

**DRAFT REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE
USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR
DESTRUCTION: 2019-2024**

Submitted by the President of the Fifth Review Conference

I. Introduction

The Convention provides a framework to “put an end to the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines” by ensuring universal adherence to a comprehensive set of prohibitions on the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines, by ensuring the exclusion of civilians from mined areas, destroying all anti-personnel mines in mined areas, destroying stockpiles, and providing assistance to mine victims. The Convention also foresees that certain matters are essential for achieving progress in these areas including cooperation and assistance, transparency and the exchange of information, national implementation measures to prevent and suppress prohibited activities and to facilitate compliance and, implementation support.

Since the Fourth Review Conference of the Convention held in Oslo in 2019, progress has been made in meeting the purpose and objectives of the Convention and in meeting the 2025 aspirational goal set by the States Parties. While regular progress continues to be made, challenges remain to reach a mine-free world and ensure that healthcare and broader support services provide sustainable support to mine victims. Unfortunately, since the Fourth Review Conference, the situation in several States Parties has deteriorated and protracted conflicts continue affecting their ability to implement their obligations under the Convention. Furthermore, since the Fourth Review Conference the large-scale use of anti-personnel mines, including anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, has been recorded.

This review is intended to record the progress made by the States Parties in fulfilling their obligations since the Fourth Review Conference, take stock of the status of implementation and document the decisions, recommendations and understandings adopted by the States Parties since the Fourth Review Conference. Furthermore, it is intended to provide an analysis of the current situation and on this basis, highlight challenges that remain in fulfilling the obligations of the Convention.

II. Universalizing the Convention

1. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties recognized that the Convention has established a strong norm against any use, production, stockpiling and transfer of anti-personnel mines and that while this norm is widely adhered to even by States not party to the Convention, efforts to promote universalisation of the Convention and the strengthening of its norms must continue.
2. As of 15 April 2024, the Convention had entered into force for 164 States Parties. Since the Fourth Review Conference, no additional States have ratified/acceded to the Convention. In this regard, increased and regular efforts to encourage ratification/accession of States will be necessary going forward.

3. Today, there are 33 States which are not yet party to the Convention including one signatory State: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Marshall Islands (signatory), Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.
4. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to use all available avenues to promote ratification of/accession to the Convention by States not party including by encouraging their participation in the work of the Convention. Since the Fourth Review Conference, in keeping with the States Parties' tradition of openness, all States not party were invited to each of the Convention's Pledging Conferences, Intersessional Meetings, Meetings of the States Parties and to the Fifth Review Conference and relevant Preparatory Meetings. In addition, States not party were regularly invited to additional informal meetings held by the President and the Convention's Committees. The following 18 States not party (54% of State not party) took part in at least one of the Convention's meetings since 2019: Armenia, Azerbaijan, India, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syria Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, the United States of America, and Viet Nam. Many of these States expressed their support for the humanitarian aims of the Convention and indicated the manner in which they provide support to States Parties in fulfilling their obligations under the Convention.
5. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the President of the Convention, Convention office holders, and other States Parties have promoted ratification of/accession to the Convention by States not party during informal and formal meetings of the Convention as well as in other fora such as the meetings of the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons as well as meeting of the Human Rights Council and the World Health Organization. Taking advantage of other fora to promote the Convention will be an important effort going forward.
6. Considering the stagnant accession/ratification rates, each year since the Fourth Review Conference, the Presidents of the Convention have engaged with the 33 States not party through writing, requesting updated information concerning their positions vis a vis the Convention and employing the information to develop observations and conclusions on the status of universalization of the Convention presented at Intersessional Meetings and Meetings of the States Parties. The Convention's Presidents (Sudan (2020), the Netherlands (2021), Colombia (2022), Germany (2023) and Cambodia (2024)) held bilateral meetings with representatives of States not party in Geneva, New York and capitals to encourage their engagement with the work of the Convention, including meetings with representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, the Kingdom of Tonga, United Arab Emirates, the United States and Viet Nam. These States not party have been encouraged to continue their consideration to accede to/ratify the Convention as soon as possible and to make formal commitments to adherence with the Convention's provisions.
7. One measure of States' acceptance of the Convention's norms is through support expressed for the annual United Nations General Assembly resolution on the implementation of the Convention. Since 2019 the following 17 States not party voted in favour of the resolution: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Tonga, United Arab Emirates.

Unfortunately, in 2023, and for the first time since entry into force of the Convention, one State not party, the Russian Federation, voted against the resolution. In the most recent vote on this resolution in 2024, the following States not party to the Convention voted in favour: **[INSERT STATES]**

8. In voting in favour of the resolution, many States not party acknowledged and supported to varying degrees, the humanitarian goals of the Convention and highlighted the grave consequences of the use of anti-personnel mines. States not party have provided different reasons for not acceding to the Convention. In some cases, States not party expressed that proceeding with accession is dependent on the accession of another State, generally a neighbouring State. Other States not party have indicated that accession is tied to sovereignty issues. Still, other States have indicated as an obstacle to accession the many competing priorities for the limited internal resources available. Finally, others perceive that the marginal military utility derived from anti-personnel mines is not outweighed by the grave humanitarian consequences of their use.
9. Additionally, the Convention's norms have seen widespread acceptance by States not party to the Convention with 9 States not party (27% of State not party) – Egypt, Georgia, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Morocco, Singapore, and the United States- reporting having put in place moratoria on the use, production, export and/or import of anti-personnel mines.
10. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the President of the Twentieth Meeting of the States Parties (20MSP) established an informal Universalization Coordination Group (UCG) to better coordinate and promote universalization efforts which is co-facilitated by Belgium. The UCG met 7 times since its establishment in 2023 to exchange information on universalization efforts, coordinate joint demarches and discuss universalization opportunities more broadly. At present, the UCG is working to continue efforts to encourage targeted States not party to join the Convention given the affinity towards the Convention expressed by these States including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Georgia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Marshall Islands (signatory), Micronesia, Mongolia, Nepal, Tonga, and Viet Nam. The UCG has also discussed opportunities to strengthen universalization efforts in the lead up to the Fifth Review Conference, including by consideration of the States Parties to formalize a role of a Universalization Coordinator.
11. The States Parties have recognised, that to ensure success of universalization efforts, continuous engagement with States not party will be required by both States Parties and other stakeholders. While accession is the ultimate objective, States not party have been encouraged to take concrete steps towards accession such carrying out landmine policy reviews, as enacting moratoria on the use, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines as well as destroying stockpiled mines, clearing mined areas, providing mine risk education, assisting mine victims, submitting voluntary transparency reports, voting in favour or the United Nations General Assembly resolution on the implementation of the Convention and participating in the work of the Convention.
12. Notwithstanding the tremendous progress achieved in the pursuit of the universal acceptance of the Convention and its norms, challenges persist. While new emplacements of anti-personnel mines by States not party remains relatively rare, since the Fourth Review Conference, several States Parties have shared their concern of the erosion of multilateral norms and in particular the possible renaissance of the perspective that anti-personnel mines are a legitimate means of warfare with military value. Since the Fourth Review Conference new use of anti-personnel mines have been reported in 2 States not

party to the Convention: Myanmar and the Russian Federation.¹ In the case of the Russian Federation's use of anti-personnel mines, this is the first time since entry into force of the Convention that a State not party has employed anti-personnel mines in the territory of a State Party. Upholding the norm of the Convention going forward will be an important task for the States Parties. In this regard, States Parties should continue to demonstrate publicly their unwavering commitment to the implementation of the Convention and continue to reaffirm and reinforce the humanitarian norm of the Convention, including by condemning the use of anti-personnel mines by any actor.

13. All States not party to the exception of three – Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Uzbekistan – have participated at least once in a Convention-related meeting. Several States not party regularly deliver statements to provide information about their state's position on accession and/or on their activities to implement certain provisions of the Convention as well as their contributions to mine action activities. Almost all the States not party which have contributed information on their position have acknowledged and supported the humanitarian aims of the Convention and have recognised the negative impact caused by anti-personnel mines.
14. The production of anti-personnel mines remains rare. At one time more than fifty (50) States produced anti-personnel mines. Thirty-six (36) of these States are now party to the Convention and have ceased and prohibited all production, in line with the Convention. Today only a handful of States not party have been recorded as producers of mines in the last years. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Landmine Monitor listed 13 States not party as landmine producers because they have yet to disavow future production, unchanged from the previous report: Armenia, China, Cuba, India, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and Viet Nam. Of these, India, Iran, Myanmar, Pakistan, and Russia are reported to likely be actively producing.
15. On 21 June 2022 the United States announced important policy changes to their landmine policy which "align US APL policy outside of the Korean Peninsula with the key requirements of the Ottawa Convention" including the commitment not to use, develop, produce, acquire, export anti-personnel mines or assist, encourage, or induce anyone to engage in any activity that would be prohibited by the Ottawa Convention as well as to destroy all APL stockpiled not required for the defence of the Republic of Korea. The United States indicated that along with the new policy "the United States will undertake diligent efforts to pursue materiel and operational solutions to assist in becoming compliant with and ultimately acceding to the Ottawa Convention".²
16. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the increased use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature by armed non-state actors has also been recorded as well as the impact on mine affected communities. The view has been expressed that engagement with these groups could help ensure that these actors cease the use stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines as soon as possible. Nevertheless, the view was also expressed that when engagement by non-governmental organisations of armed non-state actors is considered, vigilance is required to prevent organizations that commit terrorist acts from exploiting the Convention for their own goals. Some States Parties continue to be of the view that when engagement with armed non-state actors is contemplated, States Parties concerned should be informed and their consent would be necessary for such an engagement to take place.

¹ Landmine Monitor Reports

²<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/06/21/fact-sheet-changes-to-u-s-anti-personnel-landmine-policy/>

17. Since the Fourth Review conference the use of anti-personnel mines by “non-state actors” has been reported by the Landmine Monitor in the following States: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Libya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Thailand, and Tunisia. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties resolved to continue to promote universal observance of the Convention’s norms and objectives, condemn violations of these norms and take appropriate steps to end the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines by any actor, including by armed non-State actors. The States Parties have acknowledged the importance of continued efforts to condemn the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines by any actor, ensuring that the norm against the use, stockpiling, production, and transfer of anti-personnel mines remains strong. Since the Fourth Review Conference, subsequent Presidents of the Convention and several States Parties have expressed deep concern in response to new emplacements of anti-personnel mines, including anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, and called for actors concerned to cease the use of such anti-personnel mines. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties at their informal and annual Meetings of the States Parties as well as in other multilateral fora have condemned the use of anti-personnel mines by any actor. Furthermore, subsequent Presidents since the Fourth Review Conference have publicly condemned the use of anti-personnel mines by any actor including through press releases. States Parties should commit to denounce and condemn any violation of the treaty’s norm and hold States using anti-personnel mines accountable to ensure that such violations are not repeated.
18. Since the Fourth Review Conference, allegations of use of anti-personnel mines by the Armed Forces of Ukraine were highlighted by Human Rights Watch in their report dated 31 January 2023. Since the allegations surfaced subsequent Presidents and the Committee on Cooperative Compliance have been engaged in a cooperative dialogue with Ukraine to address these allegations and to ensure that the Convention’s compliance mechanisms remain strong. The Committee on Cooperative Compliance welcomed the cooperative dialogue sustained with Ukraine and encouraged Ukraine to provide additional information on its efforts to carry out investigations as well as on the status of its remaining stockpiled mines, to ascertain which stockpiles are under the control of Ukraine and those that are currently outside of its control. The Committee has further encouraged Ukraine to continue working with all partners to ensure that investigations take place as soon as possible.
19. While the vast majority of States with stockpiled anti-personnel mines – 91 – have joined the Convention, the Landmine Monitor indicates that the following 30 of the 33 States not party to the Convention likely possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kazakhstan, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syria, UAE, United States of America, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.
20. States not party can submit voluntary Article 7 transparency reports to communicate information about the key areas of implementation of the Convention. Those States that have expressed support for the object and purpose of the Convention have been particularly encouraged to provide voluntary transparency reports. Since the Fourth Review Conference, of the 33 States not party, only Morocco submitted such a report on an annual basis.

21. The Convention's Special Envoys, His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein, and Her Royal Highness Princess Astrid of Belgium, in coordination with the President, have continued to make themselves available to engage States not party to the Convention at a high level.

- a. In April 2022 in support of the President's universalization mandate: the President, together with the Convention's Special Envoy, His Royal Highness (HRH) Prince Mired Raad Zeid Al-Hussein of Jordan, travelled to New York and met a number of delegations of States not party including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Lao PDR, Marshall Islands and Viet Nam to discuss barriers to accession and to explore the opportunity of visiting the country to engage in discussions on accession.
- b. During their visit to New York, the President and the Special Envoy participated in a UN press conference to condemn the recent use of mines by the Russian Federation and to manifest the importance of strengthening of the norm of and implementation of the Convention. To further promote the Convention's norm, the Special Envoy also met with Eritrea, encouraging the State Party to return to compliance with the Convention. Other high-level meetings to discuss universalization and strengthening the norm of the Convention included the Delegation of the European Union to the UN in New York, the Under-Secretary-General and High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, and the ICBL.
- c. The Special Envoy HRH Prince Mired Raad Zeid Al-Hussein of Jordan took advantage of the Third Global Conference on Victim Assistance in October 2023, to join the Convention President, Germany, and incoming President, Cambodia, in meeting with States not party and other stakeholders. A technical meeting took place at the EU Delegation in Phnom Penh, with representatives from Belgium, Germany (local embassy in representation of the President of the Convention), Japan, and UNDP to discuss the opportunity afforded by the Fifth Review Conference to promote the Convention in the region. A meeting was held with the Presidency Troika: Germany, Cambodia, Japan, and the Special Envoy to discuss possible follow up for actions on universalization in a more cohesive manner. The group also discussed best manners to support Cambodia in the lead up to the Review Conference in Siem Reap and its own universalization efforts. As a result, the Troika met with friends of the Convention to discuss not only universalization but also the need to support Cambodia in its presidency and universalization efforts. These included Ambassadors or representatives from Australia, France, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, United Kingdom, and UNDP. In addition, the Special Envoy supported the Convention President, Germany, in meeting with Ambassadors and/or other high-level representatives of Indonesia (as Chair of the ASEAN), Lao PDR, South Korea, Viet Nam, and United States.
- d. On the margins of the Indo Pacific Forum held on 2 February 2024 in Brussels, HRH Princess Astrid met with high level representatives from the People's Democratic Republic of Lao, the Marshall Islands and Viet Nam to discuss their position vis a vis the Convention and to encourage these States to take concrete steps towards accession to the Convention.

22. On 18 February 2021, the European Union (EU) adopted Council Decision (CFSP) 2021/257 in support of the Oslo Action Plan (OAP) for the implementation of the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction. Part of the Decision is focused on supporting the Presidency in the implementation of its universalization mandate and supporting the activities of the Convention's Special Envoys in this endeavour. The States Parties

have recognized the important contributions of the EU Council Decision to the implementation of the Convention and the actions plans adopted by the States Parties.

III. Stockpile destruction and retention of anti-personnel mines

23. The Fourth Review Conference noted that great strides have been made in the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines since the entry into force of the Convention and that each mine destroyed represents a potential life or limb saved. In this regard, the States Parties aimed to ensure that all stockpiled anti-personnel mines are expeditiously destroyed in line with Article 4 of the Convention and that anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 do not exceed the minimum number necessary for permitted purposes.

24. At the close of the Fourth Review Conference, there were three States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained relevant – Greece, Sri Lanka, and Ukraine. In addition to these States, one State Party - Tuvalu – needed to confirm whether they held stockpiled anti-personnel mines or not. Tuvalu’s initial report was due on 28 August 2012.

25. On 8 September 2021, Sri Lanka reported in a communication to the Convention’s Implementation Support Unit (ISU), that it had completed its Article 4 obligations ahead of its 1 June 2022 deadline on 24 August 2021 following the destruction in Kilinochchi, Sri Lanka, of its last 11,840 stockpiled anti-personnel mines.

26. There are now two States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remains relevant – Greece and Ukraine – with two of these States Parties being noncompliant since 1 March 2008 (Greece) and 1 June 2010 (Ukraine). One State Party, Tuvalu, has yet to provide its required initial transparency information and hence has not yet confirmed the presence or absence of stockpiled anti-personnel mines. However, Tuvalu is presumed not to hold stocks. Hence, there are now 161 States Parties which do not hold stockpiles of anti-personnel mines because they have completed their destruction programmes or because they never held stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, together States Parties have reported the destruction of over 53.1 million stockpiled anti-personnel mines.

27. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties also agreed that “States Parties that have failed to meet their stockpile destruction deadline and therefore are in non-compliance with Article 4 will present a time-bound plan for completion and urgently proceed with implementation as soon as possible in a transparent manner, regularly informing States Parties on progress made and remaining challenges.” Since the Fourth Review Conference, all States Parties that have missed their Article 4 deadlines have responded to this call by regularly informing States Parties on progress made and remaining challenges. The States Parties have recognised the importance of States providing clarity on the status of stockpile destruction as well as the importance of State Parties providing concrete timelines for implementation of obligations under Article 4.

28. Since the Fourth Review Conference, one of the main challenges in stockpile destruction has been the pending completion of stockpile destruction by Greece and Ukraine. Both States have consistently reported on the situation concerning their stockpiled anti-personnel mines. However, as of 15 April 2024 these States Parties have not provided a time-bound plan for completion. The States Parties have recognised that it is critical that States Parties make every effort to achieve completion of their Article

4 obligations, as soon as possible, and no later than their respective deadline, and that they do so in a transparent manner by communicating progress made and remaining challenge on a regular basis. The importance of the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines as soon as possible following entry into force has been spotlighted by the situation in Ukraine where part of Ukraine's stockpiled anti-personnel mines have no longer under their effective control.

29. [INSERT INFORMATION REPORTED BY UKRAINE AND GREECE ON PROGRESS IN DESTRUCTION AT THE INTERSESSIONAL MEETINGS 2024]

30. At the Fourth Review Conference, it was agreed that any State Party that discovers previously unknown stockpiles after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed will inform States Parties as soon as possible and destroy these anti-personnel mines as a matter of urgent priority and no later than six months after their discovery. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 2 States Parties – Gambia (2019) and Montenegro (2020) – have reported the discovery of previously unknown stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with the commitments made in the OAP. While Montenegro has reported destruction of the 195 discovered unknown stockpile mines, Gambia, while reporting its commitment not to use these mines and to destroy them in full compliance with the Convention, has not provided an update on progress in the destruction of the 3,000 previously unknown stockpiled mines.

31. Additionally, it has been reported that in some cases, previously unknown stockpiles of mines of armed non state actors are identified.

32. Since the Fourth Review Conference, subsequent Presidents have highlighted the importance of continuing to report the discovery of previously unknown stockpiles and ensuring their destruction as soon as possible following their discovery and have included information in this regard in their observations and conclusions on stockpile destruction.

33. At the Fourth Review Conference, it was agreed that “Any State Party that retains anti-personnel mines for reasons permitted under Article 3 of the Convention will annually review the number of mines retained to ensure that they do not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes and will destroy all anti-personnel mines that exceed that number. The States Parties will report annually by 30 April on the use of retained mines and on their destruction.”

34. At the Fourth Review Conference, it was recorded that 70 States Parties had reported, as required by Article 7, paragraph 1 d), anti-personnel mines for the development of training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention.

35. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the following has transpired:

- a. Six States Parties – Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Nicaragua, Nigeria, and Sudan - indicated that they now no longer retain anti-personnel mines for training purposes;
- b. One State Party – Tajikistan – indicated that the anti-personnel mines it retains under Article 3 are inert and therefore do not fall under the definition of the Convention.

- c. Two State Party – Bulgaria and Cambodia - reported an increase in the number of anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3. Bulgaria further reported that in 2020, 9,059 anti-personnel mines (8927 M2A4 and 132 M3), previously owned by the Bulgarian private company “EXPAL BULGARIA” JSC, have been successfully transferred to Italy, a State Party to the Convention, for destruction.
- d. One State Party - The Netherlands - reported that 606 anti-personnel mines (DM31) previously retained for training by the Ministry of Defence of the Netherlands were transferred for the purpose of destruction to Italy on 30 November 2020. The transferred mines are in secured storage until the reactivation of the factory following an accident which led to its total lockdown.
- e. In its 2020 Article 7 Report, Italy reported that it imported for destruction a total of 9,059 anti-personnel mines and that a total of 6,119 mines have been destroyed. Italy further reported that it imported for destruction a total of 606 anti-personnel mines belonging to another State Party for destruction, but destruction activities have not yet started.
- f. Since the 18MSP, one State Party– Guyana – indicated that it retains anti-personnel mines for training purposes.

36. At present, there are sixty-four States Parties - Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Oman, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe - that retain anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes. As of 15 April 2024, the number of anti-personnel mines reported retained by the States Parties totals 123,376, this is 39,420 less than at the time of the Fourth Review Conference.

37. Since the Fourth Review Conference, most States Parties have provided updated annual information on the number of anti-personnel mines retained for permitted purposes as required by Article 7, with 54 of them providing some level of voluntary information on the use (present and/or future) of retained anti-personnel mines. However, the following States Parties which have reported that they retain anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 3 have not submitted annual updated transparency information on their retained mines for many years: Benin (2008), Burundi (2021), Cameroon (2009), Cape Verde (2009), Congo (2009), Côte d’Ivoire (2014), Djibouti (2005), Eritrea (2014), Gambia (2020), Guyana (2021), Honduras (2007), Indonesia (2020), Kenya (2008), Mali (2005), Namibia (2010), Oman (2021), Rwanda (2008), Tanzania (2009), Togo (2003) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (2012). Improving reporting rates by States Parties with retained mines will be an important effort going forward.

38. Furthermore, in some cases, since the Fourth Review Conference, the following States Parties have reported the same number of retained mines in their Article 7 Reports: Bangladesh, Ecuador, Iraq, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Mauritania, Senegal, Serbia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Reporting the same number of retained mines over several years may indicate that these mines have not been used for permitted purposes and that the number of mines retained may not constitute the “minimum number absolutely necessary” for permitted purposes, unless otherwise reported.

39. In addition to the above, at the Fourth Review Conference, it was agreed that States Parties retaining anti-personnel mines will “explore available alternatives to using live anti-personnel mines for training and

research purposes where possible.” Since the Fourth Review Conference, Iraq, Slovenia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe reported efforts to explore alternatives to using live anti-personnel mines for training and research purposes.

40. Since the Fourth Review Conference, subsequent Presidents have included information on the status of Article 3 in their annual reports to the Intersessional Meetings and Meetings of the States Parties and have communicated through writing to States Parties reporting retained anti-personnel mines. Likewise, activities to promote the use of alternatives to live anti-personnel mines have been organized including:

- a. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings the President held a discussion on “Alternatives to using live anti-personnel mines for training”. During the discussion, the President offered an updated on the status of Article 3 and invited The Development Initiative (TDI) to offer a presentation on the use of 3D printed training aids. In its presentation TDI offered an overview of how TDI employs 3D printed mines for training, detector calibration and explosive risk ordnance risk education. TDI also discussed the challenge of using real mines for training including 1) mined contain an explosive hazard, 2) unsafe for the operator 3) special permission is needed for transporting mines and 4) mines lose part of their composition and can become ineffective for training. In its presentation, TDI also provided real cases of where it employs training mines.
- b. At the time of writing and in the context of the European Council Decision 2021/257, the President of the Convention is organizing, together with the ISU, an event to further explore alternatives to anti-personnel mines to be held on 21 June 2024.

IV. Survey and clearance of mined areas

41. At the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties, while recognizing that considerable progress has been made in addressing mined areas, reiterated the need to increase the pace of survey and clearance activities to meet Article 5 obligations as soon as possible. To ensure significant progress towards their ambition of completing their timebound obligations to the furthest extent possible by 2025, the States Parties agreed that accelerated survey and clearance would provide the greatest contribution to reducing human suffering and to protecting people from the risk posed by anti-personnel mines.

42. At the close of the Fourth Review Conference – 32 States Parties were in the process of implementing Article 5 obligations. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the following has transpired:

- a. Two State Party – Chile and the United Kingdom - reported having completed implementation of Article 5.
- b. Three State Parties – Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, and Nigeria - informed the States Parties that they discovered previously unknown mined areas or, in the case of Nigeria, newly mined areas in territory under their jurisdiction or control.

43. In total, since the entry into force of the Convention, 63 States Parties have reported obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Of these, there are now 33 States Parties for which Article 5

obligations remain relevant: Afghanistan³, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, State of Palestine, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

44. While significant and measurable progress has been achieved in the implementation of Article 5, the rate of progress is different amongst States Parties and challenges in implementation remain. Some of the persistent challenges reported by States Parties include lack of national/international financial resources, security concerns, border challenges, topography, matters concerning access to contaminated areas and stoppages associated with the Covid 19 pandemic. In other cases, the continued and increased use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature has been reported as a significant challenge in implementation of Article 5. The use of improvised anti-personnel mines has been a persistent challenge since the Fourth Review Conference. Likewise, it is important to note that in many cases anti-personnel mines are only one of the explosive ordnance threats faced by these States. These challenges have slowed progress in implementation of Article 5. Furthermore, while in some States significant progress has been made in other cases the slow pace of survey and clearance has resulting in recurrent extension requests.
45. In the OAP, States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature committed to “ensure that they apply all provisions and obligations under the Convention to such contamination as they do for all other types of anti-personnel mines, including during survey and clearance in fulfilment of Article 5 and disaggregate by types of mines when reporting in fulfilment of Article 7 obligations”. Since the Fourth review Conference 12 States Parties have applied the provision of the Convention to anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature including Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Türkiye, Ukraine, and Yemen. It is important to note that the use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature by armed non state actors has been an important factor in the rise in the number of casualties in several States.
46. Since the Fourth Review Conference, efforts have been put forth by the States Parties to raise awareness of the impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature including the following:
- a. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings the Committee on Article 5 Implementation organized a panel discussion on “Addressing anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature under the framework of the Convention”. The panel discussion was moderated by the Netherlands and included participation from Canada, Iraq, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), Mine Action Review (MAR) and Norwegian People’s Aid. The objective of panel was to explore the OAP’s approach to addressing this matter based on the agreed understanding of the States Parties of the place of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature within the Convention, explore best practices in reporting and the importance of the disaggregation of devices and available guidance. The panel supported the efforts of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation to raise awareness of the importance of States Parties addressing anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature under the framework of the Convention and the guidance available to States that face contamination by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature in territory under their jurisdiction or control. The panel also highlighted the fact that the use of improvised anti-personnel mines will most likely continue to be a challenge for States Parties implementing Article

³ References to *Afghanistan* in this document refers to the period of 1 January 2020 to August 2021.

5 of the Convention and support to States Parties in accurately reporting the challenges they face, including reporting in a disaggregated manner, will be important.

- b. During the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings, the President organized a panel entitled “The Convention and the threat of improvised anti-personnel mines”. The Panel was moderated by Sweden in its capacity of Chair of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and included participation from the National Mine Action Centre of Colombia, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Human Rights Watch and Mines Advisory Group (MAG). The objective of the panel discussed the legal obligations of states affected by improvised anti-personnel mines, what we know about their impact and challenges and lessons learned in addressing improvised anti-personnel mines. The panel reiterated the importance of the next action plan continuing to address matters related to improvised anti-personnel mines. The panel further highlighted that while access to affected communities is a critical challenge, there are innovative and creative ways to address the challenges faced, including by increasing localization efforts and strengthening mine risk education and reduction efforts ahead of gaining access for survey and clearance.
- c. On 13-15 February 2024, the Republic of Ghana with the support of the European Union and the Implementation Support Unit held a regional conference on the need to address the humanitarian impact of improvised anti-personnel mines in West Africa and the Sahel Region within the framework of the Convention. The event took place in Accra and gathered representative from all States in West Africa to discuss how to address the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel mines within the framework of the Convention. The need to address the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature within the framework of the Convention including its provisions on mine clearance, mine risk education and risk reduction, reporting, the development of national implementation measures and the need to develop national capacities were clear outcomes of the meeting.

47. At the 21MSP the then President of the Convention submitted a paper entitled “Anti-Personnel Mine of an improvised nature and the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention”⁴. The paper was in follow up to a panel discussion organized by the President during the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings. The paper noted that, given the impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature and the mounting threat posed by these weapons, addressing the humanitarian impact of this weapon within the framework of the Convention will continue to be an important challenge going forward. The paper further noted the challenges faced by States Parties contaminated by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, particularly related to access and capacity to implement the provisions of the Convention. In this regard, the paper concluded with the following recommendations:

- i. **Recommendation 1:** States Parties affected by mines of an improvised nature should ensure that they address such contamination within the framework of the Convention as highlighted in Action 21 of the Oslo Action Plan and adhere to the decisions of the States Parties.
- ii. **Recommendation 2:** States Parties affected by mines of an improvised nature should ensure the application of the guidance contained in the paper entitled “Proposed rational response to States Parties discovering previously unknown mined areas after deadlines have passed”, welcomed by

1. ⁴ APLC/MSP.21/2023/5

the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties, which addresses situations in which previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas, are discovered after original or extended deadline to implement Article 5 have expired.

- iii. **Recommendation 3:** States Parties affected by mines of an improvised nature, should strengthen their collaboration to take advantage of the lesson learned and best practices employed by States Parties facing similar circumstances by, in accordance with Action 47 of the Oslo Action Plan, exploring opportunities for cooperation, including international, regional and bilateral, cooperation between affected States Parties or South-to-South, with a view to voluntary sharing of best practices and lessons learned.
- iv. **Recommendation 4:** The compilation of up-to-date lessons learned and best practices in addressing the impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature within the framework of the Convention in situations where access is limited or restricted would make an important contribution to the work of the Convention.
- v. **Recommendation 5:** Efforts should be made to ensure that the lessons learned and best practices in addressing the impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature within the framework of the Convention are disseminated to affected States Parties, and international and non-governmental organizations with expertise in addressing the impact of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature within the framework of the Convention through regional and national dialogues, as well as formal and informal meetings of the Convention.
- vi. **Recommendation 6:** States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature should, as highlighted in Action 43 of the Oslo Action Plan, disseminate information on challenges and requirements for assistance, including through their annual Article 7 transparency reports and take advantage of mechanisms under the Convention to support their efforts in this regard, including by participating in informal and formal meetings of the Convention and taking advantage of the Individualized Approach.
- vii. **Recommendation 7:** States Parties in a position to do so should provide assistance to States Parties in the implementation of their obligations under the Convention in line with Action 47 of the Oslo Action Plan including in building their capacity to address the impact of mines of an improvised nature within the framework of the Convention.
- viii. **Recommendation 8:** States Parties should ensure that implementation activities into national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, humanitarian response plans and national strategies for the inclusion of persons with disabilities as appropriate, and that partnerships the mine action community and relevant humanitarian, peacebuilding, development, and human rights communities are strengthened.

48. In this regard, it is critical that States affected by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature report on this contamination and apply the recommendation of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties as contained in the paper entitled "Proposed rational response to States Parties discovering previously unknown mined areas after deadlines have passed". Timely recognition of the impact of new contamination and support to these States in strengthening their national capacity to implement their treaty obligations is critical. Likewise, the increased use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature highlighted the need for a

multi-sectoral approach. Nevertheless, the importance of observing humanitarian principles in achieving the humanitarian aims of the Convention was noted.

49. In the OAP, the States Parties expressed their resolve to “identify the precise perimeter of mined areas, to the extent possible, and establish evidence based, accurate baseline of contamination based on information collected from all relevant sources.” Since the Fourth Review Conference 30 of the 33 States Parties implementing Article 5 have completed or have reported being in the process of carrying out survey to acquire more clarity on the remaining challenge including: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe. While progress in this regard has been recorded, several States Parties continue to report large swaths of land as suspected requiring survey, having made limited progress in clarifying the extent of contaminated areas. Additionally, many of the States indicated above continue to grapple with some of the challenges highlighted in the above paragraphs. Nevertheless, achieving greater clarity on the actual extent of contamination through an evidence-based approach continues to be a critical objective of the States Parties to develop clear baselines and comprehensive work plans towards completion and ensure the appropriate prioritization of mine clearance operations.

50. The OAP further indicated the importance of States Parties establishing a baseline through inclusive consultation with women, girls, boys and men. In this regard, the following 14 States Parties (43%) have reported this to be the case including: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. It is generally agreed that greater consultation will lead to a better result in implementation of the Convention including in the collection of information and prioritization. States Parties should be encouraged to continue strengthening their efforts in this regard to ensure an inclusive process in their implementation efforts.

51. In the OAP, the States Parties expressed their resolve to “develop evidence-based and costed national work plans, including projections of the number of areas and the amount of mined area to be addressed annually to achieve completion as soon as possible, and no later than their Article 5 deadline” and to “annually update their national work plans based on new evidence and report on adjusted milestones in their Article 7 reports by 30 April each year, including information on the number of areas and amount of mined area to be addressed annually and on how priorities have been established”. Since the Fourth Review Conference 29 States Parties (88%) have reported having in place such work plans including the following States: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Of the above State 26 States Parties (79%) have provided adjusted milestones in their Article 7 reports, including: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The States Parties have highlighted the importance of having evidence-based and costed work plans in place to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of Article 5 and to support resource mobilization efforts.

52. In the OAP, States Parties committed to report “in manner consistent with IMAS by providing information on the remaining challenges, disaggregating by ‘suspected hazardous areas’ and ‘confirmed hazardous

areas' and their relative size, as well as by the type of contamination. Report on progress in accordance with the land release methodology employed (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, or cleared through clearance)." Since the Fourth Review Conference there has been marked improvements in reporting by States Parties in this regard. Of the States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control 25 (76%) have continued to report on their remaining challenge and progress made in a manner consistent with IMAS including the following States Parties: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Of the State Parties listed above 24 (73%) have provided information disaggregated by the type of contamination including: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Reporting on the remaining challenge and progress in a manner consistent with IMAS as well as disaggregating between the type of contamination and the impact of such contamination continues to be a critical factor in ensuring clarity on the remaining implementation challenge faced by the States Parties.

53. In the OAP, States Parties committee to ensure that requests for extension "contain detailed, costed and multi-year work plans for the extension period and are developed through an inclusive process". Since the fourth Review Conference 25 States Parties has submitted request for extension of their mine clearance deadline under Article 5 including the following: Afghanistan, Argentina (2), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo (2), Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau (2), Eritrea (2), Ethiopia, Mauritania (2), Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, and Yemen(2). Of these States Parties 16 (64%) have included detailed, costed, and multi-year work plans including: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia and South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand, Türkiye, and Yemen. Detailed, costed and multi-year work plans continue to be a key element of extension requests and of the cooperative framework of the Convention. Likewise, the engagement of States Parties requesting extensions with the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and other in-country stakeholders continues to be a key element of the extension request process. It must also be observed that in some cases requests have been submitted late which presents a challenge to the cooperative dialogue envisaged by the process.

54. In addition to the above, the OAP committed States Parties to ensure that requests submitted under Article 5 include "detailed, costed and multi-year plans for context-specific mine risk education and reduction in affected communities". Of the request submitted since the Fourth Review Conference 10 States Parties (40%) submitted information in this regard including: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Nigeria, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, Türkiye, and Yemen. Given the importance of ensuring the effective exclusion of civilians from mined areas and the role of mine risk education and reduction efforts in this regard, States Parties should ensure that plans for context specific mine risk education continues to be prioritized.

55. The States Parties have further recognised the important opportunity presented by the extension request process and emphasised the importance of States Parties requiring an extension of their deadline to abide by the process established by the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties on the submission and consideration of requests for extension as well as the recommendations regarding the Article 5 extension Process endorsed by the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties. Furthermore, States Parties should apply

the recommendations of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties which highlighted the “the value of States Parties requesting only the period of time necessary to gather and assess data on landmine contamination and other relevant information with a view to develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on this information,” and then submitting a second request containing plans based on a clearer understanding of the extent of the challenge and which project with greater certainty the amount of time that will be required to complete Article 5 implementation. The application of the recommendations of the 12MSP can support ensuring that high level and more realistic requests are submitted by the States Parties.

56. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several States Parties, in their effort to align themselves with the 2025 aspirational deadline for implementation of the Convention’s time bound obligations have developed extensions requests and plans with equally aspirational deadlines, in some cases, of 31 December 2025. While aligning with the 2025 aspirational goal of the States Parties, the reality on the ground in most cases has prevented States Parties from achieving their deadline. The 2025 aspiration deadline set by the Third Review Conference was misconstrued by many as a completion deadline. In fact, the sentiment of the Third Review Conference was for States Parties to implement their time-bound obligations, “to the furthest extent possible”, by 2025. This has also had the unfortunate consequence of making completion the only success indicator of 2025.

57. At the 20MSP, Belgium, based on its experience as Chair of the Committee on the Article 5 Implementation, presented a paper titled “Reflections on the implementation of mine clearance obligations of States Parties and the Article 5 Extension Process”.⁵ This paper highlighted the impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on implementing States Parties and the vital link between implementation of Article 5 and availability of resources. The paper also included some suggestions on strengthening the process including extension the mandate of the Committees to three years, establishment of an ad hoc informal extension request subgroup under the responsibility of the Committee, and the provision of additional financial resources to the Convention’s ISU.

58. As a follow up to the paper presented by Belgium, the 20MSP further invited the incoming Committee on Article 5 Implementation to assess the Article 5 extension request process and challenges, based on the previously adopted decisions by States Parties and, taking into consideration relevant documents on this matter, determine whether there would be a common ground for strengthening the process, including the considerations of all relevant stakeholders in an open, inclusive, and transparent manner, in particular mine affected States, and to report its conclusions and recommendations at the Twenty-first Meeting of States Parties (21MSP).

59. At the 21MSP the Committee on Article 5 Implementation presented to the States Parties a document entitled “Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention - Extension Request process”⁶ which drew the following conclusions associated with the process:

- a. The Article 5 Extension Request Process is not an end in itself but has been established as a means to support States Parties with the implementation of Article 5. The process, while not perfect, needs to remain flexible to address a number of different circumstances which impede the ability of the

⁵ APLC/MSP.20/2022/6 titled

⁶ APLC/MSP.21/2023/15

State Party to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas. Continued consideration for the national context faced by States Parties is of paramount importance.

- b. The process forms part of the ongoing cooperative dialogue between States Parties to meet their desire of “ending the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines”. Many of the challenges with the Article 5 extension request process can be addressed by continued adherence by requesting States Parties and States Parties mandated to analyse requests to the recommendations highlighted in the 2012 paper on Reflections on the Article 5 Extensions Process.
- c. It is important that the process remain state driven and ensure that any alterations to the process are in line with the cooperative spirit of the Convention and serves to further support mine affected States Parties in their implementation of their Article 5 obligations. Any alteration to the process should avoid the process taking on an adversarial approach and avoid exerting undue pressure on States Parties.
- d. It is important to avoid the addition of an additional layer to the process as it stands. As the working methods for analysis of requests provides States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extension with the opportunity to reach out to experts, at their discretion, emphasis should be placed on strengthening the implementation of the adopted working methods instead of creating additional layers to an already exhaustive process.
- e. The Article 5 extension request process and the working methods adopted for the analysis of requests in 2008 provide the flexibility necessary for the Committee to implement its mandate of analysis of requests for extension, including continuing to ensure engagement of experts and the cooperative dialogue between States Parties envisioned by the process.
- f. While, in some cases, challenges associated with cooperation and assistance and with overall implementation of Article 5 exist, many of these challenges and their solutions extend beyond the Article 5 extension request process. Despite this, there may be areas in which the Article 5 extension request process can further support meeting some of these challenges, in particular through ensuring that the extension request process continues to enhance the cooperative dialogue between stakeholders and support efforts to ensure that States Parties requesting extensions will be better positioned to articulate in detail their requirements for assistance and mobilize resources to achieve their deadline as soon as possible.

60. Based on these above conclusions the Committee presented the following recommendations:

- a. **Recommendation 1:** *Implementing previous recommendations and decisions regarding requests submitted for extension of Article 5 deadline.* To support States Parties requesting extensions to ensure that their requests for extension contain all the relevant information concerning the implementation of Article 5, including a detailed budget and requirements for technical/financial assistance, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that efforts should continue to be made by the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and the Implementation Support Unit to ensure that States Parties submitting requests for extension of their Article 5 deadline continue to be sensitized to the recommendations and decisions of the States Parties including the 14 recommendations of the *Reflections on the Article 5 Extensions Process* and the following actions of the OAP which concern requests for extension and the development of work plans:

- Action #23: States Parties submitting requests for extensions will ensure that these requests contain detailed, costed, and multi-year work plans for the extension period and are developed through an inclusive process, in line with the decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties and the recommendations endorsed by the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties in the paper “Reflections on the Article 5 Extensions Process”.
 - Action #24: States Parties submitting requests for extensions will also ensure that the request include detailed, costed, and multi-year plans for context-specific mine risk education and reduction in affected communities.
- b. **Recommendation 2:** *Ensuring States Parties submitted complete requests.* The Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that States Parties make use of all the support and tools available in the development of their requests for extension and employ these tools (e.g. *suggested outline, general advice in the development of an Article 5 implementation work plan*) as good starting points, with adaptations made if necessary, according to national circumstances.

As the Convention’s website is in the process of being redesigned, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation will work with the ISU to ensure that a web page is created on the Convention’s website which contains all decisions and relevant tools for States Parties requesting extensions of their Article 5 deadlines.

- c. **Recommendation 3:** *Strengthening the dialogue with expert organizations and States Parties.* In line with the working methods drawn by the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 Extension requests, expert organizations and States Parties have consistently been invited to provide input into extension requests and the Committee on Article 5 Implementation has employed input received to support their cooperative dialogue with requesting States Parties. In this regard, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that engagement with expert organizations and States Parties providing input into requests, particularly those active in affected countries, continues to take place and is strengthened, in cooperation with the requesting State Party, and in particular through in-person dialogue, where possible, throughout the extension request process including, where relevant, ahead of the receipt of the request for extension, following receipt of the request and in cases where revised requests or additional information is submitted.
- d. **Recommendation 4:** *Taking full advantage of the opportunity presented by requests.* While outside of the scope of the Article 5 extension request process, given that a lack of national and international resources has been highlighted as a key circumstance preventing completion by the requested deadlines, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that States Parties utilize the extension request process to highlight significant achievements made, which in turn can reinvigorate interest in its national programme and establish a sound basis for national and international resource mobilization.

In this regard, States Parties submitting request for extension should include a clear and detailed budget and requirements for assistance. Likewise, States Parties should continue to consider good practices in the mobilization of resources.

- e. **Recommendation 5:** *Support States Parties in detailing their needs for assistance by strengthening synergies between interested committees.* The importance of cooperation and assistance highlighted in the implementation of the work plans presented by States Parties in their request for extension provides a number of areas for strengthening synergies between the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance. The Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that the possibility of establishing a more formalized and recurrent dialogue between the Committee on Article 5 and the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance in relation to each extension request be further explored in the lead up to the Fifth Review Conference when States Parties will consider any necessary alterations to the Convention’s machinery. In particular, the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance could be potentially mandated to contribute to the dialogue with the requesting State Party and the analysis of request for extension.
- f. **Recommendation 6:** *Support States Parties in making their needs for assistance known.* Given the importance of financial and technical support to the implementation of work plans presented in extension requests the Committee on Article 5 Implementation recommends that States Parties, seeking extension requests take advantage of the opportunities available to disseminate their implementation plans and requirements for assistance as widely as possible.

This could be done through informal and formal meetings of the Convention as well as through participation in mechanisms of the Convention such as the Individualised Approach.

- g. **Recommendation 7:** *Addressing increased number of requests.* In view of the increase in the number of extension requests submitted by mine affected States Parties expected in 2024 and 2025, the Committee believes that the key factor in facilitating the analysis process is to make sure that the requests are submitted on time and contain all the information necessary for an analysis. However, in the event that States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extension within the short time frame available require increased support, the Committee would recommend that States Parties, in line with the decisions adopted by the States Parties at the 7MSP in establishing the Article 5 extension request process, “provide additional, ear-marked funds to the ISU Trust Fund to cover costs related to supporting the Article 5 extensions process”. The Committee further recommends that the ISU provide a project proposal to States Parties for consideration by States Parties in a position to provide support.

61. In the OAP, States Parties completing their mine clearance obligations committed to “continue the best practice of submitting voluntary declarations of completion and give due consideration to the paper “Reflections and understandings on the implementation and completion of Article 5 mine clearance obligations” submitted to the Seventeenth Meeting of the States Parties which included the following recommendations:

- a. States Parties are encouraged to continue the voluntary practice of submitting to a Meeting of the States Parties/Review Conference a declaration of completion that incorporates the language adopted by the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties and Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties. States Parties, when formally declaring completion are encouraged to provide detailed information on the activities carried out throughout the duration of the mine action programme taking into account the elements included the draft table of content for a voluntary declaration of completion.

- b. In keeping with the traditional spirit of cooperation of the Convention, States Parties in a position to declare completion, are encouraged to employ the services of the Convention's Implementation Support Unit in the elaboration of the declaration of completion and consider sustaining a cooperative dialogue with the Committee on Article 5 Implementation concerning the content of the declaration of completion, which could lead to an enhanced declaration of completion.

62. Of the two States Parties that declared completion since the Fourth Review Conference – Chile and the United Kingdom – both (100%) submitted voluntary declaration of completion and sought the advice of the ISU in this regard. The States Parties have agreed that the submission of voluntary declarations of completion continue to be an important part of the completion process. The States Parties further noted the important collaborative effort between relevant States Parties, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation, and the ISU with the aim to provide support to States Parties in declaring completion in an unambiguous manner.

63. The States Parties further reconfirmed that areas that are known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines cannot be considered 'residual contamination' and must be addressed under the State Party's obligations under the Convention.⁷

64. The OAP, in acknowledging the fact that States Parties that declare completion may, following completion, identify previously unknown mined area or be affected by newly mined areas, committed State Parties to ensure that national strategies and work plans for completion make provision for sustainable national capacities. Since the Fourth Review Conference 25 States Parties (76%) have included provision for addressing previously unknown mined area in their national strategies and/or completion plans or have reported on efforts to ensure that a sustainable national capacity is in place including: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Peru, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

65. Since the Fourth Review Conference two States Parties – Guinea-Bissau and Mauritania – have identified previously unknown mined area and one State Party – Nigeria – reported being affected by newly mined areas. The States Parties recognize the important steps these States have taken in accordance with the decision of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties as contained in the paper entitled "Proposed rational response to States Parties discovering previously unknown mined areas after deadlines have passed". The situation faced by these State Parties, particularly the need to rebuilding national capacities, further highlighted the importance of States Parties ensuring that a sustainable national capacity is in place to address these situations. Furthermore, in several cases, States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines will often also face challenges with other explosive ordnance which will remain following completion of their commitments under the Convention and may require continued support. Since the Fourth Review Conference, States Parties have acquired a better understanding of the importance of giving due consideration to the establishment of sustainable national capacities at the outset of a mine action programme and not following the completion of Article 5. In this regard, increased exchange of information and best practices in the establishment of sustainable mine action capacities would support States Parties in preparing for completion.

⁷ Ibid.

66. During the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation organized a panel discussion on “Completion and Sustainable National Capacities”. The panel discussion was chaired by Zambia, Chair of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and included participation from Jordan, Norway, MAG, the Organization of American States, UNICEF. The objective of panel was to discuss challenges and best practices in the drawing down of a national mine action programmes and best practices in the establishment of a national sustainable capacity. The panel highlighted the importance of ensuring the that mine risk education efforts are sustained and the importance of integrating these efforts into broader frameworks and the need to ensure that a sustainable demining capacity is in place to address any residual contamination including ensuring that the community can report any identified threat. Likewise, the panel discussed the importance of considering, well ahead of completion, the eventual drawdown of mine clearance personnel and address the impact of, for example, loss of jobs for national staff of the programme.
67. Furthermore, during the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings the Committee on Article 5 Implementation organized a panel entitled “Finishing Strong – Preparing for completion as soon as possible”. The Panel was moderated by France in its capacity of Chair of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and included participation from the National Mine Action Centre of Sri Lanka, the GICHD, the Mine Advisory Group, and the HALO Trust. The panel spotlighted the efforts put forth by Sri Lanka to fulfil its commitments under Article 5 and recalled the importance of taking appropriate measures, as soon as possible, to prepare for completion, what these steps entail, the experience of states in addressing residual contamination and approaches to mitigating the possible negative impact of completion, in particular the need to ensure the proper demobilization of demining personnel. The panel further highlighted the importance of involving affected communities in ensuring that no mined areas remain following completion is critical, this is particularly important in the context of Sri Lanka, where populations were internally displaced due to conflict.
68. In the OAP, States Parties further committed to “Take appropriate steps to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of survey and clearance, including by promoting the research, application and sharing of innovative technological means to this effect.” In this regard, since the Fourth Review Conference 27 States Parties reported on efforts in this regard including: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Ethiopia, Iraq, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. These efforts included updating their National Mine action Standards (NMAS) in accordance with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), the introduction of mechanical or canine demining techniques into their work amongst other. Since the Fourth Review Conference the application of emerging technologies in States Parties has also increased. In this regard, continued exploration of research into the application of innovative technology should continue.
69. During the 15 – 19 November 2021, Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties (19MSP), the President organized a high-level panel on “Strengthening localization through capacity building and inclusion: From Rhetoric to concerted Action”. The panel was moderated by H.E. Kitty van der Heijden, Vice Minister for International Cooperation of the Netherland, and included participation by Colombia, the Iraq Health and Social Care Organization, the Global Mentoring Initiative, the MAG, and the Swedish Civil Contingency (MSB). The Panel recognized that a greater focus on the important of localization defined by some as “a process where international humanitarian actors shift power and responsibility of development and humanitarian aid effort towards local and national actors, to ensure effective and efficient support to mine-affected communities. The panel explored what localization means in the mine action sector, including

donors and implementation partners, and how a shift in our approach can better support localization efforts. The panel also highlighted that local organizations face difficulties in accessing international funding directly.

70. During the 20-22 June 2022 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance organized a joint panel entitled “Making Every Effort Count: Towards a Successful 2025”. The Panel was moderated by Belgium and Japan in their capacity of Chair of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, respectively, and included participation from the Cambodian Mine Action Centre, the Tajikistan National Mine Action Centre, the GICHD, ICRC, and the Japan International Cooperation Agency. The panel recalled the States Parties’ legal understanding of “completion” under Article 5 and introduced the concept of “all reasonable effort” within the framework of the Convention and some examples of the application of all reasonable efforts by national authorities. The panel further noted the importance of cooperation and assistance, and in particular south-south cooperation, for capacity building.

V. Mine risk education and reduction

71. At the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties recognized that mine risk education and reduction can help prevent new mine accidents and save lives and that in addition to clearance, providing risk education and other risk reduction programmes to affected populations is a primary means of preventing injuries and fatal accidents. The States Parties also noted that, in recent years, large new groups of refugees and internally displaced persons have come to count among the many groups at risk from anti-personnel mines and the number of casualties has been on the rise. The States Parties further noted that the delivery of effective, relevant risk education and other risk reduction programmes that are sensitive to gender, age, disability, and that take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account, require ongoing focus to prevent new mine accidents.

72. The OAP committed States Parties to integrate mine risk education and reduction activities with wider humanitarian, development, protection, and education efforts, as well as with ongoing survey, clearance and victim assistance activities to reduce the risk to the affected population and decrease their need for risk-taking. Since the Fourth Review Conference 23 States Parties (70%) have reported integrating mine risk education and reduction activities into other frameworks including the following: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Mauritania, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Furthermore, since the Fourth Review Conference, efforts to integrate mine risk education into wider humanitarian, development, protection, health, religious, education efforts have increased and should be further encouraged. This is particularly relevant, in transition and protracted crisis contexts where more holistic approaches and integration with other sectors to provide alternative solutions could reduce the risk of communities being forced to conduct unsafe practices due to socio economic reasons.

73. The OAP committed States to provide context-specific mine risk education and reduction programmes to all affected populations and groups at risk and ensure that such programmes are developed on the basis of a needs assessment, that they are tailored to the threat encountered by the population, and that they are sensitive to gender, age, disability and take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account. Since the Fourth Review Conference 19 States Parties (58%) reported having

mine risk education and reduction programmes for all affected populations in place including: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Iraq, Peru, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Likewise, 18 States Parties (55%) reported carrying out mine risk education and reduction activities that collect, analyse and report data disaggregated by gender, age, disability, and other diverse needs including: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Türkiye, Tajikistan, Thailand, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Emphasise on improving on implementation and reporting on mine risk education and reduction activities will be important going forward.

74. Furthermore, the OAP committed States Parties to prioritize people most at risk by linking mine risk education and reduction programmes and messages directly to an analysis of available casualty and contamination data, an understanding of the affected population's behaviour, risk pattern and coping mechanisms, and, wherever possible, anticipated population movements. Since the Fourth Review Conference 18 States Parties reported having evidence-based priority-setting mechanism for mine risk education and reduction programmes including: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Thailand, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.
75. Since the Fourth Review Conference, despite an increase in efforts to ensure the provision of context-specific mine risk education and reduction programmes based on needs assessments, analyses populations' behaviour, risk pattern and coping mechanisms related to mine contamination, reporting on these efforts and how this information informs national mine risk education and reduction efforts could be improved. Improvements in reporting in this regard, could support States in sharing best practices on the methodologies in designing mine risk education and reduction programmes. Furthermore, the importance of strengthening efforts in this regard going forward would be important.
76. The OAP committed States Parties to build national capacity to deliver mine risk education and reduction programmes with the ability to adapt to changing needs and contexts, including the delivery of such programmes to affected communities in the case that previously unknown mined areas are discovered. Since the Fourth Review Conference 21 States Parties have reported providing risk education and reduction programmes to affected communities in the case that previously unknown mined areas are discovered including: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.
77. The OAP committed States Parties to report on mine risk education and other risk reduction programmes in Article 7 reports, including the methodologies used, the challenges faced, and the results achieved, with information disaggregated by gender and age. Since the Fourth Review Conference 29 States reported on their mine risk education and other risk reduction programmes and results including: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.
78. The importance of mine risk education in saving lives, particular in settings were access for survey and clearance activities is not currently available has been further noted as illustrated in the UN General Assembly Resolution on assistance in mine action adopted on 7 December 2023 (A7RES/78/70).

79. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several innovative approaches have been developed to enhance the delivery of mine risk education and reduction efforts. This includes the review of the International Mine Action Standard on explosive ordnance risk education (IMAS 12.10) and the Technical Note for Mine Action on risk education for improvised explosive devices (TNMA 12.10/01). Other examples include the development of digital EORE projects, the increased use of social and behaviour change methodologies, and the launch of an EORE e-learning course. In this regard, the States Parties have pointed to the importance of ensuring that NMAS are in line with best practices highlighted in IMAS and are applied routinely by stakeholders.

VI. Assisting the victims

80. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties reemphasised their commitment to ensuring the full, equal and effective participation of mine victims in society, based on respect for human rights, gender equality, inclusion and non-discrimination. The States Parties have reiterated their recognition that, to be effective and sustainable, victim assistance should be integrated into broader national policies, plans and legal frameworks relating to the rights of persons with disabilities, and to health, education, employment, development, and poverty reduction in support of the realisation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

81. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the number of States Parties having reported carrying out victim assistance activities includes the following 38 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, State of Palestine, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

82. Unfortunately, since the Fourth Review Conference, the number of new victims from explosive ordnance globally has increased due primarily to the new use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature in states in conflict situations. For the period of 2020-2022 the Landmine Monitor has reported that a total of 17'327 casualties States Parties with 6'335 having been killed and 10'931 having been injured. In this regard, efforts need to continue to ensure that casualties are provided with lifesaving and continued medical care as well as long term support for the inclusion into the political and social life of their communities.

83. Since the Fourth Review Conference, most of these States Parties have reported progress in the implementation of all or some of the victim assistance actions of the OAP. The Committee on Victim Assistance has noted the importance of States Parties continuing to provide detailed information on progress in implementation as well as on challenges in implementation. States Parties have reported that some of the greatest challenges affecting their progress in implementing victim assistance efforts include the lack of regular inter-agency coordination and planning, lack of reliable data, shortages of services and technical expertise in remote areas, shortages of financial and technical resources and in some cases lack of an overall awareness of the broader rights of mine survivors, amongst others.

84. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been seen as highly complementary to a rights-based approach to victim assistance under the Convention, offering opportunities for continued efforts of strengthening collaboration between the Convention and other relevant frameworks that support mine victims and persons with disabilities. The States Parties have recognised the continued importance of

increasing and consolidating synergies between the Convention and other instruments associated with health, development, disability, rule of law and human rights, amongst others.

85. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee on Victim Assistance has continued its efforts to reach out to and strengthen synergies with broader frameworks through their participation in meetings of the Human Rights Council, the World Health Assembly, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Committee continued to promote the link of victim assistance with broader frameworks by supporting recommendations put forward by the WHO and other international organisations on matters such as assistive technology, rehabilitation, safety and protection and emergency trauma care, as well as, for example, recommending and supporting the development of a general comment on Article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (CRPD) the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk, including situations of armed conflict, humanitarian emergencies and the occurrence of natural disasters.
86. At the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties committed to ensure that a relevant government entity is assigned to oversee the integration of victim assistance into broader national policies, plans and legal frameworks, develop an action plan and monitor and report on implementation based on specific, measurable, realistic, and time-bound objectives to support mine victims. Since the Fourth Review Conference 30 States Parties have designated a government entity to coordinate victim assistance activities, including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Likewise, 25 States Parties have reported having national action plans in place including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Ensuring a relevant focal point and the development of an action plan is critical for the sustainability of Victim Assistance and essential to ensure that broader framework respond to the needs of mine victims.
87. Victim assistance continues to be a multi-sectoral efforts and synergies with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities continue to provide opportunities for progressing towards the Convention's victim assistance objectives. Since the Fourth Review Conference 27 States Parties have reported including mine victims in relevant national policy and support framework including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The Committee welcomed the development of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS 13.10), a tool to assist the States Parties in strengthening shared responsibility and enhancing national ownership in victim assistance implementation.
88. At the Fourth Review Conference States Parties acknowledged the importance of information sharing to ensure a comprehensive response to address the needs of mine victims. A centralized database with information on persons killed by mines as well as persons injured by mines and their needs and challenges, disaggregated by gender, aged and disability was seen as critical in this regard. Since the Fourth Review Conference 21 States Parties have indicated the inclusion of victims of anti-personnel mines in disability data systems including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Cambodia, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand,

Türkiye, and Zimbabwe. Additionally, the States Parties have recognized the importance of States Parties disaggregate victim data by gender, age, and disability. Since the Fourth Review Conference 26 States Parties have presented data in this regard in their report: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, efforts need to continue to ensure that data collection is comprehensive and includes sufficient detail to identify specific needs and challenges faced by mine survivors and persons with disabilities and can serve as a guide to provide a comprehensive response and/or services. Furthermore, centralized databases (such as those on disabilities, injury surveillance) should aim to include information on persons killed or injured by mines and other explosive ordnances, and their needs and challenges disaggregated by gender, age, and disability, as well as on indirect victims (affected families and affected communities).

89. During the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Victim Assistance organized a panel discussion on “establishing and strengthening a centralised database”. The panel discussion was moderated by Thailand and included participation by Iraq, the ICBL, ICRC and the Asia Foundation - Afghanistan. The objective of panel was to support States Parties with Victim Assistance responsibilities by drawing attention to challenges in data collection and in establishing/strengthening national centralised database in support of fulfilment of Action 35 of the OAP. The panel also aimed to enhance understandings on the significance and importance of data collection and a sustainable national unified database for victim assistance and provide information to States on good practices and on available assistance. The panel stressed the importance of States Parties ensuring that data on mine victims are integrated into centralized national databases to ensure improved coordination to address the needs and challenges of mine victims and other persons with disabilities.

90. The fatality rate of mine survivors has been raised as an important issue to address through the effective and efficient first aid to new casualties in mine-affected communities, as well as the provision of other pre-hospital care and ongoing medical care. Since the Fourth Review Conference attention has been spotlighted on the need to do better in this regard. Since the Fourth Review Conference 26 States partes have reported on efforts to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response to mine accidents including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Thailand, Uganda, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. While many States Parties are have reported on efforts in this regard, it is clear more needs to be done to strengthen the survivability rate of mine casualties.

91. To provide a comprehensive response to mine victims and to facilitate access to services, the States Parties recognized the important of the sharing of information on appropriate services through referral mechanism, including by creating and disseminating a comprehensive directory of services. Since the Fourth Review Conference 22 States Parties have reported having a national referral mechanism in place including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Furthermore 15 States Parties have reported having a directory of services in place including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Peru, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, and Zimbabwe. Increased reporting in this regard would be welcome to share best practice and lessons learned on the development and dissemination of such information.

92. Providing access to comprehensive rehabilitation services, including in rural and remote areas, continues to be an important challenge in the implementation of victim assistance commitments. This effort including assistive technology and psychological and psychosocial support which have increasingly been viewed as an essential component of victim assistance. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 29 States Parties have reported on efforts to increase the availability and accessibility of rehabilitation services, with some having constructed new physical rehabilitation centres, including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. To strengthen sustainability in provision and delivery of rehabilitation and assistance technology, States Parties have been encouraged to integrate them into national health systems. 22 State Parties have reported effort to increase the availability of psychological and psychosocial support services including: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, and Zimbabwe. Of these States Parties, 9 have reported efforts on the use of peer supports on an irregular manner, including: Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Jordan, South Sudan, Tajikistan, and Thailand. More efforts should be invested into making use of peer-to-peer support as an effective and complementary effort to address mental health and psychological needs of mine victims, including in rural and remote areas.
93. Nevertheless, despite progress reported, many States Parties with mine survivors in areas under their jurisdiction or control and many service providers lack capacity (e.g. resources, technical knowledge) to continuously making tangible progress to enable inclusive and accessible services for mine victims and other persons with disabilities. In this regard, it is essential that States Parties increase efforts to ensure that services are available, accessible, and affordable to all mine victims, on an equal basis with other members of their society. As part of this efforts, States Parties should consider strengthening or creating community-based services (such as community outreach programs, case management, peer-to-peer support networks) that can ensure that mine victims and other persons with disabilities in rural and remote areas have full access to services they need.
94. During the 20-22 June 2022 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Victim Assistance organized a panel discussion on “Fostering Cooperation for Rehabilitation”. The panel was moderated by Algeria and Japan in their capacity of Chair of the Committee on Victim Assistance and the Chair of the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, respectively and included representatives from Amputee Self Help Network, the World Health Organization, the Ministry of Public Health of Guinea-Bissau, the ICRC, John Hopkins International Injury Research Unit and Humanity and Inclusion. The panel discussion called attention to the persistent challenges in delivering rehabilitation services and explored opportunities for support to ensure improved, sustainable, affordable, equitable and accessible rehabilitation.
95. The role of programmes such as Mental Health and Psychological Support (MHPSS) to address the needs of mine victims have been highlighted since the Fourth Review Conference. During the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Victim Assistance organized a panel discussion on “Victim Assistance and the OAP: Are we on track in providing mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS)?”. The panel was moderated by Slovenia in its capacity of member of the Committee on Victim Assistance and included representatives from the Tajikistan Mine Action Centre, Ministry of Health of Uganda, International Federal of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, Italian Campaign to Ban Landmines and the ITF

Enhancing Human Security. The discussion examined the lessons learned over the past years concerning the importance of MHPSS and reemphasized the importance of delivering this critical element of victim assistance. The panel also highlighted the importance of integrating MHPSS into victim assistance efforts and working with local organization to provide MHPSS.

96. The social and economic inclusion of mine victims, including in rural and remote areas, continues to be a challenge in many States Parties and requires a multi-sectoral approach to ensure its success. Since the Fourth Review Conference 26 States Parties have reported efforts to remove barriers to the social and economic inclusion of mine victims including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Social and economic inclusion of mine victims which encompass access to education, capacity-building, employment, referral services, microfinance institutions, business development services, reasonable accommodation, rural development and social protection programmes, including in rural and remote areas, is one of the most complex pillars of victim assistance, that require long-term engagements by different sectors, such as national ministries or agencies responsible for development, education, poverty reduction, labour and social protection, among others.
97. Inclusion of mine survivors and their representative organizations in all matters that affect them, including in rural and remote areas, has also been an important effort in ensuring that “no one is left behind”. In this regard, since the Fourth Review Conference, 26 States Parties have reported on efforts to include victim representatives or their organizations in victim assistance planning at the national and local level including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Thailand, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Ensuring and increasing the inclusion of mine survivors and their representative organization in the planning and implementation of victim assistance efforts will be critical going forward to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of victim assistance. Representative organisations of mine survivors increasingly integrated into persons with disabilities’ organisations, through which took part in broader disability efforts including the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Given the significance of participation and inclusion, more efforts would need to be invested to ensure systemic inclusion and participation including in the implementation of the Convention.
98. Considering protracted and new conflicts around the globe the States Parties have recognized the importance of ensuring that relevant national humanitarian response and preparedness plans provide for the safety and protection of mine survivors in situation of risks, including situation of armed conflict, humanitarian emergency and natural disasters, in line with relevant international humanitarian and human rights law and international guidelines. Since the Fourth Review Conference 19 States Parties have reported integrating protection of mine survivors, and other persons with disabilities, in their humanitarian response and preparedness plans including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mozambique, Peru, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. To assist the States Parties efforts in this regard, in 2020 the Committee on Victim Assistance commissioned a case study on “Ensuring the Safety and Protection of Mine Survivors in Situation of Risk and Humanitarian Emergencies” compiling good practices in Afghanistan, Colombia and Uganda. In this regard, the States Parties welcome efforts of the Committee of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in developing a General Comment on the implementation of Article 11 of the CRPD concerning the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk,

including situations of armed conflict, humanitarian emergencies, and the occurrence of natural disasters. These efforts will provide guidance to States Parties implementing victim assistance efforts, most of which are parties to the CRPD.

99. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings the Committee on Victim Assistance organized a panel discussion on “Safety and Protection of Mine Survivors in Situations of Risks and Humanitarian Emergencies”. The panel discussion was chaired by Italy as Chair of the Committee on Victim Assistance and included participation from Colombia, Iraq, the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy on Disability and Accessibility, the ICRC and Humanity and Inclusion. The objective of panel was to increase understandings on the significance of the safety and protection of mine survivors in situations of risk and emergencies and to offer expert recommendations on how they can be achieved over the next five years. Given the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the panel drew attention on the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on mine survivors and the importance of drawing lessons learned and good practices to reduce risks and consequences on lives and livelihoods of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities. During the panel, experts highlighted the importance of synergies with other international frameworks for the safety and protection of persons with disabilities, including mine survivors, in situations of risk and humanitarian emergency and explored best practices in mitigation, preparedness and response. In particular the complementarity and intersections between victim assistance and disability rights was highlighted and the advantages of applying an integrated approach to achieve the objectives of Action 40 of the OAP.
100. In 2022, the Committee on Victim Assistance hosted a side event on the margins of the Global Disability Summit to raise awareness on “Victim Assistance: the importance of inclusion in broader frameworks including situations of risks, crises and humanitarian emergencies”. The virtual event provided an opportunity to disability rights community and other participants of the Global Disability Summit to learn more about the work of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention on victim assistance and to exchange information in stimulating further thoughts on inclusion of persons with disabilities, including explosive ordnance survivors in situations of risks, crises including COVID-19 pandemic and humanitarian emergencies. This event helped to build awareness within the disability community of the plight of landmine survivors.
101. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been viewed as highly complementary to a human rights-based approach to victim assistance under the Convention, offering opportunities for continued efforts of strengthening collaboration between the Convention and other relevant frameworks that support mine victims and persons with disabilities. The States Parties have recognised the continued importance of increasing and consolidating synergies between the Convention and other instruments associated with health, development, disability, rule of law and human rights, amongst others.
102. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several national stakeholder dialogues have been held to strengthen the national response to victim assistance and raise awareness of the rights of persons with disabilities, including mine survivors, acquired through wider rights recognition for protected groups, e.g. disability status. For example, Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq and Sudan held national stakeholder meetings to look at the status of victim assistance efforts, remaining challenges and to propose a way forward for implementation. The inclusive and participatory nature of these National stakeholder dialogues allowed for an important exchange of information between partners to determine the best way to proceed with implementation. Some of the results have included the increased understanding and awareness of the rights-based approach to assistance to and matters related to persons with disabilities, including mine survivors, the importance of gender and age-based approaches, the relevance of timely data provided in

disaggregated fashion and the need for affordable and accessible support. States Parties and participating organisations have expressed the value of these type of robust national dialogues.

103. Additionally, since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee on Victim Assistance has carried out efforts to provide a platform for exchanging lessons learned and best practices in meeting the needs and realising the rights of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities through the hosting of periodic Victim Assistance Experts meetings:

- a. On 11 November 2020, the Committee on Victim Assistance of the Convention held a Victim Assistance Experts Meeting focused on safety and protection of mine victims in situations of risk and emergencies. The virtual Experts Meeting provided an opportunity raise awareness and to enhance understandings Action #40 of the OAP.
- b. On 10 November 2021, the Committee on Victim Assistance of the Convention held a virtual Victim Assistance Experts Meeting focused on enhancing understandings on multi-sectoral efforts and the importance of integrating victim assistance into broader national frameworks.
- c. On 23-24 November 2022, the Committee on Victim Assistance of the Convention held a Victim Assistance Experts Meeting focused on rehabilitation, a major objective in victim assistance and a significant commitment under Action #38 of the Convention's OAP.

104. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee has held an annual Victim Assistance retreat, inviting with stakeholders in Geneva representing different sectors including the different victim assistance coordinators of disarmament Conventions, including the Committee on Cluster Munition and the Secretariate of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the ICRC, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), Humanity and Inclusion, and the United Nations Mine Action Service. This platform has provided by the Committee offers an opportunity for different actors to learn about their respective thematic priorities, activities, objectives, and mandates and evaluate concrete opportunities for cooperation, and ultimately build and strengthen a concerted victim assistance approach to support the promotion of our common objectives.

105. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee has held an annual Victim Assistance retreat, inviting with stakeholders in Geneva representing different sectors including the different victim assistance coordinators of disarmament Conventions, including the Committee on Cluster Munition and the Secretariate of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the ICRC, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), Humanity and Inclusion, and the United Nations Mine Action Service. This platform has provided by the Committee offers an opportunity for different actors to learn about their respective thematic priorities, activities, objectives, and mandates and evaluate concrete opportunities for cooperation, and ultimately build and strengthen a concerted victim assistance approach to support the promotion of our common objectives.

VII. International cooperation and assistance

106. Cooperation and Assistance is a key element of the Convention engrained in Article 6. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties reaffirmed that while each State Party is responsible for implementing the provisions of the Convention in areas under its jurisdiction or control, the States Parties stress that enhanced cooperation can support implementation of Convention obligations as soon as possible.

107. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several States Parties have reported the lack of funding as one of the main obstacles to implementation of their commitments under the Convention. The Covid-19 pandemic which began in early 2020 shortly after the Fourth Review Conference, led to reported delays in operation and reduction in the availability of national and international funding. Likewise, a general downturn in the global economy has reduced availability of national and international resources. Nonetheless, the Covid-19 pandemic demonstrated the resilience of States Parties' implementation efforts which continued throughout despite restrictions in place. Furthermore, the conflict in Ukraine has been dominating the global context since 2022, leading to a redirection of some of the financial support and engagement traditionally provided to other mine-affected States Parties.
108. The States Parties have recognised the importance of States Parties committing the resources needed to meet their obligations as soon as possible. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 28 States Parties (85%) implementing obligations under Article 5 and/or victim assistance commitments have reported making national financial commitments to the implementation of the Convention including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Serbia, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The amount of the national contribution differs greatly between these States both in the level of assistance as well as in the areas to which national contributions are allotted (e.g. operations, staffing/equipment of the national mine action centre, victim assistance etc..).
109. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Landmine Monitor has recorded from 2020-2025 funding to mine action from mine affected countries to their mine action programme at approximately **[INSERT TOTAL AMOUNT]** (78.3 million (2020), 55.4 million (2021), 72.24 million (2022) and **[INSERT AMOUNT REPORTED FOR 2023]**). Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Landmine Monitor has recorded from 2020-2025 funding to mine action from donors at approximately **[INSERT TOTAL AMOUNT]** (565.2 million (2020), 543.5 million (2021), 798.4 million (2022) and **[INSERT AMOUNT REPORTED FOR 2023]**). The Landmine Monitor emphasized that small number of countries receive most of the funding. In general funding to mine action remains globally low compared to other areas of international assistance and is insufficient to address the needs faced by mine affected States.
110. Since the Fourth Review Conference 23 States Parties reported providing support to mine affected States including: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.
111. Since the Fourth Review Conference funding for victim assistance efforts remain low with several States Parties reporting little or no funding having been received. The lack of (sustainable) funding remains a major impediment to addressing the needs of victims. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the proportion for victim assistance funding at a global level remains approximately 4-8% of global funding. Increasing funding to victim assistance activities will be important going forward including through global mine action budgets and through the integration of victim assistance into other funding envelopes (such as humanitarian or development envelopes) in countries affected by anti-personnel mines. In supporting victim assistance activities, the States Parties have noted the importance of ensuring that support is provided in a non-discriminatory manner and that support reaches mine affected communities, often located in rural or remote areas. Likewise, lack of funding for mine risk education and reduction efforts

remains a critical challenge, with funding totalling less than 1% of total global funding. Addressing these financial gaps would be important going forward to meet the objectives of the Convention.

112. Due to the lack of available national and international funding to match the demand for resources, the States Parties have reiterated the importance of States Parties exploring all possible alternatives and /or innovative sources of funding. In this regard, only three States Parties – Angola, Cambodia, and the United Kingdom – have reported on efforts in this regard. A great deal of these efforts has centred around engaging the private sector in contributing resources to the Convention’s implementation. Nevertheless, since the Fourth Review Conference efforts have been put forward by States Parties and the mine action community to continue exploring alternative and innovative sources of funding. In this regard, several efforts have been put forth to further understand how innovative financing could be employed to support implementation. For example, on 7-9 March 2022 the UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office including the Global Mine Action Programme team, the Counter-Proliferation and Arms Control Centre and the UK Mission Geneva, organized an event entitled “Utilising innovative financing models to further the goal of a landmine free world” at Wilton Park. The event was used as an initial brainstorming on innovative financing and included experts who presented on different funding models including “outcomes finance – Impact Bonds”, “Public – Private Partnerships” and “Front-loading finance”. Furthermore, studies such as “Innovative Finance for Mine Action Improving the Effectiveness of Mine Action through Innovative Finance”⁸ of 2021 and “Innovative Finance for Mine Action: Needs and Potential Solutions”⁹ of 2023 have provided insight into the possibilities of innovative financing.
113. The States Parties have noted the importance of States Parties requiring assistance developing resource mobilization plans for implementation and to make use of the Convention’s mechanisms to share information on challenges and requirements, including through Article 7 reports as well as taking advantage of the Individualised Approach. Since the Fourth Review Conference 34 States Parties requiring support have shared information on their progress, challenges and requirements for assistance in their Article 7 Reports including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Some of the main challenges reported by States Parties have included lack of resources, un-demarcated borders, International technical assistance, technical and operational challenges such as lack of national capacity, unregistered mine contamination, climate conditions, contamination other than anti-personnel mines, Covid-19 crisis, security, topographical challenges, lack of equipment, political instability, armed non state actors, natural disasters, amongst others.
114. Since the Fourth Review Conference ,12 States Parties have taken advantage of the Individualised Approach to share information on their progress, challenges and requirements for assistance including: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, and Türkiye. While the Individualised Approach is viewed as an important platform, it is widely understood that such an effort must be accompanied by an in-country effort to ensure dialogue with national and international stakeholders. In this regard, the States Parties have recognized the importance of affected States establishing national

⁸ <https://www.halotrust.org/media/7786/innovative-finance-for-mine-action.pdf>

⁹ https://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/user_upload/INNOVATIVE_FINANCE_FOR_MINE_ACTION_NEEDS_AND_POTENTIAL_SOLUTIONS.pdf

platforms to ensure regular dialogue among all stakeholders. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 8 States Parties have reported on the establishment or efforts to establish platforms to strengthen dialogue at a national level: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, and Yemen. Despite these efforts, no State Party reported on the successful establishment of a national mine action platform in which all stakeholders (e.g. operators, donors, state authorities, international partners etc.) meet regularly to discuss progress in implementation. The establishment of such platforms, as indicated by the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, is critical to demonstrate national ownership, strengthen coordination and contribute to resource mobilization efforts.

115. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties recognised the importance of States Parties in a position to provide assistance coordinating their support for the effective implementation of Convention obligations by affected States. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 15 States Parties have reported using existing mechanisms (e.g., UNMAS Voluntary Trust Fund, Mine Action Support Group) to coordinate their funding including: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Estonia, Germany, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Despite the efforts to coordinate funding, improving coordination between donors to ensure the successful application of the cooperation and assistance commitments under Article 6 of the Convention will be crucial going forward. Since the Fourth Review Conference, most funding continues to be directed towards a small number of States while other States Parties receive limited or no support for their implementation efforts. Greater coordination amongst donor for the implementation of the Convention could support States Parties in achieving their completion dates and prevent further requests for extension from being submitted.
116. At the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties recognized the importance of exploring opportunities for cooperation, including international, regional, and bilateral, cooperation between affected States Parties or South-to-South, with a view to voluntary sharing of best practices and lessons learned. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 24 States Parties have reported on efforts in this regard, including Australia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, France, Estonia, Japan, Finland, Lithuania, Peru, New Zealand, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand and Türkiye, and the United Kingdom.
117. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties have raised awareness of the importance of implementation of the cooperation and assistance elements of the Oslo Action Plan to foster cooperation and assistance for the implementation of Convention obligations as soon as possible including by the following:
 - a. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance organized a panel discussion on “Aligning Donor Coordination to Support Implementation of the Oslo Action Plan”. The panel discussion included participation from a representative of Chile, Colombia, Japan, United Kingdom, and the Mine Action Support Group. The panel highlighted that the Oslo Action Plan provides key elements to foster international cooperation and assistance and highlighted the need to continue exploring the strengthening of cooperation and assistance to make real progress towards meeting the 2025 ambition of the States Parties. The Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance also shared best practices and lessons learned to support and assist States Parties in the full implementation of Article 6 of the Convention. In this regard, the panel concluded that national ownership continues to be cornerstone of this efforts and that cooperation and assistance comes in many forms including through south-south cooperation and the exchange of lessons learned and best practices.

- b. During the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance organized a panel discussion on “Mobilizing Resources towards a Mine Free World”. The panel discussion included participation from a representative of Japan, Sudan, the United Kingdom, the Mine Action Support Group, the GICHD, and the UNDP. The panel explored the relevant cooperation and assistance actions of the OAP and reflected on how they interact with each other to provide guidance to States Parties in mobilizing resources to fulfil their commitments as soon as possible. The panel also looked at the results of discussions between the Committee and stakeholders to explore how to integrate best practices to ensure that States Parties successfully achieve their 2025 ambitions. The panel once again highlighted, amongst other, the importance of national ownership, the establishment of national mine action platforms to support resource mobilization, and the importance of the integration of mine action activities into implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals as well as into broader national frameworks.
- c. During the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance organized a panel discussion entitled “Cooperation and Assistance and the Oslo Action Plan – Towards improved cooperation and assistance”. The panel was moderated by Thailand in its capacity of Chair of the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, respectively and included representatives from Cambodia, Mauritania, Zimbabwe, and Italy as new Chair of the Mine Action Support Group. The panel discussion called attention to the fact that since the Fourth Review Conference, while funding in some years has increased, most of the funding has been allotted to a hand full of countries and highlighted the importance of providing increased funding to States that are close to meeting their completion milestones and to ensure that other mine affected States are not left behind. The panel further considered the importance of donor states increasing coordination and the role the MASG could play in strengthening coordination.

118. The Council Decision (CFSP) 2021/257 in support of the Oslo Action Plan (OAP) for the implementation of the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction continued to provide support to States Parties with their implementation efforts by providing an important platform for States Parties at a national, regional and international level to highlight challenges in implementation and to share best practices. Since the Oslo Review Conference 7 States Parties took advantage of this support to hold national stakeholder dialogues including Colombia, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Peru, Sudan, Zimbabwe. Likewise, the regional dialogue in Ghana and the Global Victim Assistance Conference in Cambodia provided an important platform to discuss progress and challenges in implementation which will contribute to the development of the Siem Reap - Angkor Action Plan 2025-2029. The States Parties have recognized the important contributions of the EU Council Decision to support States Parties in the implementation of their commitments under the Convention.

VIII. Measures to Ensure Compliance

119. The States Parties stressed the importance of complying with all the Convention’s provisions and remain committed to ensuring compliance with the obligations of the Convention to reach its objectives. In doing so, the States Parties reaffirmed their commitment to promote compliance with the Convention and adopted several actions in this regard.

120. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties recognized the importance of States Parties that face alleged or known non-compliance with the general obligations under Article 1 to provide information on the situation to all State Parties in the most expeditious, comprehensive, and transparent manner possible and to work together with other States Parties in a spirit of cooperation to resolve the matters in an expeditious and effective manner, in accordance with Article 8.1. While the cases of alleged non-compliance by a State Party with Article 1.1 of the Convention remain rare, the States Parties are determined to cooperate to ensure that the norms of the Convention are upheld by all.
121. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee on Cooperative Compliance has considered allegations/confirmed allegations of non-compliance with Article 1.1 which surfaced in Sudan (2011/2012), Ukraine (2023) and Yemen (2011). The Committee has regularly requested these States Parties to provide updates on their efforts to address the allegations/confirmed allegations, respectively, through written communication and bilateral meetings. The Committee has welcomed the continuous engagement of these States. In the case of Sudan and Yemen, these States have indicated that security remains the critical challenge in addressing the allegations/confirmed allegations, as areas where the incidents took place are currently outside of their effective control. These States Parties have indicated that they will continue communicating with the Committee and the States Parties on their efforts in this regard.
122. Concerning Ukraine, since the allegations surfaced in 2023 subsequent Presidents and the Committee on Cooperative Compliance have been engaged in a cooperative dialogue with Ukraine to address these allegations as soon as possible and to ensure that the Convention's compliance mechanisms remain strong. Ukraine at the Twenty-First Meeting of the States Parties and in subsequent meetings with the Committee on Cooperative Compliance highlighted that Ukraine possesses no verified information which would support the allegations of use of anti-personnel mines by Ukrainian Armed Forces in the city of Izyum, Kharkiv region. Ukraine further indicated that, "recognizing the importance of the rule of law, the Ukrainian side attached outmost attention to the verification of information that could confirm or refute these reports. Should any violation be found, those responsibly will be held accountable under applicable Ukrainian law." Ukraine further highlighted that "based on the data highlighted in the reports of some non-governmental organizations, Ukraine is verifying the received information. Upon completion of data verification, Ukraine will notify the Committee on Cooperative Compliance of the Ottawa Convention."
123. In the OAP the States Parties agreed that any State Party implementing obligations in particular under Article 4 or 5, or retaining or transferring mines in line with Article 3 that has not submitted an Article 7 report detailing progress in implementing these obligations each year will provide in close cooperation with the ISU an annual update on the status of implementation in line with Article 7 and will provide information to all States Parties in the most expeditious, comprehensive and transparent manner possible. If no information on implementing the relevant obligations for two consecutive years is provided, the President will assist and engage with the States Parties concerned in close cooperation with the relevant Committee.
124. **[INSERT SITUATION ON REPORTING 2023]**
125. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties reiterated the importance of any State Party that has not yet fulfilled its obligations under Article 9 of the Convention urgently taking all appropriate legal, administrative, and other measures to implement those obligations and report on the measures taken no later than by the 20MSP. Additionally, at the Fourth Review Conference, the mandate of the Committee

on Cooperative Compliance was amended to include, amongst other, support to States Parties in their efforts to implement and report on matters contained in Article 9 of the Convention.

126. Since the Fourth Review Conference subsequent chairs of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance have sent written communications to States Parties with outstanding obligations under Article 9 and engaged with these States on a bilateral basis in Geneva as well as in New York. On 6 May 2021, the Committee on Cooperative Compliance held a workshop on Article 9 reporting which included participation of the Committee, New Zealand, the ICRC, and the ISU with the objective of raising awareness of the importance of Article 9 and the tools and assistance available to States Parties as well as taking stock of the status of implementation efforts and, challenges and obstacles faced in this regard. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee on Cooperative Compliance has strengthened important partnerships in this regard, particularly with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the ICRC. The strengthening of these partnerships has been agreed as critical going forward.

127. At the close of the Fourth Review Conference, there were 72 States Parties that had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations and that there were 38 States Parties that had reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. The remaining 54 States Parties, i.e. almost 32 percent of States Parties, had not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they considered existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention.

128. Since the Fourth Review Conference:

- a. One State Party – Niue - has indicated that on 17 March 2021, the Nieu Assembly passed an Anti-Personnel and Cluster Munitions Prohibition Action 2021.
- b. One State Party - State of Palestine - has indicated that a draft law is being prepared and that in the meantime, its existing laws were sufficient in the context of Article 9.
- c. One State Party – Sri Lanka – has indicated having adopted national legislation in the context of Article 9.
- d. Three States Parties – Iraq, Guyana, State of Palestine States Parties - have indicated that they consider existing laws to be sufficient.
- e. One State Party - Eritrea – had been erroneously listed amongst the States Parties that had not yet reported on measures taken to implement Article 9.

129. In this regard, there are now 75 States Parties that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations and 43 States Parties that have reported that they consider existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. The following 46 States Parties still need to report on measures they have taken to implement Article 9: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Haiti, Jamaica, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Nauru, Nigeria, Palau, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uruguay and Vanuatu. The States Parties have agreed that pursuing fulfilment of Article 9 is an important goal for the Convention in the coming years.

130. While the cases of alleged non-compliance by a State Party with Article 1.1 of the Convention remain rare, the States Parties are determined to ensure that the norms of the Convention are upheld by all. States

Parties have further highlighted the need to ensure that States Parties comply with the obligations of the Convention including matters associated with the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 1.2 as well as on reporting under Article 7.

131. Since the Fourth Review Conference, one State Party - Eritrea – failed to submit an Article 5 request for extension of its Article 5 deadline by its deadline of 31 March 2020. The 19MSP in 2021 decided to establish a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea in the traditional spirit of the Convention and that failing the establishment of a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea and resolution of the current status of non-compliance through Eritrea’s submission of an extension request, by 31 March 2023, the Meeting decided to seek clarification and resolve questions related to compliance by Eritrea through the Secretary General of the United Nations in accordance with Article 8.2 of the Convention. Since the Fourt Review Conference, subsequent Presidents and the Committee on Article 5 Implementation, through written communication and bilateral meetings endeavoured to establish a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea. Having not been successful in establishing a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea to resolve this matter, the States Parties at the 20MSP recalled the 19MSP decision and “mandated the President of the 21MSP to implement this decision and to report back to the States Parties at their Twenty-First Meeting”. The decision also noted that the President and office holders of the Convention stood ready to sustain a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea to see that this situation could be overcome as soon as possible, and that Eritrea would be supported in reengaging in the work of the Convention. Following the closure of the 20MSP, the following transpired:

- a. On 31 March 2023, Eritrea did not submit a Request for Extension of its Article 5 deadline.
- b. On 24 May 2023, following several unsuccessful efforts to establish a cooperative dialogue with Eritrea as envisaged under Article 8.1, the President of the Twenty-First Meeting of the States Parties sent a Request for Clarification to Eritrea through the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with the decision of the Twentieth Meeting of the States Parties.
- c. On 21 June 2023 Eritrea submitted a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations indicating Eritrea’s decision to withdraw from the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.
- d. On 2 October 2023 Eritrea submitted a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations indicating its decision to withdraw its notification letter of 21 June 2023 regarding ‘withdrawal from the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention’.
- e. Following the establishment of a cooperative dialogue with the President of the 21MSP, Eritrea, on 16 November 2023, submitted a Request for Extension of its Article 5 deadline which was granted by the 21MSP.

132. The States Parties welcomed Eritrea’s re-engagement with the work of the Convention and their participation at the 21MSP. The States Parties also noted the importance of States Parties maintaining a cooperative dialogue with the office holders of the Convention to resolve any matter concerning implementation of the provisions of the Convention. The States Parties further recalled the important role that transparency plays in the Convention’s implementation.

133. Furthermore, since the Fourth Review Conference, the President as Chair of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance has worked to raise awareness of the importance of strengthening the norm of Convention:

- a. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Article 5 Implementation organized a panel discussion on “Cooperative Compliance within the framework of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention”. The panel discussion was chaired by Sudan and included

participation by Switzerland, the ICRC, and Human Rights Watch. The panel highlighted that while progress in the Convention's implementation has been impressive, the Convention faces several challenges including the slow pace of implementation of Article 5, lack of progress in other areas such as stockpile destruction and other deficiencies such as the lack of submission of Article 7 transparency reports. The panel also highlighted the importance of progress in ensuring that States Parties have strong national implementation measures in place and the role of the ICRC in supporting States Parties in this regard. The panel also highlighted the new role of the Committee on Cooperative compliance in following up on issues related to Article 7 and Article 9 as the key compliance mechanisms of the Convention.

- b. During the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings, the Committee on Cooperative Compliance organized a panel discussion on "Strengthening Compliance Measures". The panel discussion was moderated by the Netherlands and included speakers from Colombia, Poland, ICRC, Inter-Parliamentarian Union, and Human Rights Watch. The panel discussion highlighted the importance of ensuring that all measures to ensure compliance of the Convention are implemented including the establishment of national implementation measures in accordance with Article 9 and adherence to transparency reporting measure under Article 7. The panel also highlighted the important of the Convention taking full advantage of partnerships with, for example, the ICRC and the IPU in strengthening compliance.

IX. Best Practices for implementation of the Convention

134. At the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties recognized the special partnerships of the Convention with the United Nations, the ICRC, the ICBL and the GICHD and the importance of fostering partnerships with civil society in support of implementing the Convention. Furthermore, the States Parties identified best practices that are key to the successful implementation of the Convention's obligations.
135. National ownership¹⁰ continues to be a key element of ensuring that Convention obligations are met, including the integration of Convention implementation activities into broader frameworks such national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, humanitarian response plans and national strategies for the inclusion of persons with disabilities as appropriate, and by making financial and other commitments to implementation. Since the Fourth Review Conference 29 States Parties implementing Article 5 and/or victim assistance obligations have reported having included Convention implementation activities into broader national frameworks including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. This included the integration of Convention activities into peacebuilding or in implementation of Sustainable Development goals. While progress has been made by several States, national efforts in this regard should continue to ensure that the implementation of the Convention continues to be prioritized at a national level, in particularly given the importance of mine action in supporting achievement of the objectives of broader frameworks.

¹⁰ The States Parties have defined national ownership as entailing the following: 'maintaining interest at a high level in fulfilling Convention obligations; empowering and providing relevant State entities with the human, financial and material capacity to carry out their obligations under the Convention; articulating the measures its State entities will undertake to implement relevant aspects of Convention in the most inclusive, efficient and expedient manner possible and plans to overcome any challenges that need to be addressed; and making a regular significant national financial commitment to the State's programmes to implement the Convention'.

136. The breaking down of silos in implementation of the Convention has been viewed as increasingly important, as implementation of the Convention addresses matters related to disarmament, development, human rights, health, humanitarian, environmental and good governance. While greater awareness has been raised about the importance of integrating Convention implementation activities into broader frameworks, efforts should continue to further capitalize on these synergies. Increasing understandings of how to ensure that these synergies result in concrete action in support of the Convention, including through the gaining of access to more diverse financial sources at national and international levels.
137. In addition to the integration of Convention implementation activities, the States Parties have recognized the importance of strengthening partnership with humanitarian, peacebuilding, development, and human rights efforts, where relevant, bearing in mind the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Since the Fourth Review Conference 31 States Parties have reported progress in this regard including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.
138. Additionally, 31 States Parties (74%) implementing Article 5 and/or victim assistance obligations have reported making national financial commitment to the implementation of mine clearance and victim assistance obligations under the Convention including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, most States Parties have indicated a lack of national financial resources to implement their obligations under the Convention. Likewise, several States Parties reported the diversion of resources to addressing matters related to the Covid-19 pandemic. The allotment of increased national resources remains a priority for States Parties.
139. The States Parties continue to recognize the importance of mine affected States Parties having evidence-based, costed and time-bound national strategies and work plans in place. Since the Fourth Review Conference 35 States Parties (83%) reported having evidence based strategies or work plans in place for the implementation of their Article 5/ victim assistance obligations including - Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The States Parties continue to view high quality work plans as an indispensable element of resources mobilization and recognize the importance of ensuring and evidence-based and inclusive approach to their development.
140. Since the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties have aimed to raise awareness concerning the importance of consideration for the different needs and perspectives of women, girls, boys, and men in implementation of the Convention, to deliver an inclusive approach and in doing so remove barriers to full, equal and gender balanced participation in mine action and in Convention meetings. Since the Fourth Review Conference 31 mine affected States Parties (74%) have reported having in place work plans and/or strategies that integrate gender and take the diverse needs and experience of people in affected communities into account including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia,

Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. States Parties noted the importance of continued efforts in this regard including ensuring greater consultation with individuals and mine affected communities and their representative organizations in the develop and implement projects, programs, policies at local and national levels.

141. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several efforts have been put forward to further raise awareness of the importance of gender and to encourage consideration for gender in the deliberations of the Convention including:

- a. During the 30 June – 2 July 2020 Intersessional Meetings the Gender Focal Points organized a panel discussion on “Effective Implementation for All: Gender and Diverse Needs in Practice”.¹¹ The panel was moderated by Norway in their capacity of Gender Focal Point on the Committee on Article 5 Implementation and included participation from Cambodia, Colombia, Uganda, the HALO Trust, and MAG. The panel served to raise awareness of the value of gender and diversity mainstreaming for the effective implementation of the Convention and the OAP. The panellists provided an overview of the challenges that remain to be addressed to ensure consideration of gender and diversity in all areas of implementation and shared best practices and recommendations to ensure effective, efficient, and context-specific implementation. The panel discussion also provided an opportunity to ensure that States Parties are familiarized with the role of the recently established gender focal points.
- b. During the 22-24 June 2021 Intersessional Meetings, the Gender Focal Points organized a panel discussion on “Integrating the Diverse Needs of Affected Communities in Operational Planning and Prioritization”. The panel discussion was moderated by Spain and included participation from a representative of the Afghanistan, El Salvador, Norway, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Humanity and Inclusion and the GICHD. The objective of panel was to provide examples and best practices on how to ensure that gender and the diverse needs of affected communities are integrated into operational planning and prioritization setting mechanisms; provide information on the tools and support available to States Parties to achieve this objective, and; provide a donor perspective on what States in a position to provide assistance can do to further support the implementation of this objective. The panel recognized the importance of considering gender and the divers needs of affected communities to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the convention. The Panel further noted the importance of States Parties in a position to provide assistance integrating gender considerations into their policies.
- c. In May 2022, a Workshop on “Best practices and lessons learned from practical mainstreaming of gender and diversity in mine action”, hosted by the Gender and Diversity Working Group (GDWG), and co-sponsored by Colombia and the United Kingdom in their respective capacity as president of the 20MSP of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties of the Cluster Munitions Convention examined how gender and diversity considerations can be better mainstreamed in survey and clearance, risk education, victim assistance and international cooperation and assistance.¹² It also sought to understand how to overcome the obstacles to full,

¹¹ [2020 Intersessional Meetings | Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention \(apminebanconvention.org\)](https://www.apminebanconvention.org/)

equal, and meaningful women’s participation in mine action operations and Convention meetings, and to raise awareness of the intersection between gender and factors of vulnerability and exclusion (e.g. age, religion, ethnicity, language, and disability). The summary report of the workshop, which is available online, contains some of the key findings and recommendations.

- d. During the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings, the President organized a panel entitled “Cross-cutting priorities of the Presidency: Gender and the diverse needs of mine affected communities – lessons learnt and way ahead”¹³. The Panel was moderated by Germany in their capacity of President of the Convention and included participation from the ASEAN Mine Action Centre, the HALO Trust and UNIDIR. The panel recognized the progress and challenges in ensuring consideration for matters related to gender and diversity in implementation of the Convention emphasizing the importance of the next action plan continue to stress the importance of consideration for gender for the effective and efficient implementation of the Convention.

142. Since the Fourth Review Conference, reporting on efforts made in this regard have improved. The establishment of a gender focal point on the Convention’s thematic Committees has helped ensure consideration for gender in implementation of the Committees’ mandates to review information submitted by the States Parties and to develop annual preliminary observations and conclusion. While progress has been made, continued attention to this matter going forward will be paramount. This includes ensuring continued disaggregation by sex, age, and disability when it comes to casualty data as well as the provision of desegregated data when it comes to beneficiaries of mine risk education and reduction programmes. Additionally, the Committees have recorded progress in reporting on matters regarding gender not only by mine affected States Parties but also increasingly by States Parties in a position to provide assistance including by Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The States Parties underlined the importance of States Parties in a position to provide assistance to report on their gender policies.

143. Furthermore, since the Fourth Review Conference approximately 50% of States Party delegations have included women on their delegations. Despite this, a lack of gender balance and representation of landmine survivors and persons with disabilities in delegations participating in Convention meetings is still observed. This representation extends to the delivery of statements during Convention meetings. Finally, since the Fourth Review Conference no State Party has included mine victims as part of their delegation to Convention meetings.

144. Since the Fourth Review Conference the States Parties have highlighted the importance of inclusion. Since the Fourth Review Conference 28 States Parties have reported an inclusive approach to the development of Article 5/ victim assistance national strategies and work plans including Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe. Likewise, 26 States Parties (68%) implementing Victim assistance activities have included victim organizations in their victim assistance planning including Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

¹³ <https://www.apminebanconvention.org/en/intersessional-meetings/im23/>

145. In implementing Convention obligation, the States Parties continued to emphasize the important of NMAS that are aligned to the latest IMAS, adapted to new challenges, and ensuring that State Parties employ best practices to ensure efficient and effective implantation. Since the Fourth Review Conference 30 States Parties (90%) implementing Article 5 obligations have indicated that national standards in place have been updated or are in the process of being updated in line with IMAS including : Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The IMAS14 were continually updated since the Fourth Review Conference and in some cases new IMAS have been introduced such as IMAS 13.10 on Victim Assistance in Mine Action adopted in January 2023. Furthermore, Technical Notes for Mine Action (TNMA) have been developed to support implementation by the States Parties in several areas of implementation.
146. In this regard, the States Parties have recognized the importance of States Parties continually reviewing and updating their NMAS accordingly, where relevant. Despite most States having reported on the application of evidence-based survey and efficient land release methodologies, in some cases survey methodologies could further be improved to avoid unnecessary complications and costs caused by inaccurate sizes and locations of hazardous areas being recorded. Improvement of survey methodologies can avoid costly clearance occurring in areas without direct evidence of contamination.
147. Despite shortcomings, since the Fourth Review Conference there is an increased awareness of challenges related to the survey, clearance and reporting of improvised mine contamination.
148. Since the Fourth Review Conference, States Parties have highlighted the importance of States Parties in a position to provide assistance to, where feasible, provide assistance to States Parties in developing, updating, or implementing their national strategies and work plans to fulfil their respective Convention obligations and to enter into multi-year partnerships and provide multi-year funding. Since the Fourth Review Conference 21 States Parties have reported partnership with mine affected States Parties in fulfilment of the Convention obligations including: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. Furthermore 25 States Parties have reported providing financial or other support to affected States Partes including Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Finally, 12 States Parties reported doing so on a multi-year basis including: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Estonia, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.
149. While several efforts have been carried out to foster cooperation and assistance, it is evident that efforts must continue in-country and at the international level. A more coordinated effort will be required by States in a position to provide assistance to support States Parties that have demonstrated a high level of national ownership and who have put forth clear plans to address their remaining challenges.
150. The States Parties have continuously emphasized the importance of mine affected States Parties providing information on progress and challenges in implementation of the Convention by 30 April of each year in

¹⁴ <https://www.mineactionstandards.org/>

line with their Article 7 obligations employing the Guide to Reporting. Since the Fourth Review Conference 32 States Parties have reported employing fully or partially the Guide to Reporting including Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

151. Since the Fourth Review Conference, several States Parties have improved their reporting practices providing increased clarity on the status of implementation in their annual Article 7 transparency reports. Nonetheless, improvements can be made to align their reports more closely to the Guide to Reporting adopted by the States Parties. This is particularly the case when it comes to reporting on methodologies employed in implementation and matters concerning considerations for gender and the diverse needs of mine affected communities. Unfortunately, global reporting rates continue to stagnate at approximately 50%. Nevertheless, reporting rates are relatively high amongst States Parties that have reported obligations under Article 5 and States Parties reporting on the implementation of victim assistance activities. On the other hand, reporting rates for States Parties with retained anti-personnel mines under Article 3 and/or outstanding obligations under Article 9 remain low. Given the importance of reporting, this matter will continue to be a priority for States Parties.
152. In line with the decision of the Fourth Review Conference for States Parties affected by anti- personnel mines of an improvised nature to apply all provisions and obligations under the Convention to such contamination as they do for all other types of anti-personnel mines, including reporting in fulfilment of Article 7 obligations, the increased use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature has increased reporting obligations for several States Parties. Continued cooperation with these State to support Convention reporting and implementation practices will be increasingly important going forward. Along with the Guide to Reporting, since the Fourth Review Conference IMAS 05.10 on Information Management for Mine Action, published in March 2020, includes standardised guidance on the information to be collected including on anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature.
153. Since the Fourth Review Conference several efforts have been put forward to improve reporting. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperative Compliance, together with the Chairs of the Convention Committees as well as a representative of the Gender Focal Points have held an online Article 7 Reporting Workshop, inviting all States Parties and States not parties to raise awareness of the importance of the information provide by States Parties on their implementation efforts to track implementation of the Convention and the OAP as well as for the fulfilment of the President and Committee’s mandates. The workshop also provided an overview of the tools and support available to States Parties. These workshops took place early in the year and served as a reminder to States Parties to encourage submission of reports by the 30 April deadline. These Article 7 Reporting Workshops have been well received by the States Parties and will be an important feature going forward.
154. While reporting on progress in implementation is crucial, States Parties have recognized the importance of States Parties continuing to articulate the challenges they face in implementation, including during the formal and informal meetings of the Convention. Since the Fourth Review Conference, approximately 39 States Parties annually report on progress and challenges in implementation during Convention meetings including: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Iraq, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, United Kingdom, Ukraine,

Yemen and Zimbabwe. The States Parties continue to view updates provided by States Parties during formal and informal meetings of the Convention as an important part of ensuring success in implementation of the Convention in the traditional spirit of transparency and cooperation of the Convention.

155. To support States Parties in reporting on progress and challenges in accordance with the Guide to Reporting, the States Parties have recognized the importance of mine affected States Parties having in place national information management systems containing accurate and up-to-date data at the national level on the status of implementation. Since the Fourth Review Conference, 28 States Parties (84%) implementing Article 5 have reported having a sustainable national information management system in place including Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The States Parties recognized that high quality data is crucial to support States Parties in the effective and efficient implementation of the obligations under the Convention.
156. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the importance of taking into consideration matters related to the environment and climate change in the Convention's implementation became more prominent. In this regard, at the 21MSP the President introduced a paper entitled "Green Implementation: integrating Environmental Consideration into the implementation of the Convention". The paper highlighted several key matters in this regard, including the following:
- a. Conflict-affected countries face heightened vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change. Of the 20 countries deemed most vulnerable to climate change, 11 have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control and several more are contaminated other types of explosive ordnance.¹⁵
 - b. In the coming decades, changes to the climate are predicted to increase in all regions of the world, bringing, for example, more intense rainfall and associated flooding, heatwaves, more intense droughts, and coastal flooding.¹⁶ This will both increase the likelihood of climate-related hazards occurring in areas contaminated with anti-personnel mines and other explosive ordnance and may affect how States Parties prioritize and conduct implementation efforts.
 - c. Anti-personnel mines and other explosive ordnance continue to pose a serious threat to the lives and livelihoods of people in many countries preventing communities from accessing and managing essential resources such as food and water and putting additional pressure on scarce natural resources. Furthermore, the degradation of explosive ordnance may also cause the release of hazardous chemicals into soil or groundwater, unplanned detonations may trigger forest fires, and the presence of explosive ordnance can hinder efforts to extinguish forest fires. In this regard, consideration and assessment of the environmental consequences throughout mine action operations can help mitigate negative impacts.
 - d. While the text of the Convention contains only two references to the environment – one on the reporting on environmental standards to be observed during the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5; and the other on the need for Article 5 extension requests

¹⁵ University of Notre Dame, ND-GAIN country index scores for 2021, at: <https://tinyurl.com/zea87zs6>.

¹⁶ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) press release, "Climate change widespread, rapid, and intensifying," 9 August 2021, at: <https://tinyurl.com/mr28d6b3>.

to include environmental implications - understandings of environmental impact and climate change have advanced considerably since the adoption of the Convention in 1997, including the need for action to mitigate our greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the changing global environment. In recent years, States and the humanitarian actors have increasingly considered how to better integrate environmental consideration into implementation efforts.

- e. Environmental and climate change considerations are relevant to everyone, including national authorities, clearance operators, and donors. In the same way as gender and diversity are, justly, being mainstreamed throughout the Convention's implementation, States Parties should consider how to best integrate and mainstream the environment and climate change.

157. During the 19-21 June 2023 Intersessional Meetings, the President organized a panel entitled "Cross-cutting priorities of the Presidency, Green Implementation: Integrating Environmental Considerations in the Convention's implementation". The Panel was moderated by Germany in their capacity of President of the Convention and included participation from Bosnia and Herzegovina Mine Action Centre and MAR on behalf of the Environmental Issues in Mine Action Working Group. The panel discussed the importance of integrating environmental considerations into implementation efforts with Bosnia and Herzegovina sharing some of their environmental consideration when it comes to the Convention's implementation. The panel discussion provided a timely opportunity for States Parties to consider the place of the environment in the next five-year Action Plan to be adopted at the Fifth Review Conference.

158. Since the Fourth Review Conference a range of initiatives and studies have been carried out to strengthen the link between mine action and the environment and to provide guidance to States Parties including the elaboration and updating of an International Mine Action Standard (IMAS) 07.13 on Environmental Management in Mine Action. Additionally, a Technical Note for Mine Action (TNMA) to support implementation is in the process of being developed which will provide additional practical guidance to States Parties on implementation of IMAS 07.13. Also, a few studies by the GICDH, particularly "Guide to the Ageing of Explosive Ordnance in the Environment" and "Mine Action and the Resilience of Communities to Climate Change" underscore the enabling role of mine action in fostering communities resilience to climate change and emphasise the potential for further enhancement in integration of climate resilience considerations in the Convention's implementation. Furthermore, a wealth of best practices have been acquired by States Parties and organizations in this regard. Going forward, a great understanding and awareness raising of the interaction between mine action and the environment could contribute to its further integration.

159. Article 11 of the Convention states that "the States Parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of the Convention (...)" and that Meetings of the States Parties subsequent to the First Meeting of the States Parties will be convened annually until the First Review Conference. At the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to hold annual Meetings of the States Parties until the Fifth Review Conference.

160. The Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties was held in Geneva (virtual) on 16-20 November 2020 and presided over by H.E. Osman Abufatima Adam Mohammed, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sudan to the United Nations at Geneva. The 19MSP was held in the Hague (virtual) on 15-19 November 2021 and presided over by H.E. Robbert Jan Gabriëlse, Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the Conference on Disarmament and Disarmament Ambassador at-large. The 20MSP was held in Geneva on 21- 25 November 2022 and presided over by Colombia. The President of 20MSP, H.E. Alicia Victoria Arango

Olmos, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations at Geneva, due to unforeseen personal circumstances, resigned from her post on 31 May 2022. The States Parties subsequently accepted the nomination of H.E. Alvaro Enrique Ayala Melendez, Ambassador and Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations at Geneva to presided over the 20MSP. The 21MSP Parties was held in Geneva on 20-24 November 2023 and was presided over by H.E. Thomas Göbel, Ambassador of the Republic of Germany to the Conference on Disarmament. The Fifth Review Conference is planned to be held in Siem Reap, Cambodia, on 25-29 November 2024 and will be presided over by H.E. Ly Thuch, Senior Minister of Cambodia and First Vice President of the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority.

161. Since the Fourth Review Conference several States Parties have served on positions within the Convention's implementation machinery including the following:

- a. Committee on Article 5 Implementation: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, France, Iraq, Norway, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom, Zambia
- b. Victim Assistance Committee: Algeria, Burkina Faso, Ecuador, Chile, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda, Zambia
- c. Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance: Algeria, Colombia, Denmark, Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, Sudan, Thailand, Türkiye, United Kingdom,
- d. Committee on Cooperative Compliance: Chile, Cambodia, Colombia, Germany, Iraq, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Spain, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye

162. The establishment of a gender focal point within each committee to mainstream matters related to gender and diversity into the work of the Committees continues to be viewed as a positive change. Since the Fourth Review Conference, every Committee has nominated a gender focal point, ensuring that matters regarding gender are highlighted in the documentation of the Committee, during bilateral meetings with mine affected States Parties as well as during informal and formal meetings of the Convention.

163. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the States Parties have continued to make use of the Meetings of the State Parties as mechanisms to advance implementation of the Convention. Each Meeting of the States Parties considered final conclusions on the implementation of the mandate of the President and the Convention's thematic Committees. These reports measured progress made by States parties in the pursuit of the Convention's core aims between Meetings of the States Parties, highlighting the status of implementation of relevant actions of the OAP and priority areas of work for the President and the Committees going forward. In addition, programmes for the Intersessional Meetings and Meetings of the States Parties provided an opportunity for States Parties implementing key provision of the Convention to provide updates in fulfilment of their obligations.

164. The States Parties have recognized the importance of ensuring that the machinery of the Convention continues to serve the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, the States Parties have recognized the importance of ensuring that assessed contributions in line with Article 14 of the Convention for United Nations support to the Meetings of the States Parties and Review Conferences and any arrears are settled as soon as possible. Since the Fourth Review Conference an average of 71% of States have paid their contributions no later than three months before the formal meetings of the Convention. Unfortunately, in some cases, States Parties have not paid their assessed contribution or settled their arrears for several years.

165. The States Parties have also recognized the importance of States Parties providing voluntary contributions to the ISU of the Convention. Since the Fourth Review Conference an average of 28 States Parties have provided voluntary contributions to the ISU on an annual basis including: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye and the United Kingdom. Since the Fourth Review Conference the ISU has continued to report regularly and in accordance with the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU” as well as with other decision of the States Parties. In accordance with the Decision of the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties, quarterly report have been submitted by the ISU to the Coordinating Committee on the activities and finances of the ISU.
166. Since the Fourth Review Conference, through financial support provide by Switzerland, the ISU continue to be hosted by the GICHD, ensuring that there was no cost to the States Parties associated with the logistical and administrative support to the ISU. The States Parties have annually recognised the important support function provided by the ISU to the President, the Committees, the Sponsorship Programme, the Universalization Coordination Group, and individual States Parties, and consistently called for States Parties to continue their support to the ISU.
167. Since the Fourth Review Conference, the Convention’s informal Sponsorship Programme, coordinated by Australia, continues to be a critical component of the Intersessional Meetings and Meetings of the States Parties and Review Conferences, ensuring that representatives of States Parties that would otherwise not be able to participate in the work of the Convention are able to participate in the Convention’s deliberations. The States Parties have recognized the importance of States continuing to consider voluntary contributions for the Sponsorship Programme to ensure its continued success. Since the Fourth Review Conference 11 States Parties have contributed to the Sponsorship Programme including: Australia, Austria, Canada, Croatia, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland and Türkiye.