

ACHIEVING THE AIMS OF THE NAIROBI ACTION PLAN: THE GENEVA PROGRESS REPORT 2005-2006

Presented by the President-Designate of the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

Introduction

1. The *Nairobi Action Plan*, adopted by the States Parties at the First Review Conference lays out a comprehensive framework for the period 2005-2009 for achieving major progress towards ending, for all people for all time, the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. In doing so, it provides the States Parties guidance in fulfilling their Convention obligations.

2. The purpose of the *Geneva Progress Report* is to monitor and support the application of the *Nairobi Action Plan* by measuring progress made during the period between the Sixth and the Seventh Meetings of the States Parties.¹ In addition, the *Geneva Progress Report* highlights priority areas of work for the States Parties, the Co-Chairs and the Convention's President in the period between the Seventh and the Eighth Meetings of the States Parties. As such, it builds upon the 2004-2005 *Zagreb Progress Report* and should be considered as the second in a series of annual progress reports in advance of the 2009 Second Review Conference.

I. Universalizing the Convention

3. Since the Sixth Meeting of States Parties (6MSP), instruments of ratification were deposited by **Ukraine** on 27 December 2005, by **Haiti** on 15 February 2006, by the **Cook Islands** on 15 March 2006 and by **Brunei Darussalam** on 24 April 2006. There are now **151 States** which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Convention having entered into force for 150 of these States.² A list of these States can be found in Annex I.

4. Forty-three (43) States have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention, including some that produce, use, transfer and maintain large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, and / or are considering developing new kinds of anti-personnel mines. Some of these States are mine-affected. Also amongst these 43 States are three States that signed the Convention: Indonesia, the Marshall Islands and Poland.

5. Since the 6MSP, States Parties to the Convention have promoted adherence to the Convention by States not party. The President of the 6MSP wrote to all States not parties encouraging them to ratify or accede to the Convention as soon as possible. Canada, in addition to coordinating the Universalization Contact Group, engaged in military-to-military dialogues with India and Pakistan. On the margins of the 6MSP and the May 2006 meetings of the Standing Committees, New Zealand and Jordan convened regional universalization discussions for the Asia-Pacific and the Middle East. Other States Parties have raised regularly accession to the Convention with States not parties.

¹ Specifically, the period covered by this report is 2 December 2005 to 22 September 2006.

² The Convention enters into force for Brunei Darussalam on 1 October 2006.

6. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) held youth workshops in Egypt and Lebanon, sent high-level delegations to Brunei, Egypt, India and Lebanon and its country campaign in Nepal played a leading role in convincing the Nepalese government and Maoist groups to include a commitment to refrain from the use of landmines in a code of conduct agreed upon during peace talks in May 2006. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) pursued its efforts to promote adherence to the Convention, in particular among signatory States and in South Asia. The United Nations (UN) recorded in its 2006-2010 inter-agency mine action strategy that it will continue to promote full adherence to the Convention. The Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and the GICHD's Director continued to provide, on request, information on the Convention in order to assist States not parties in making informed decisions regarding acceptance of the Convention.

7. The European Union's (EU) commitment of support to the destruction of Ukraine's stockpiled anti-personnel mines was critical in facilitating Ukraine's entry into the Convention. Given the leadership of the EU in promoting the Convention, the EU was called upon to act with respect to bringing into the Convention Finland and Poland, the only two EU member States that have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention. In another region, the Organization of American States continued to play an important role in universalization, with the OAS's General Assembly on 6 June 2006 adopting a resolution which in part urges OAS member States which have not yet done so to ratify or consider acceding to the Convention.

8. Since the 6MSP, States Parties and other actors including the ICBL and its member organizations, the ICRC, the UN, and the OAS General Assembly continued to advocate the end to the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors. Several States Parties expressed their support and / or made financial commitments to the Geneva Call for its work to engage non-state actors and promote their adherence to the Convention's norms. Some States Parties were of the view that the consent of the State Party concerned should be granted in order for such engagement to take place.

9. A priority for the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties is for States Parties to turn their commitment to universalisation into action, continuing to emphasise work in this area particularly given the extent of the challenges that remain.

II. Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines

10. Since the close of the 6MSP, Ukraine – a State in possession of stockpiled anti-personnel mines – ratified the Convention and the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** reported that it had fulfilled its Article 4 stockpile destruction obligations. Hence the number of States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remains relevant has been narrowed to include **13 States**: Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Greece, Guyana, Latvia, Serbia, Sudan, Turkey and Ukraine.³ One of these

³ While it is understood that these 13 States Parties are the only States Parties which must still fulfill Article 4 obligations, an additional [5] States Parties not mentioned in this paragraph have never provided an initial Article 7 report as required to confirm informal indications that no stocks are held. These States Parties are: [Cameroon, Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, and Sao Tome and Principe]. [NOTE TO DRAFTERS: INITIAL REPORTS DUE FROM BHUTAN ON 31 JULY AND FROM VANUATU ON 28 AUGUST.] In addition, in coming months, Brunei Darussalam, the Cook Islands and Haiti will be required to submit initial Article 7 reports to confirm informal indications that no stocks are held and Ukraine will be required to submit an initial report providing information on stocks held.

States Parties indicated during the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that it may seek an extension for destroying its stockpiles, this while it is clear that the Convention does not permit such extensions. Timelines for these States Parties to complete stockpile destruction in accordance with Article 4 is contained in Annex II.

11. One hundred and thirty eight states that have ratified or acceded to the Convention no longer hold stocks of anti-personnel mines, either because they never did or because they have completed their destruction programmes. States Parties have destroyed more than 38 million stockpiled mines. However, for a small number of States Parties, stockpile destruction remains relevant and several challenges remain.

12. Some States Parties are emerging from years of conflict and may not know the extent to which stockpiled anti-personnel mines exist in areas under their jurisdiction. In some instances, these States Parties may not have control over all such areas. For two States Parties, the destruction of vast numbers of the PFM-1 type mine remains a challenge. For some, the sheer volume of mines that must be destroyed presents difficulties. In addition, all 13 relevant States Parties are challenged by the obligation to destroy their stocks “as soon as possible”.

13. Two states (Ethiopia and Guyana), have not yet reported, as required, the number and types of stockpiled anti-personnel mines that are under their jurisdiction or control. Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia and Sao Tome and Principe have not yet provided an initial Article 7 report to confirm the assumption that they do not hold stocks. Indeed, if Cape Verde and Equatorial Guinea did possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, then they would be past their deadlines for destroying them. In addition, initial reports will soon be due from some of the newest States Parties.

14. While the responsibility to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines rests with each State Party, the Convention calls for others to assist. In most instances States Parties can fulfill Article 4 obligations with their own resources. However, in 2006 it was again noted that the Convention community must respond to appeals for technical or other assistance.

15. The *Zagreb Progress Report* recorded the need to raise awareness of the need to destroy the stockpiles of mines belonging to armed non-State actors that have committed to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines. Since the 6MSP, the Geneva Call reported the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines in Western Sahara by a signatory to the Geneva Call’s *Deed of Commitment*.

16. Priorities for the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties include: for all States Parties to comply with their deadlines; for States Parties that have achieved a relatively high level of economic development to display leadership in destroying their stockpiles as soon as possible; for all other States Parties in the process of fulfilling Article 4 obligations to have a clear plan in place to ensure compliance with their deadlines; and for all relevant States Parties to report on their stockpile status as required under Article 7 of the Convention.

III. Clearing mined areas

17. Since the close of the 6MSP, two States Parties – **Guatemala** and **Suriname** – formally reported that they had fulfilled their Article 5 obligations bringing to six the number of States Parties that have indicated they have fulfilled their Article 5 obligations. Hence, there remain 45 States Parties which have indicated that the mine clearance obligations of Article 5 remain relevant for them. Timelines for these States Parties to destroy or ensure the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5 is contained in Annex III.

18. In 2006, it was recalled that in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention, States Parties must “make every effort to identify all areas under (their) jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced” and undertake “to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of (the) Convention for (a particular) State Party.” It was also again noted that the Convention does not contain language that would require each State Party to search every square metre of its territory to find mines. The Convention does require, however, the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas which a State Party has made every effort to identify. Moreover, it was noted that while terms like “mine-free,” “impact-free,” and “mine-safe” are sometimes used, such terms do not exist in the text of the Convention and are not synonymous with Convention obligations.

19. In 2006, it was also again emphasised that clearance of all mined areas in accordance with Article 5 is part of the Convention’s overall comprehensive approach to ending the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines – “for all people, for all time.”⁴ Anti-personnel mines, and the clearance of them, have a humanitarian impact, an impact on development, an impact on the disarmament goal of the Convention and an impact on solidifying peace and building confidence. The totality of the impacts caused by anti-personnel mines should be addressed in the context of the Convention.

20. Despite the clarifications made at the 6MSP, some ongoing ambiguity was evidenced in 2006. At the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, at least two States Parties referred to their end-state under Article 5 obligations as “impact-free” or having no new victims, terms which are not in the Convention nor consistent with Convention obligations. In addition, at least one State Party indicated its intention to emplace *permanent* markings of minefields, implying an intention that such markings would not be interim measure as required by the Convention but rather that anti-personnel mines in such mined areas would not be destroyed as required.

21. Given the urgency surrounding fulfilling Article 5 obligations, the States Parties at the 6MSP suggested that a number of matters must be clarified. Foremost amongst these matters concerns the need to meet expectations in complying with this Article prior to the Convention’s Second Review Conference in 2009. There are expectations that those States Parties that reasonably could be expected to comply with their clearance obligations within the 10-year period set by the Convention indeed do so. In addition, as implied by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, there are expectations that those States Parties which a Meeting of the States Parties determines could not have reasonably been expected to comply in a 10-year period:

⁴ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Introduction.

(a) will have acquired, as soon as possible after entry-into-force, all necessary information and hence prepared a national demining programme;

(b) will have made available from national sources financial and technical means to implement Article 5 and made best efforts to acquire any necessary external assistance; and,

(c) will have achieved a status of work conducted under a national demining programme that one could reasonably expect after a 10-year period.

22. At the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, the Co-Chairs encouraged all States Parties that are in the process of fulfilling Article 5 obligations to provide clarity on matters such as plans to fulfil these obligations, progress made, work that remains, and factors that may impede fulfilling their obligations in a 10 year period. Thirty-five (35) of 45 relevant States Parties accepted the Co-Chairs invitation with many providing more clarity on these matters than ever before. However, few of these States Parties indicated that they have a plan in place to fulfil their obligations by their deadlines with some of these emphasising that completion in a 10 year period was contingent upon sufficient resources being made available.

23. In terms of identifying mined areas, important advances in understanding were made in 2006. In particular, risk management approaches have been developed by actors such as the GICHD that focus on maximizing techniques for effectively releasing land in order that demining assets can be more efficiently deployed to areas that are actually mined. In other cases, such as in Cambodia or Lebanon, methodologies have been established to cancel, with confidence, suspected hazardous areas. In one instance, the use of such methodologies has resulted in 50 percent of suspected hazardous areas being determined to not actually contain mines. These advances, which enable States Parties to release suspected hazardous areas and much more rapidly identify actual mined areas, suggest that the challenges faced by many States Parties may be less than previously thought and that efforts to fulfil Convention obligations can proceed in a more efficient manner. These advances also suggest that some past surveys may have dramatically overstated the extent of the problem faced.

24. Another matter discussed in 2006 concerned all aspects related to possible requests for extension of deadlines to comply with Article 5 obligations, including timelines, scope and format of extension requests, review procedures and decision-making process. At the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs initiated a discussion on this matter with a view to actions being taken at the 7MSP.

25. With respect Convention obligations that concern reducing risks to civilian populations from mined areas awaiting clearance, in 2006 it was reported by the ICBL and UNICEF that a growing number of mine clearance programs now include a mine risk education community liaison as called for by the *Zagreb Progress Report*. It was noted that community liaison is increasingly integrated by clearance operators as a standard component their programmes in three States Parties (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ethiopia and Mauritania) and that some community liaison has been recorded in 10 State Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Sudan and Thailand). It was also noted that some States Parties, including Cambodia and Senegal, have made concrete efforts to develop community liaison projects as part of peace-building and development program. Also in terms of progress, it was reported that since the

6MSP, UNICEF in partnership with the GICHD has produced 12 guidebooks to provide advice, tools and guidance to States Parties and others to undertake mine risk education programmes that are compliant with International Mine Action Standards.

26. According to the ICBL and UNICEF, no mine risk education activities were recorded in several States Parties where communities may be at risk. It was also brought to the States Parties' attention that while in accordance with Article 7.1.i States Parties are obliged to provide information on "the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all (mined areas)," the information is often insufficient and some instances no information has been provided.

27. Since the 6MSP, some important efforts were undertaken consistent with the *Nairobi Action Plan's* guidance with respect to right of States Parties, as indicated in Article 6.2, "to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of this Convention." These efforts included a technology workshop convened by the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) and the GICHD in February 2006 and a mine action technologies experts' group meeting convened by Belgium on the margins of the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies.

28. Discussions on mine action technologies that took place in 2006 resulted in a variety of conclusions being drawn by experts in this area. These conclusions included: that the greatest challenge rests with getting enough appropriate existing technology into national demining programmes with economic realities being the chief limiting factor; that factors such as training, life cycle costs, modifications to an organizational structure and maintenance programme and rewriting of standard operating procedures are often overlooked when introducing a new technology; that many national demining programmes, if adaptable, well-managed, and have a clear plan, could benefit from the introduction of new technologies; and, that there is a lack of information available to convince mine action operators of the advantages of using machines and new technologies effectively and that information that does exist is often not retained.

29. Priorities for the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties include: for States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 which have not yet done so to act in accordance with the *Nairobi Action Plan* to identify mine areas under their jurisdiction or control, to develop national plans consistent with Convention obligations, achieve progress in implementing such a plan; for States Parties in a position to do so to continue to comply with their obligations to provide assistance for mine clearance and mine risk education; and, for all States Parties to establish practical-minded approaches to assist them in developing and considering requests for extensions submitted in accordance with Article 5.

IV. Assisting the victims

30. The Final Report of the First Review Conference provided a clear framework to develop efforts in relation to mine victim assistance. Three statements are particularly relevant. In particular, the States Parties emphasized that "the call to assist landmine victims should not lead to victim assistance efforts being undertaken in such a manner as to exclude any person injured or disabled in another manner." They stated that "assistance to landmine victims should be viewed as a part of a country's overall public health and social services systems and human rights frameworks." As well, they highlighted that "providing adequate assistance

to landmine survivors must be seen in a broader context of development and underdevelopment.”⁵ Finally, the final report of the First Review Conference recorded that a greater emphasis must be placed on the fulfillment of the responsibilities to landmine victims by the 24 States Parties that had indicated that they hold ultimate responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors.

31. Guided by the conclusions drawn at the First Review Conference, in 2006, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration built on the work of the 2005 Co-Chairs to assist the 24 relevant States Parties to set goals for fulfilling their victim assistance responsibilities the period 2005-2009. In particular, an effort was made to overcome the following challenges:

- Few of the 24 relevant States Parties in 2005 had responded with specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound objectives, and some States Parties had failed to spell out what is known or not known about the status of victim assistance.
- In many instances the effort to develop victim assistance objectives had been led by demining officials with little interaction with those responsible for health and social services; and,
- In many instances the preparation of victim assistance objectives had not taken broader national plans into consideration.

32. The Co-Chairs recognized that the best way to assure progress in overcoming these challenges was to work intensively, on a national basis, with as many of the relevant States Parties as possible while providing some level of support to all 24 of these States Parties. With assistance provided by Switzerland, the ISU extended its services to provide *process support* to these States Parties to: support those with good objectives to develop good plans; support those with vague objectives to develop more concrete objectives; and, support those that had not engaged, or had engaged very little, in the process of developing objectives and plans in 2005 to get engaged. In many instances, *process support* has included one-on-one meetings with officials from relevant ministries to raise awareness of the matter and to stimulate inter-ministerial coordination, outreach to relevant international and other organizations, and, inter-ministerial workshops – as appropriate – to bring together all relevant actors to discuss and consolidate improvements on objectives and the development of plans. In addition, the Co-Chairs invited the 24 relevant States Parties to provide updates on their efforts at the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee. Sixteen (16) of these States Parties responded to the Co-Chairs by providing information.

33. The work of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration in 2006 also focused on three priority areas: the role of inter-ministerial coordination in the development of national plans of action; the promotion of quality of, and access to, medical first aid for mine victims, including by identifying training needs of first responders and key components of pre-hospital care; and, best practices in the social and economic reintegration of persons with disabilities, focusing on innovative projects for self-employment and micro-financing schemes.

⁵ INSERT REFERENCE

34. With assistance provided by Australia, the ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance through its member organizations, Standing Tall Australia and Handicap International, made a useful contribution to work on victim assistance in 2006 by producing the report *Victim Assistance in 2005: Overview of the Situation in 24 States Parties*. This is the second annual report in a series intended to monitor progress in the implementation of the victim assistance section of the *Nairobi Action Plan*.

35. While important advances have been made since the 6MSP, challenges remain which require the attention of the States Parties. Priorities for the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties include overcoming the following such challenges: that there continues to be little to no knowledge of commitments made in the *Nairobi Action Plan* or the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration among relevant officials and experts working on disability issues at the national level; that there continues to be a low level of involvement in the work of the Convention by health care, rehabilitation or disability rights experts; many relevant States Parties lack the of capacity to develop objectives and national plans; in some States Parties there is limited collaboration between mine action centres and relevant ministries and other key actors in the disability sector; and, financial resources are limited to implement national plans.

V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims

a. Cooperation and assistance

36. [TO BE DRAFTED; INCORPORATE RESOURCE MOBILISATION CONTACT GROUP WORK ON EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS; INCORPORATE WORK ON MINE ACTION AND DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW CONTACT GROUP; COMMENT ON FUNDING TRENDS]

Transparency and the exchange of information

37. Since the 6MSP, initial transparency reports were submitted by [Bhutan], Latvia and [Vanuatu]. Hence, all States Parties have now complied with their Article 7.1 obligations with the exception of six States Parties which had not yet provided an initial report: Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guyana, and Sao Tome and Principe.⁶

38. In terms of compliance with Article 7.2 of the Convention, annual article 7 reports for 2006 were provided by all states with the exception of the following [XX] States Parties: [INSERT LIST]. As of 22 September 2006, the overall reporting rate in 2006 stood at [XX] percent.

39. The 6MSP reemphasised that reporting in accordance with Article 7 is particularly important for States Parties in the process of fulfilling key obligations or which have retained anti-personnel mines under Article 3. In this regard, the following was the status as of 22 September 2006:

- (i) Of the 13 States Parties which, as of the close of the 6MSP, still had to destroy stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, each provided transparency

⁶ Ukraine is required to submit an initial transparency report as soon as practicable and, in any event, not later than [INSERT DATE], Haiti not later than [INSERT DATE], the Cook Islands not later than [INSERT DATE], and Brunei Darussalam not later than [INSERT DATE].

information on this matter in 2006 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [INSERT LIST].

- (ii) Of the 45 States Parties which, as of the close of the 6MSP, still had to clear mined areas in accordance with Article 5, each provided transparency information on this matter in 2006 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [INSERT LIST].
- (iii) Of the [XX] States Parties which, as of the close of the 6MSP, had not yet reported on legislation in the context of Article 9, each provided transparency information on this matter in 2006 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [INSERT LIST].
- (iv) Of the [XX] States Parties which, as of the close of the 6MSP, had reported that they had retained mines for reasons permitted under Article 3, each provided transparency information on this matter in 2006 with the exception of the following: [INSERT LIST]. An update on the numbers of mines retained and transferred for permitted reasons is contained in Annex VI.

40. At the 6MSP, the States Parties amended the transparency reporting format to provide, in Form D, the opportunity to volunteer information in addition to what is minimally required on mines retained for reasons permitted under Article 3. [XX] States Parties used the amended reporting format to provide such information. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation invited States Parties to volunteer relevant information, at the May 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee, on mines retained under Article 3 to make use of this forum.⁷ Seventeen (17) States Parties took advantage of this opportunity to share such information at the Standing Committee's meeting. An overview of additional information volunteered is contained in Annex VI.

41. Another means available to States Parties to share information in addition to what is minimally required is the Article 7 reporting format's Form J. Since the 6MSP, the following [XX] States Parties have made use of Form J as a voluntary means of reporting: [INSERT LIST].

42. Further to the States Parties' commitment in Action #55 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* to exchange views on the practical implementation of the various articles 1, 2 and 3, The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention provided an opportunity for an exchange of views on such matters on 12 May 2006. Three States Parties used this opportunity to share views on Articles 1, 2 and / or 3 and two States Parties shared views on other aspects of implementation.

⁷ The Co-Chairs suggested that States Parties may wish to volunteer three main pieces of information: (i) The purposes for which retained mines have been used and the results of this use, including for example: the mine detection, clearance or destruction techniques that have been / are being developed; the mine detection, clearance or destruction training that has been carried out; and, the number of personnel trained and to what standard. (ii) Plans for the further development of mine detection, clearance or detection techniques and further training which would result in the use of mines retained under Article 3. (iii) The number and types of mines that a State Party anticipates using in coming years for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques.

43. Since the 6MSP, one State not party, Poland provided a voluntary transparency report, sharing information on all pertinent matters mentioned in Article 7.

c. Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities, and facilitating compliance

44. Since the 6MSP, two additional States Parties, including one that had previously indicated that it considered existing laws to be sufficient, reported having adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations – Albania and Croatia – and one additional State Party – Cyprus – reported existing laws to be sufficient. Hence, there are now 48 states that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations and an additional 26 had reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient. Seventy-seven (77) States that have ratified or acceded to the Convention have not yet reported having adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they consider existing laws to be sufficient. As noted, since the 6MSP, four additional States ratified or acceded to the Convention and none of these has yet reported on actions taken in accordance with Article 9. An overview of the status of implementation of Article 9 can be found in Annex V.

45. Since the 6MSP, the States Parties remained committed to work together to facilitate compliance under the Convention. In addition, since the 6MSP, no State Party submitted a request for clarification to a Meeting of the States Parties in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 2, or has proposed that a Special Meeting of the States Parties be convened in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 5. As well, the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs continued fulfilling the UN Secretary General's responsibility to prepare and update a list of names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts designated for fact finding missions authorized in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 8. Since the First Review Conference, [XX] States Parties – [INSERT LIST] – provided updated information for the list of experts.

46. Priorities for the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties relate to the agreement States Parties made in the *Nairobi Action Plan* to develop and adopt legislative and other measures in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention, including to impose penal sanctions for prohibited activities, and to integrate the Convention's prohibitions and requirements into their military doctrine. Since the First Review Conference, few States Parties have reported adopting such measures. States Parties requiring assistance in adopting such measures should make use of the support available from the ICRC and other actors.

d. Implementation support

47. Since the 6MSP, the Coordinating Committee met [X] times to prepare for and assess the outcome of the Intersessional Work Programme and to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the Meeting of the States Parties. The Coordinating Committee continued to operate in an open and transparent manner with summary reports of each meeting made available to all interested parties on the web site of the GICHD.

48. At the May 2006 meetings of the Standing Committees there were over 550 registered delegates representing 97 States Parties, 18 States not parties and numerous international and non-governmental organizations. These meetings featured focused discussions on the implementation of key provisions of the Convention and on assuring that cooperation and assistance would continue to function well. The meetings were again supported by the

GICHD and active participation was enhanced by interpretation services which were provided courtesy of voluntary contributions made by the European Commission and Canada.

49. In 2006, the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the GICHD continued to assist States Parties in all possible aspects of implementing the Convention's obligations and objectives. The ISU supported the President, the President-Designate, the Co-Chairs, the Contact Group Coordinators, the Sponsorship Programme donors group and individual States Parties with initiatives to pursue the aims of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. In addition, through the provision of professional advice, support and information services, the ISU assisted individual States Parties in addressing various implementation challenges.

50. The ongoing operations of the ISU were assured by voluntary contributions which were made by the following States Parties since the 6MSP: [INSERT LIST]. In addition as noted, through project funding provided by Switzerland, the ISU was able to enhance its available services in 2006 by providing victim assistance *process support* to the inter-ministerial coordination efforts of States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of mine victims.

51. The United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, Australia and Switzerland, with the assistance of the ISU, proceeded in 2006 in making arrangements for the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties. In addition, the States Parties continued to make use of Contact Groups concerning universalization, Article 7 reporting and resource mobilization. As well, Canada established a new Contact Group on Mine Action and Development in order to pursue in more focused manner various aspects of the *Nairobi Action Plan*.

52. The Sponsorship Programme remained an important instrument in ensuring participation in the Convention's meetings by States Parties which would normally not be able to be represented at these meetings by relevant experts or officials. In advance of the May 2006 meetings of the Standing Committees, the programme's Donors' Group invited 42 States Parties to request sponsorship for up to 64 delegates in order that updates could be provided on various aspects of implementation. Twenty-nine (29) of these States Parties responded to these invitations in such a manner that resulted in 35 representatives of States Parties being sponsored to attend the May meetings.

53. Sponsorship of States Parties' delegates also assisted in the application of Action #39 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, to include health and social service professionals in deliberations. Nine (9) relevant States Parties took advantage of the Donors' Group offer of support for participation by such a professional. As well, the programme contributed to the aims of universalization, with the Donors' Group having offered sponsorship support for the May 2006 meetings to 10 States not parties. Five of these States not parties accepted this offer with each providing an update on its views on the Convention at the 8 May meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention.

54. The ongoing operations of the Sponsorship Programme were assured in 2006 by contributions to the Sponsorship Programme having been received since the 6MSP from the following States Parties: [INSERT LIST].

Annex I: States that have ratified or acceded to the Convention

[INSERT TABLE]

Annex II: States Parties that have indicated that are in the process of fulfilling Article 4 obligations

[INSERT TABLE]

Annex III: States Parties that have indicated they are in the process of fulfilling Article 5 obligations

[INSERT TABLE]

Annex VI: Anti-personnel mines reported retained or transferred by the States Parties for reasons permitted under Article 3, and, a summary of additional information provided by these States Parties

Table 1: Anti-personnel mines reported retained in accordance with Article 3⁸

[INSERT TABLE
]

Table 2: Anti-personnel mines reported transferred in accordance with Article 3⁹

[INSERT TABLE]

⁸ This table contains only those States Parties which have not, in 2006 or previously, reported zero as the number of anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with Article 3. States Parties not included in this table are: [INSERT LIST]

⁹ This table includes only those States Parties that reported mines transferred in accordance with Article 3 since the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties.

Annex V: The status of legal measures taken in accordance with Article 9

Table 1: States Parties that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations

[INSERT TABLE]

Table 2: States Parties that have reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient in the context of Article 9 obligations

[INSERT TABLE]

Table 3: States that ratified or acceded to the Convention that have not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that existing laws are sufficient

[INSERT TABLE]