance since its entry into force on 1 March 1999. However, between now and the Convention's first Review Conference in 2004 additional efforts will be required to ensure that the Convention lives up to its humanitarian promise. With this in mind, the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties urges all States parties and relevant organizations to remain as committed during the next intersessional period as they have been in the past. To focus our collective efforts in this period leading to the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties, the President has identified the following objectives and actions for consideration.

#### **II. FOCUSING ON OUR CORE HUMANITARIAN OBJECTIVES**

##### **A. Clearing mined land**

Thirty-one States parties have reported mined areas. At least a further 11, of those States parties that have not yet submitted article 7 reports, suffer from the impact of landmines. Clearing mined areas within 10 years after entry into force of the Convention will be a significant challenge for many of these States. We must work quickly to ensure that we know the extent of the problem, establish and support national mine action programmes, develop national plans which take into account the Convention's 10-year time frame, identify technical and financial needs and ensure that progress is effectively measured. By acting promptly we can ensure that this 10-year period will be well used, and that very few States parties, if any, will need to request an extension on their period of obligation as prescribed in article 5.

##### **B. Destroying stockpiled mines**

While the destruction of anti-personnel mines is one of the Convention's major success stories, we must recall that the Convention's first stockpile destruction deadlines are only months away. The deadline for having completed the destruction of stockpiled mines in accordance with article 4 is 1 March 2003 for the first 45 States parties for which the Convention entered into force. An additional 24 States parties will be required to have completed destruction by the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties. Of these 69 States parties, 19 are still in the process of destroying stockpiled mines or have yet to begin doing so. While mine clearance and victim assistance require our utmost attention, in the interest of the health of the Convention we must also place a high priority on meeting our deadlines for stockpile destruction.

##### **C. Assisting victims**

Forty-three States parties may require assistance to meet the care, rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration needs of landmine survivors. The challenge of meeting these needs is compounded by the fact that countries with the greatest numbers of mine victims are

also amongst the world's poorest. And the commitment to assist landmine survivors is not expressed in a time limit in the Convention, but in the lifetime of the victims. We have gained an understanding of the challenges faced by survivors. We must continue to take steps to assist them in overcoming these challenges

#### **D. Universalizing the Convention**

With two-thirds of the world's States having already joined the Convention, dramatic strides have been taken towards consolidating the international norm being established by the Convention. Among the States remaining outside of the Convention, those States that have recently used anti-personnel mines and/or continue to produce them cause particular concern. Further efforts need to be made to bring the major possessors of anti-personnel mines into the Convention. We need therefore to increase our efforts, individually and collectively, to stress our conviction that no conceivable utility of anti-personnel mines could possibly outweigh and justify the devastating humanitarian costs of these weapons.

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

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

Exchanging information through the Intersessional Work Programme and article 7 reporting has proven to be essential to our collective efforts to implement the Convention. During the 2002-2003 intersessional period, a priority should be placed on providing mine-affected States parties with sufficient opportunities to share information on their plans and needs for assistance and providing States parties and others in a position to do so with sufficient opportunities to share their plans for assistance. An emphasis should be placed on identifying the needs of those States parties whose deadlines for stockpile destruction fall between now and the Review Conference. All parties, including the Co-Chairs and the President, should work directly with these States parties to encourage them to develop plans for, and measure progress in, the destruction of stockpiles.

As article 7 reporting provides valuable information to both support cooperation and assess progress, States parties must give due regard to the annual reporting deadlines contained in article 7. States parties, individually or collectively, the article 7 Contact Group, the President and interested organizations should continue to promote implementation of these provisions and provide means to assist States parties in complying with them.

An emphasis should be placed on those States parties, which have not yet submitted their initial article 7 reports and those, which are late in submitting their annual reports. In addition, mine-affected States parties should consider maximizing the potential of article 7 reporting by using it, on a voluntary basis, as a tool to communicate to other States parties their plans, challenges and needs regarding mine clearance, victim assistance and stockpile destruction.

States parties are encouraged to consider using "Form J" to indicate specific expertise and technical advice that they are willing to share with other countries. All States parties should also take full advantage of the mechanisms and tools that have been developed to assist in

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

### **B. Mobilizing resources**

In article 6, States parties in a position to do so committed themselves on a long-term basis to sustain the process of achieving the Convention's humanitarian aims. States parties can live up to this obligation by continuing to give high priority to mine action within their development and humanitarian policies, particularly with a view to the Convention's 10-year time frame for mine clearance. In this regard, States parties should provide assistance and cooperation primarily to those that have accepted the Convention. Such a clear message will make a valuable contribution to universalization.

Our efforts to date have continuously made advances in the quality and cost-effectiveness of mine action programmes. We need to ensure that we sustain these efforts to truly achieve our aims. In this regard, all relevant actors should take the necessary steps now and maintain frequent contact to ensure that by the Review Conference a significant renewal of our collective commitment is made to finish the job of eliminating anti-personnel mines.

### **C. Regional approaches**

With certain regions or subregions deserving greater attention, all actors should be encouraged to undertake regional initiatives related to implementation, with the outcomes reported at the Standing Committees. In addition, States parties should place a priority on the achievement of the Convention's aims within regional forums of which they are members.

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

Given the importance of universalization in achieving the humanitarian aims of the Convention, States parties, individually and collectively, the Universalization Contact Group, the President and interested organizations should play an active role in promoting the Convention. We should strive to achieve maximum acceptance of the Convention and of the international norm established by it in time for the Review Conference.

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

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

The efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and numerous other non-governmental organizations around the world in calling for a ban of anti-personnel mines is evidence of the important role of

public conscience in furthering the principles of humanity. The role of public conscience will remain important in maintaining domestic interest in the landmines issue. Doing so will be essential to sustain the necessary political will and to generate financial and non-material resources to finish the work that remains. States parties should continue to reinforce their strong partnership with the ICBL and ICRC, as well as with other significant actors in our common cause, like the United Nations and relevant regional organizations.

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

The contributions of States parties in informal discussions on matters pertaining to articles 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Convention have improved clarity and understanding with respect to application of these articles by States parties. States parties should continue to share information in the same informal, cooperative and voluntary manner with a view towards obtaining further clarity and understanding regarding the application of these articles.

## **Annex VII**

### **REPORT ON THE FUNCTIONING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT UNIT SEPTEMBER 2001-SEPTEMBER 2002**

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

#### **Background**

1. At the 18-21 September 2001 Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP), States parties endorsed the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and agreed to provide a mandate to the GICHD to establish the ISU. In addition, States parties encouraged States in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the unit and provided a mandate to the President of the Third Meeting, in consultation with the Coordinating Committee, to finalize an agreement with the GICHD on the functioning of the unit.
2. The Council of Foundation of the GICHD accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.
3. On 7 November 2001, in accordance with the above-mentioned actions taken by States parties at the 3MSP, an agreement on the functioning of the unit was finalized between the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD. This agreement, which was distributed to all States parties on 17 December 2001 and which is attached to this report (see Appendix), indicates inter alia that the Director of the GICHD shall submit a written report on the functioning of the ISU to States parties and that this report shall cover the period between two meetings of the States parties.

#### **General Operations**

4. The ISU began operations on 14 January 2002 with the arrival of an ISU Manager, Mr. Kerry Brinkert, who was selected in a manner consistent with the agreement between the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD. A half-time administrative assistant began working for the ISU in February 2002.
5. In the President's Paper on the Establishment of the ISU, it was noted that initially funds would be sought to support the staffing of one officer and one support staff, with an additional staff member being added later as the workload evolved and as funds permitted. By May 2002, it was clear that the workload of the ISU warranted an additional staff member. On 31 May 2002 the Director of the GICHD reported to the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that the ISU manager would take steps over the next couple of months to establish a position for a junior officer to ensure that such a position can be filled in time for the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties (4MSP).

6. While work continued to establish an officer position, steps were taken to meet immediate human resource needs by hiring an individual on a temporary basis. In July 2002 a temporary officer began work to assist the ISU Manager in supporting the efforts of current and incoming Presidencies, current and future Co-Chairs, and other States parties, and in enabling the ISU to better and more promptly respond to information requests made by States parties. Plans are now in place to hire a permanent Implementation Support Officer soon after the 4MSP.

### **Activities**

7. The ISU provided support to the work of the Coordinating Committee, particularly with respect to supporting the Coordinating Committee's efforts to enhance and ensure the ongoing relevancy of the Intersessional Work Programme. The ISU assisted the President in its efforts to communicate to others the activities of the Coordinating Committee by ensuring that "President's Summaries" of Coordinating Committee meetings were made available on the GICHD's web site ([www.gichd.ch](http://www.gichd.ch)).

8. The ISU provided professional advice and support to the current President with respect to all facets of its duties. In addition, the ISU supported the incoming President's efforts to prepare for the 4MSP, in part by ensuring that draft documentation was distributed in a timely manner to all States parties and others, developing a web site on the 4MSP and working closely, as requested by the President-nominee, with the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs.

9. The establishment of the ISU enhanced the traditional level of service that the GICHD has provided to the Intersessional Work Programme. The ISU provided support to the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committees in the preparation of programmes for their meetings and in distributing detailed information on these meetings to participants. Over 470 participants attended the meetings of the Standing Committees in January, and over 440 in May. The ISU also provided support, in a manner consistent with its mandate, to States parties' informal initiatives related to the work of the Standing Committees, including supporting the work of Contact Group coordinators.

10. The ISU began to establish itself as a means for the States parties and others to obtain timely and comprehensive information on the Convention and the implementation of it. The ISU responded to dozens of information requests from States parties, States not parties and others, and enhanced the GICHD web site's Convention-related content. Upon receipt of invitations that were consistent with the ISU's mandate, the Manager of the ISU made presentations on the implementation of the Convention at various workshops and seminars.

11. The GICHD continued to administer the Sponsorship Programme established by some States parties to the Convention. The aim of the Programme is to support widespread participation in meetings related to the Convention. During each of the two periods of Standing Committee meetings, the Centre administered sponsorship to over 60 delegates. In addition, the ISU provided advice to the Programme's donors' group. (Note: The Sponsorship Programme's donors group retains the responsibility for making all decisions related to sponsorship.)



12. The ISU began work to establish a documentation resource facility to house and make accessible documentation on the establishment of the Convention and its implementation. In July 2002, a consultant was hired for a six-month period to coordinate the establishment of this facility. With the contributions of documents made by several States parties, the ICBL and the ICRC, significant progress in establishing this facility had already been made by September 2002.

### Financial Arrangements

13. In accordance with the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and the agreement between the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD, the GICHD created a voluntary trust fund for activities of the ISU in late 2001. The purpose of this fund is to finance the on-going activities of the ISU, with the States parties endeavouring to assure the necessary financial resources. In 2001, contributions totalling CHF 127,342 were made to this fund and to date in 2002 contributions totalling CHF 368,248 have been made.

#### Contributions to the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund<sup>a</sup>

	Contributions in 2001	Contributions in 2002
Australia	25 668	
Belgium		12 013
Canada		92 589
Ireland		73 991
Netherlands		88 878
Norway	96 698	100 777
South Africa	4 976	
Total	127 342	368 248

14. Following the GICHD Council of Foundation's acceptance of the mandate to establish the ISU, the GICHD in consultation with the Coordinating Committee developed a budget for the ISU covering the period 1 October 2001 to 31 December 2002. This budget,<sup>b</sup> totalling CHF 456,000, was distributed to all States parties on 17 December 2001. As of 31 August 2002, actual expenditures totalled CHF 181,733. A budget covering calendar year 2003 will be established by the Director of the GICHD in consultation with the Coordinating Committee in November 2002 and will be forwarded to all States parties.

15. Following the end of the period covered by the current budget, an annual financial report will be submitted to the President/Coordinating Committee, to all donors and, upon request, to any State party and interested actor. The ISU's voluntary trust fund will be audited by an independent auditing company with the auditor's report forwarded to the President, Coordinating Committee and donors.

## **Appendix**

### **Agreement between the States Parties of the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines and the Geneva International Centre For Humanitarian Demining on Implementation Support for the Convention**

1. During the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction in Managua from 18 to 21 September 2001, the States parties to the Mine Ban Convention endorsed the Paper on the Implementation Support for the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines, as contained in Annex I to this Agreement. States parties warmly welcomed the establishment within the GICHD, of an Implementation Support Unit to further enhance the operation and the implementation of the Convention. States parties expressed their appreciation to the GICHD for its cooperation in the establishment of this unit, encouraged States in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the unit and mandated the President of the Third Meeting, in consultation with the Coordinating Committee, to finalize an agreement with the GICHD on the functioning of the unit. (Final Report APLC/MSP.3/2001/L.7)

2. The Council of Foundation of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining accepted this mandate at its seventh meeting on 28 September 2001 and tasked the Director to conclude an agreement with the President of the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Convention.

#### **MANDATE**

3. The services GICHD provides to support the Mine Ban Convention include:
- 3.1 Preparing and supporting meetings of the Standing Committees and the Coordinating Committee, including writing summaries and facilitating follow-up activity;
  - 3.2 Providing independent professional advice and assistance to the Coordinating Committee;
  - 3.3 Establishing a documentation and resource database facility (on the Ottawa Process, Oslo Diplomatic Conference, Meetings of States Parties, SCEs, SCs and the CC).

#### **IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT UNIT**

4. The Director of the GICHD shall take all appropriate measures consistent with this Agreement to establish an Implementation Support Unit to carry out the duties related to the Mine Ban Convention according to Part B of Annex I<sup>c</sup> to this Agreement and shall ensure that these duties are carried out. The Implementation Support Unit should remain small in number of staff.

5. Where necessary, priorities shall be defined by the Coordinating Committee and the Director, in consultations with the States parties. Such priorities may be reviewed on a regular basis.
6. The Implementation Support Unit will in the performance of its substantive duties on implementation issues, receive direction from and support the work of the Coordinating Committee, ensuring ongoing input from States parties into the work of the ISU. The Director of the GICHD, or a representative, shall participate as an observer at meetings of the Coordinating Committee to ensure effective and close communications and coordination.
7. The personnel working in the Implementation Support Unit shall have the same status as other regular GICHD staff. Normal legal provisions as well as existing staff regulations and practices in GICHD apply to the personnel of the ISU.
8. The Director shall be responsible for the recruiting of staff members serving with the ISU. He shall consult the President of the Meeting of States Parties as well as the members of the Coordinating Committee. To maintain the independence of the ISU its staffing will not include personnel seconded by Governments.

## **REPORTING**

9. The Director of the GICHD shall submit a report on the functioning of the implementation support to the States parties. This report is to be submitted at their annual meeting in written form. The report shall cover the period between two meetings of States parties.
10. The Director may be invited by the President or the Coordinating Committee to make an oral report on the functioning of the implementation support at the intersessional meetings or on other occasions.

## **FINANCES**

11. A Fund for voluntary contributions shall be established to finance the ongoing activities of the ISU. The Fund shall be administered in Swiss Francs. The relevant details are provided in Annex II<sup>d</sup> of this agreement.
12. The annual budget for the ISU will be established by the Coordinating Committee and the Director of the GICHD.
13. The budget document:
  - shall include figures for the forthcoming financial year;
  - shall, if necessary, indicate a set of priorities. These priorities shall be understood as guidelines in order to allocate available resources;
  - may be changed or amended at any time on mutual agreement.

14. The States parties endeavour to assure the necessary financial resources. GICHD will assist in this effort.
15. An annual financial report shall be submitted to the President/Coordinating Committee and to all donors. To assure transparency, the financial report shall be made available, upon request, to any Government, interested institution and/or person.
16. The Fund shall be included in the GICHD accounting system and be audited by an independent auditing company on an annual basis. The auditing report shall be forwarded to the President, the Coordinating Committee and to donors.

## **FINAL PROVISIONS**

17. Wherever a clarification on the application of this Agreement is required, it should be discussed in a spirit of cooperation between the Coordinating Committee and the Director of GICHD or be transferred for consideration to the States parties.

## **DURATION**

18. This Agreement may be changed or amended at any time on mutual agreement.
19. The Agreement shall enter into force upon signature by both parties. It will remain effective for at least one year. Withdrawal from this Agreement can be effected after this initial period by six months' written notice from either party.
20. Signed in the English and Spanish languages, on four copies, each text being equally authentic. In case of any inconsistency, the English version will take precedence.

For the  
GENEVA INTERNATIONAL  
CENTRE FOR HUMANITARIAN  
DEMINING

*original signed by:*

Ambassador Martin Dahinden  
Director of the Geneva International  
Centre for Humanitarian Demining

Date: 7 November 2001

For  
THE STATES PARTIES OF THE  
CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION  
OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES

*original signed by:*

Doctor Francisco Aguirre Sacasa  
President of the Third Meeting of States  
Parties, Minister of Foreign Affairs  
of Nicaragua

**Notes**

- <sup>a</sup> As of 31 August 2002. All amounts in CHF.
- <sup>b</sup> Please note that basic infrastructure costs (e.g. general services, human resources, accounting, conference management) for the ISU are covered by the GICHD and therefore not included in the ISU budget.
- <sup>c</sup> Annex 1 to the signed original agreement consisted of the Third Meeting of the States Parties President's Paper on the Establishment of an Implementation Support Unit, document APLC/MSP.3/2001/1.
- <sup>d</sup> Annex II to the signed original agreement consisted of the bank account details of the Fund.

## **Annex VIII**

### **DECLARATION: THE MANAGUA APPEAL**

At the invitation of the Government of Nicaragua, the Deputy Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, Costa Rica and El Salvador and the representatives of Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru took part in the Conference on Progress of Demining in the Americas on 27 and 28 August 2002 to discuss and share information on experience and achievements of and obstacles to the Demining Programme and the implementation of the agreements adopted at the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention), held in Managua, Nicaragua, from 18 to 21 September 2001.

The countries which are taking part in this Conference and which are affected by the problem of mines and UXOs thus consider that, despite the great progress made in the demining process taking place in the Americas, anti-personnel mines continue to be a serious threat to peace and the security of persons and an obvious obstacle to the socio-economic development of large productive areas of our countries.

We know from our own experience that demining and other related work are expensive, but essentially humanitarian and therefore necessary to guarantee and protect the physical integrity of persons who live in these endangered areas. Hence the need for the total eradication of the imminent danger that anti-personnel mines and UXOs represent as a result of the painful armed conflicts the American continent has lived through.

In carrying out this task and as a result of the success achieved, we acknowledge the valuable support which has been provided by the donor community and which is essential if we are to be able to declare the western hemisphere an "anti-personnel-landmine-free zone" in the near future.

We also recognize the important and valuable contribution that the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States (OAS) has been making to demining efforts in the American hemisphere through the Organization of American States Comprehensive Action against Antipersonnel Mines (AICMA/OAS) assistance programme and the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy.

In the spirit of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, whose preamble states:

*"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,”

Taking account of the provisions of article 6 (Cooperation and international assistance), paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8, of the Ottawa Convention, the countries and international organizations participating in the Conference on Progress of Demining in the Americas:

**Hereby agree to sign the “The Managua Appeal” Declaration in order to:**

1. Reaffirm our Governments’ commitment to humanitarian demining and their determination to fulfil the obligations under the Ottawa Convention;
2. Also reaffirm our Governments’ willingness to continue contributing to the process of the implementation of the Ottawa Convention and, in this regard, congratulate the Government of Nicaragua on the work it has done, as the country occupying the Presidency of the Third Meeting of States Parties, to refocus efforts on the core humanitarian objectives of the Convention and the issue of international assistance and cooperation;
3. Make an urgent appeal to friendly countries which are part of the community of donors to humanitarian demining, especially those which are parties to the Ottawa Convention, not to halt or suspend the earmarking of resources for the countries of the Americas which have still not concluded their demining or comprehensive mine action programmes;
4. Welcome the initiative by the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua to convene, through the Organization of American States (OAS), a donors’ meeting to be held in October in Washington D.C. (USA) to examine the issue of cooperation in the light of the objectives achieved and the American countries’ technical and financial requirements; and reiterate our position that cooperation and assistance for mine action activities should be intended mainly for those which have renounced the use of these weapons by acceding to the Ottawa Convention and agreeing to implement and fulfil its provisions, as decided in the Declaration of the Third Meeting of States Parties.
5. Make a fervent appeal to all Governments in the world to join us in taking up the great challenges we face as a result of the need to ensure comprehensive care for the victims who have survived mine accidents with a view to providing technical and financial assistance to the programmes established for this purpose.
6. Strongly support the need for all American countries to convert the western hemisphere into an anti-personnel-landmine-free zone, an aim stated in the Declaration of the Third Meeting of States Parties to the Ottawa Convention, with a view to making this goal an example to the whole world and an inspiration for other regions of the world affected by mines.

7. Make an appeal for the universalization of the Ottawa Convention, especially to the countries of our region which have not yet become States parties to the Convention, so that they may do so as soon as possible.
8. Request the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States (OAS) to continue providing support to all countries which are part of the Comprehensive Action against Antipersonnel Mines (AICMA-OAS) assistance programme, especially those countries which face internal armed conflicts.
9. Thank the donor community for the solidarity and valuable support provided to the American countries in their efforts to eradicate the scourge of anti-personnel mines and UXOs.
10. Requests the Republic of Nicaragua, as the country occupying the Presidency of the Third Meeting of States parties to the Ottawa Convention, to submit the "Managua Appeal" to the Fourth Meeting so that the States parties will welcome and support it.
11. Congratulate and thank the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua and the Comprehensive Action against Antipersonnel Mines (AICMA-OAS) assistance programme for the organization and support offered during the Conference on Progress of Demining in the Americas.

Signed in Managua, Nicaragua, on 28 August 2002:

**Salvador Stadhagen Icaza**  
Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs  
Republic of Nicaragua

**Elayne White**  
Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs  
Republic of Costa Rica

**Hector Miguel Dada Sanchez**  
Depute Minister for Foreign Affairs  
Integration and Economic Promotion  
Republic of El Salvador

**Julio Enrique Ortiz Cuenca**  
Ambassador of the Republic of Colombia  
to Nicaragua

**Helena Yanez**  
Department of Sovereignty and Borders  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Republic of Ecuador

**Rafael Salazar Galvez**  
Ambassador of the Republic of Guatemala  
to Nicaragua

**Jacqueline Abudoj**  
Chargé d'Affaires  
Republic of Honduras

**Harry Belevan McBride**  
Under Secretary for Multilateral and  
Special Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Republic of Peru



**Annex IX**

**DECLARATION OF THE HUMAN SECURITY NETWORK ON PROMOTING  
THE UNIVERSALIZATION OF THE CONVENTION**

**“Declaration on Promoting the universalization of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction**

We, the Partners and Observers in the Human Security Network, Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland and Thailand, remain strongly committed to further strengthening the humanitarian norm that has been established by the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. This Convention was born out of the determination to put an end to the suffering and casualties by anti-personnel mines, that kill or maim innocent and defenseless people, obstruct economic development and reconstruction, inhibit the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons and have other severe consequences many years after emplacement. The Convention has set an international humanitarian norm that is working beyond its membership.

We stress our conviction that no conceivable military utility of anti-personnel mines could possibly outweigh and justify the devastating humanitarian costs of these weapons.

We emphasize therefore the desirability of attracting the adherence of all those States that are not yet formally bound by the Convention and are determined to work strenuously towards the promotion of universalization of the Convention.

In this context, we welcome the recent ratification of the Convention by Chile, a partner in the Human Security Network, and the ratifications of or accessions to the Convention by Algeria, Angola, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Nigeria, and Suriname.

In addition, we are also encouraged by the steps taken by other States to be formally bound by the Convention, including Greece, a partner in the Human Security Network, and Turkey, as well as Afghanistan.”

Adopted by the Human Security Network - Ministers for Foreign Affairs on 12 September 2002 in New York

-----