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

(a) Cooperation and assistance

1. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (Ecuador and Thailand) sought to build upon the cooperation and assistance agenda for the Convention which had been spelled out by the President of the Second Review Conference in 2010 and which had been followed up on since. This included efforts to advance work started in 2012 on a Platform for Partnerships information exchange tool. The Co-Chairs invited all States Parties to contribute to this effort, which was established on a trial basis as a tool to exchange information on the breadth of assistance available to implement the Convention. The Co-Chairs emphasised that, in addition to financial assistance, other forms of assistance, including expertise, equipment and the exchange of experience, are also valuable. As such, almost any State Party is a potential contributor of assistance. The Co-Chairs informed the States Parties that information on available assistance provided by some States Parties has been made available by the Implementation Support Unit at the following webpage: http://www.apminebanconvention.org/platform-for-partnerships/.

2. In follow-up to a 2012 discussion on regarding the pros and cons of existing or possible new funding mechanisms, the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (Ecuador and Thailand) sought to build upon the cooperation and assistance agenda for the Convention which had been spelled out by the President of the Second Review Conference in 2010 and which had been followed up on since. This included efforts to advance work started in 2012 on a Platform for Partnerships information exchange tool. The Co-Chairs invited all States Parties to contribute to this effort, which was established on a trial basis as a tool to exchange information on the breadth of assistance available to implement the Convention. The Co-Chairs emphasised that, in addition to financial assistance, other forms of assistance, including expertise, equipment and the exchange of experience, are also valuable. As such, almost any State Party is a potential contributor of assistance. The Co-Chairs informed the States Parties that information on available assistance provided by some States Parties has been made available by the Implementation Support Unit at the following webpage: http://www.apminebanconvention.org/platform-for-partnerships/.

* Document submitted after the established deadline to allow the States parties to provide comprehensive information on their activities.
Assistance explored in more detail one such mechanism – the United Nations Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Multi-Donor Trust Fund, which is often referred to as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) Trust Fund. It was noted by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) that all eight of the trust fund’s thematic priorities are of high relevance in effectively protecting and promoting the rights of persons with disabilities, including survivors of mines and other explosive remnants of war. The OHCHR noted that, in May 2012, the trust fund released its first call for applications to United Nations Country Teams, who coordinate and lead the country level projects, and that by the end of 2012, eight priority countries received funding.

3. The OHCHR noted that a project funded by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) Trust Fund in Mozambique serves as an example of how a State Party responsible for significant numbers may benefit in that the project in Mozambique fulfils the following key criteria: alignment with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the human rights-based approach to disability; national ownership among governmental and non-governmental stakeholders; participation of persons with disabilities and their representative organisations in the development, implementation and monitoring of the project; and sustainability in terms of focusing on legal and policy reform.

4. With a view to continuing to enhance cooperation and assistance under the Convention, particularly in light of the Convention’s 2014 Third Review Conference, Thailand, with the support of Australia and the ISU, convened the Bangkok Symposium on Cooperation and Assistance: Building Synergy Towards Effective Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation on 24-25 June 2013. A wealth of knowledge, experience and views were shared during the Symposium, with some key conclusions emerging as follows:

(a) The Convention’s promise to landmine survivors will be, in large part, achieved through the integration of activities into broader approaches to disability. It is important, therefore, that the challenges faced by landmine survivors be evident within disability discussions and that those from the disability world continue to participate in cooperative efforts to implement the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

(b) The fact that a so-called landmines world is part of a larger world means that the resources to fuel the fulfilment of our aims could come from wide-ranging sources. The challenge, therefore, is two-fold. First, there is a challenge in terms of making use of the full range of funding sources, be they specifically related to mine action or not. Second, there is a challenge in ensuring that funds that are invested are actually achieving their desired ends.

(c) Also as concerns cooperative efforts to fulfil the Convention’s promise to landmine survivors, it is clear that there is a need to focus more intensively on sustainability. Addressing the needs and guaranteeing the rights of landmine survivors are national responsibilities which will remain for the long-term. Programmes and services embedded in a national health care system will need to take this point into account. Those requiring external resources to ensure sustainability should make sure that their resource needs are communicated as priorities in broader development frameworks.

(d) Building upon the need to ensure sustainability is the imperative to establish partnerships and to do so from the outset. For example, partnerships are essential for achieving national ownership over a sustainable physical rehabilitation programme. Partnerships are key to individual States Parties taking on a leading role in sharing its experience and capacities. Partnerships are important to overcome capacity constraints. In
addition, as has been evident in regional cooperation, partnerships enable partners to do more together than they could on their own.

(e) A central theme, if not the central theme, throughout the symposium was the fundamental place of national ownership – both to facilitate cooperation and assistance, and to actually comply with the Convention’s obligations. This point was highlighted from the outset during the keynote address by His Royal Highness Prince Mired. In addition, national ownership was mentioned during every panel discussion and alluded to by almost every panellist. The implementation of the Convention is the responsibility of each individual State Party in areas under its control or jurisdiction. Those that have understood and internalised this point have generally been more successful in deepening relations with partners, in mobilising resources, and in producing results.

5. The importance of a complementary twin-track approach to victim assistance was recalled in which efforts are made both to eliminate barriers that exclude persons with disabilities in all aspects of development assistance and to take specific actions that promote the individual and collective empowerment of persons with disabilities, including mine victims.

6. In the Cartagena Action Plan, it was agreed that all States Parties will strengthen partnerships between affected and non-affected States Parties and among affected States Parties to identify and mobilise new technical, material and financial resources of support for activities to implement the Convention. In a manner that relates to this commitment, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), as part of its Arabic Language Outreach Programme held its first annual workshop in Dubai in December 2012, prepared to hold its second annual workshop in Kuwait in December 2013, and staged a training event in Jordan on operational efficiency and land release for 14 Arabic-speaking demining programmes. In addition, the GICHD initiated a Persian Language Outreach Programme, holding a workshop in Tajikistan in February 2013.

7. In the Cartagena Action Plan, it was agreed that all States Parties will contribute to the further development of the United Nations’ International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) to be used as a frame of reference to establish national standards and operational procedures for addressing all aspects of mine and other explosive ordnance contamination. As noted, since the 12MSP, important amendments were made to the IMAS on land release. In addition since the 12MSP, the GICHD has continued to manage and coordinate the IMAS process and has produced a multi-language IMAS compact disk, along with providing support to individual States Parties to develop national standards.

(b) Transparency and the exchange of information

8. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not submitted their initial Article 7 report will immediately fulfil their obligation to initially submit and annually update Article 7 transparency reports. At the close of the 12MSP, two States Parties – Equatorial Guinea and Tuvalu – had not yet complied with the obligation to report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party, on the matters for which transparency information is required in accordance with Article 7.1. In addition, 90 States Parties had provided
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information as required, in accordance with Article 7.2, covering the previous calendar year. 67 States Parties had not done so.

9. Since the 12MSP, [three] States Parties – Finland, [Poland] and Somalia – have submitted their initial report in accordance with Article 7.1 and two States Parties are still not compliant with their obligation to report in accordance with Article 7.1: Equatorial Guinea and Tuvalu. Equatorial Guinea’s initial report was due on 28 August 1999 and Tuvalu’s on 28 August 2012. In addition in 2013, the following [74] States Parties did not provide updated information covering calendar year 2012 in accordance with Article 7.2 as required: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

10. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will maximise and take full advantage of the flexibility of the Article 7 reporting process as a tool to assist in implementation, including through the reporting format “form J” to provide information on matters which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilization, such as information on international cooperation and assistance, victim assistance efforts and needs and information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in all aspects of mine action.4 Since the 12MSP, 48 States Parties have made use of “form J”:

(a) The following 23 States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on victim assistance and needs: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Australia, Austria, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iraq, Italy, Mozambique, Peru, Serbia, Somalia, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, and Zimbabwe.

(b) The following 7 States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on numbers of new mine incidents and victims: Croatia, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, and Zimbabwe.

(c) The following 21 States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on international cooperation and assistance: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Thailand.

(d) The following State Party used “form J” to volunteer information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in all aspects of mine action: Germany.

(e) Several States Parties used “form J” to volunteer information on other matters related to the implementation of the Convention, including information on: mine action research, mine risk education, clearance of unexploded ordnance and explosive remnants of war, conversion of Claymore mines to command activated, Article 3 retained mines, humanitarian demining/explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) training, participation in international meetings and capacity building.
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Several States Parties used “form J” to complement the information provided elsewhere in their annual submission of information on required areas of reporting, including on programmes for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention and on measures to provide warnings to the populations in relation to mined areas.

At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will regularly review the number of anti-personnel mines retained for purposes permitted under Article 3 of the Convention to ensure that it constitutes the minimum number absolutely necessary for these purposes and destroy all those exceeding that number. It was agreed that all States Parties will annually report, on a voluntary basis, on the plans for and the actual use of anti-personnel mines retained, explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained anti-personnel mines.

Since the 12MSP, Angola reported 135 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and indicated that the decrease in the amount of retained anti-personnel mines was due to the fact that the last reports did not mention the number of mines used for training. Mines retained are used by the Angolan Armed Forces (AAF) for the purposes of development and training, and mines for instruction have been provided to National Institute for Demining and other different mine action operators. Argentina reported ten fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that these mines were used by the Institute of Scientific and Technical Investigation for Defence for the “Mine destruction systems without explosives” project. Australia reported 3,654 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that stocks are regularly reviewed, with a significant portion of the stock destroyed after the 2012 review. Australia further reported that in total, around 70 per cent of the stock originally retained when Australia ratified the Convention has been destroyed. Australia also indicated that it views the retention of anti-personnel mines as essential for Australian Force training requirements, including the destruction and disposal of anti-personnel mines, mine awareness and countermine training and to undertake research into the effects of anti-personnel mines.

Since the 12MSP, Angola reported 135 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and indicated that the decrease in the amount of retained anti-personnel mines was due to the fact that the last reports did not mention the number of mines used for training. Mines retained are used by the Angolan Armed Forces (AAF) for the purposes of development and training, and mines for instruction have been provided to National Institute for Demining and other different mine action operators. Argentina reported ten fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that these mines were used by the Institute of Scientific and Technical Investigation for Defence for the “Mine destruction systems without explosives” project. Australia reported 3,654 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that stocks are regularly reviewed, with a significant portion of the stock destroyed after the 2012 review. Australia further reported that in total, around 70 per cent of the stock originally retained when Australia ratified the Convention has been destroyed. Australia also indicated that it views the retention of anti-personnel mines as essential for Australian Force training requirements, including the destruction and disposal of anti-personnel mines, mine awareness and countermine training and to undertake research into the effects of anti-personnel mines.

Belarus reported 8 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012. Belgium reported 472 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 for the purpose of education and training of EOD specialists and deminers with live ammunition as well as for demolition exercises in order to reduce the quantities of mines in the Armed Force’s possession. Bhutan reported to the 12MSP having retained 4,001 fewer anti-personnel mines than it had reported in 2007, with these mines to be used for all officers and troops to be given basic and specialized trainings in mine clearance and the removal of improvised explosive devices. Bhutan indicated that a week-long training is conducted for all officers and troops annually and that this training includes mine identification and awareness, minefield marking and layout, detection and destruction techniques.

Brazil reported 1,326 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for military training purposes, to allow the Brazilian armed forces to adequately participate in international demining activities for the purpose of training in mine detection, clearance and destruction. Chile reported 216 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that these 216 mines were destroyed to train the deminers of the Chilean army and Chilean navy in the detection, deactivation and destruction of anti-personnel mines.

Croatia reported 58 fewer anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and that 52 mines were used during testing and evaluating of demining machines on the test polygon in Cerovec, CROMAC-CTDT Ltd and 6 mines were used by the Training Company of Engineering regiment in its regular training and education for deminers. The Czech Republic reported 83 fewer mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that retained anti-personnel mines are used to train and or educate EOD personnel in mine detection, mine...
clearance and destruction techniques. Denmark reported 47 fewer mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that the mines are retained to be used for research and development by the Danish Defence Research Establishment and to be used for training in mine detection.

16. Ecuador reported five fewer mines than it did in 2012 with these mines having been used in a course of the National Demining School. Ecuador plans to use annually ten anti-personnel mines to be destroyed in training as well as potential research. Planned training activities include a basic demining course (five mines) and an explosive ordnance disposal course (five mines). Eritrea reported 71 fewer mines than it did in 2012. Germany reported 19 fewer mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that the necessary quantities, types and estimated future requirements are reviewed on an annual basis. Germany further indicated that since the Second Review Conference, 64 mines were disassembled for using as inert training mines, 67 were used for different development programmes in mine protection and clearance and 19 surplus retained mines were destroyed. In addition, Germany indicated that the latest review of requirements will lead to an early and additional destruction of 1,300 anti-personnel by the end of 2014. Iraq reported 706 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and that these are used for mine detection dogs and mine detector training by the Mines Advisory Group (MAG). Ireland reported 1 fewer mine than it did in 2012 and reported that the Irish Defence Forces use live anti-personnel mines in the development and validation of mine render safe procedures, in training personnel in these procedures, in testing and validating mechanical mine clearance equipment and in training of personnel in the use of such equipment. In addition, Ireland indicated that minimum metal content mines are used, as required, in the calibration and testing of mine detection equipment.

17. Italy reported ten fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that warfare mines are used for bomb dispositions and pioneers training courses. Japan reported 258 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that in 2012 anti-personnel mines were used for education and training in mine detection and mine clearance, and research and development of mine clearance equipment. In addition, Japan indicated that in 2013, it plans to use anti-personnel mines for education and training in mine detection and mine clearance. Jordan reported 60 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Lithuania reported 1,183 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that the mines are fitted with command-controlled fuses. Mozambique reported 320 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that 98 of these mines are inert without explosives and detonators.

18. The Netherlands reported 80 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Peru reported 25 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Slovenia reported two fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Spain reported eight fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Sweden reported 164 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Thailand reported 24 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012, and that in 2012, the Thailand Mine Action Centre and the Royal Thai Army conducted a training programme for 40 individuals using 24 mines, with this course an integral part of Thailand’s continuous plan to increase the number of deminers to accelerate the mine clearance operation without compromising safety. Tunisia reported 50 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. Turkey reported 109 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that mines were used during the Partnership for Peace Training Centre Mine and EOD course, featuring the participation of 761 personnel from 16 countries. In addition Turkey indicated that there are plans to use a minimum of 700 of these mines for the training of staff to be employed for mine clearance along the Syrian border and that an overall reassessment of the number of mines retained for training purposes by Turkey is being considered. Zambia reported 1,213 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 and indicated that mines were retained to prepare troops proceeding on United Nations peacekeeping missions, to familiarise staff college students in minefield layout and density and to prepare combat engineers in mine warfare. Zimbabwe reported 50 fewer anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012.
19. Cambodia reported 72 more anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012. France reported 15 more anti-personnel mines retained than it did in 2012 and indicated that its stocks of anti-personnel mines retained had increased by 111, 96 anti-personnel were destroyed during the course of 2012, including 53 anti-personnel mines destroyed in training at the Direction générale de l’armement Diving School, 36 anti-personnel mines destroyed in training at the Groupe Central d’intervention NEDEX, six anti-personnel mines destroyed by the Direction générale de l’armament and one anti-personnel mine was transferred to the Wehrtechnische Dienstelle für Waffen und Munition in Germany. South Africa reported 11 more anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012, indicating that these additional mines had been recovered during 2012. Ukraine reported 605 more anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reported 149 more anti-personnel mines than it did in 2012 indicating that the increase from 311 reported in 2012 reflected the dynamic nature of the threat on current United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland operations.

20. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have maintained under the provision of Article 3, the same number of anti-personnel mines over periods of years, and have not reported on the use of such mines for permitted purposes or on concrete plans for their use, would be encouraged to report on such use and such plans and to review whether these anti-personnel mines are needed and constitute the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes and to destroy those that are in excess of this number.

21. Algeria reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (5,970) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Bangladesh reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (12,500) that since 2007 it has reported retained. Benin did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (16) that it reported retained in 2008. Bosnia and Herzegovina did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,624) that it reported retained in 2012. Botswana did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,019) that it reported retained in 2012. Bulgaria reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,672) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Burundi reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (four) that since 2008 it has reported retained. Cameroon did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,885) that it reported retained in 2009.

22. Canada reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,921) that since 2011 it has reported retained. Cape Verde did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (120) that it reported retained in 2009. Colombia reported that it had destroyed all 586 mines that it had previously indicated had been retained. Congo did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (322) that it reported retained in 2009. Cyprus reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (500) that since 2010 it has reported retained.

23. Djibouti did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (2,996) that it reported in 2005. Ethiopia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (303) that it reported in 2012. Gambia reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (100) that since 2012 it has reported retained. Greece reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (6,158) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Guinea-Bissau did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (nine) that it reported retained in 2011. Honduras did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (826) that it reported retained in 2007. Indonesia reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,454) that since 2010 it has reported retained. Kenya did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,000) that it reported retained 2008.
24. Mali did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (600) that it reported in 2005. Mauritania did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (728) that it reported in 2012. Namibia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,634) that it reported in 2010. Nicaragua did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (448) that it reported in 2011. Nigeria did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,364) that it reported in 2012. Portugal reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (694) that since 2011 it has reported retained. Romania reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,500) that since 2004 it has reported retained.

25. Rwanda did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (65) that it reported in 2008. Senegal reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (37) that since 2012 it has reported retained. Serbia reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,149) that since 2012 it has reported retained. Slovakia did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,272) that it reported in 2012. Sudan did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,938) that it reported in 2012 [to be confirmed]. United Republic of Tanzania did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,272) that it reported in 2012. Togo did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (436) that it reported in 2004. Uganda did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (260) that it reported in 2008. Yemen reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,760) that since 2012 it has reported retained.

26. Côte d’Ivoire provided new information by indicating that it retained 290 more anti-personnel mines. Finland provided information indicating that it decided to retain 16,500 anti-personnel mines that will be transferred on a yearly basis to the Finnish Defence training organisations. Somalia provided information by indicating that it does not retain anti-personnel mines for the purposes permitted under Article 3 and should it decide to do so in the future, it would report on the numbers and types retained and the entities authorized to retain such mines as well as on the plans for actual and future use and explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained anti-personnel mines.

27. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, Bulgaria and New Zealand, wrote to States Parties to encourage them to make use of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention on 20 and 24 May 2013 to volunteer updated information on mines retained for permitted purposes under Article 3. The Co-Chairs expressed an interest in hearing from States Parties their reasons for increasing or decreasing quantities of retained mines and in hearing from States Parties that have reported the same numbers of mines retained for a number of years without having yet volunteered information on the purposes for which these mines have been retained and on plans for their use. The invitation to provide updates was seized by 12 States Parties.

28. The Article 7 Contact Group Coordinator continued raising awareness on the importance of reporting and exchanging information and recalled the objectives contained in the roadmap for better reporting: by the Third Review Conference, all initial reports should have been submitted and all States Parties with key obligations to implement should have provided updated information. The Article 7 Contact Group and its Coordinator continued consultations and discussions on the development of tools to facilitate reporting and encouraged all interested States Parties to take part in the process.
(c) Measures to ensure compliance

29. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not developed national implementation measures will, as a matter of urgency, develop and adopt legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9, to fulfil their Convention obligations under this Article and thereby contributing to full compliance with the Convention. At the close of the 12MSP, there were 63 States Parties that had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 and there were 35 States Parties that had reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient in the context of Article 9. The remaining 60 States Parties had not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 or that they considered that existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention.

30. Since the 12MSP, three States for which the Convention recently entered into force, Finland, Poland and Somalia, did not report either having adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 or indicated that they considered existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. In addition, Bhutan indicated that with regards to national legislation, the Bhutan Civil and Criminal procedure code contains relevant provisions which would adequately cover implementation of the Convention for the time being. There are now 63 States Parties that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9, 36 States Parties that have reported that they consider existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention and 62 States Parties have not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 or that they consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. (See APLC/MSP.13/2013/WP.8, annex III.)

31. It was recalled that in the Cartagena Action Plan it was agreed that all States Parties will, in case of alleged or known non-compliance with the Convention, work together with the States Parties concern to resolve the matter expeditiously in a manner consistent with Article 8.1. In acting upon this commitment, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention (Bulgaria and New Zealand) wrote to both Cambodia and Thailand to express their gratitude for their longstanding commitment to comply with the Convention and to note that they were encouraged that landmine removal is on the agenda of a Cambodia-Thailand Joint Working Group. In this context, the Co-Chairs invited Cambodia and Thailand to share with other States Parties information on how joint efforts were proceeding to clear mines along their common border.

32. Cambodia responded to the Co-Chairs’ invitation, indicating that pursuant to the International Court of Justice’s (ICJ) Order for Provisional Measures, dated 18 July 2011 and based on the result of discussion of the Eighth Meeting of the General Border Committee (GBC) in Phnom Penh on 21 December 2011, the Joint Working Group had held three meetings (Bangkok on 3-5 April 2012, Phnom Penh on 26-28 June 2012 and Bangkok on 17-19 December 2012). Cambodia further indicated that the ninth meeting of the General Border Committee (GBC) was held in Bangkok from 15-17 May 2013, that the meeting focused on general cooperation along and across the borders of Cambodia and Thailand, including mine action cooperation, and that the meeting maintained that both sides agreed to encourage Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) and Thai Mine Action Centre (TMAC) as well as relevant authorities of both countries to determine the priority areas along the common border for de-mining cooperation under the framework of the Joint Boundary Commission. Cambodia added regarding the demining in the areas adjacent to PreahVihear temple, that both governments have given an approval to task CMAC and TMAC to jointly conduct de-mining based on a Joint Demining Plan, details of which Cambodia shared with the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention. Cambodia further noted that CMAC and TMAC had planned to meet at the end of June 2013 in Thailand to consolidate a
deployment plan. Cambodia subsequently reported that this was delayed until further notice.

33. Thailand welcomed, in particular, the outcomes of the 9th Meeting of the General Border Committee (GBC), chaired by both countries’ Defense Ministers and indicated that it is also looking forward to the next meeting between Thailand Mine Action Center (TMAC) and Cambodia Mine Action Centre (CMAC). Thailand expressed the hope that the two countries will work together even more closely in the area of mine action and that this constructive approach will lead to the possibility of joint demining along Thai-Cambodia border in the future.

34. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention wrote to Sudan to recall that in 2012 the International Campaign to Ban Landmines had brought to the States Parties’ attention allegations of the use of anti-personnel mines in Sudan in 2011 and 2012. The Co-Chairs invited Sudan to share with information on any investigations that have been carried out and on their results and any related legal proceedings. No information was provided.

35. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention wrote to Turkey to thank Turkey for having kept the States Parties informed regarding previous concerns about compliance on its territory and to note that their understanding from recent news reports was that a court verdict had now been rendered with respect to one such concern and that a senior military officer had been convicted in a case that concerns Turkish soldiers killed and injured by mines planted by the Turkish armed forces. Given this development, the Co-Chairs invited Turkey to share this news and related details. The Co-Chairs also suggested that, if it was the case that anti-personnel mines were used by the Turkish armed forces, Turkey may wish to clarify what additional legal, administrative and other steps are being taken to prevent a repetition of any such prohibited activities in the future.

36. Turkey responded to the Co-Chairs’ invitation by indicating that further to certain allegations in the Turkish media with regard to an explosion which claimed the lives of soldiers in the Cukurca Province of Turkey in April 2009, an investigation was initiated with the matter subsequently brought before the Turkish General Staff Military Court. Turkey further indicated that on 19 April 2013 the court rendered its verdict and sentenced a Turkish Brigadier General to 6 years and 8 months of imprisonment due to causing death and injury by negligence. Turkey noted that this was the initial verdict of the court of first instance, not the final decision, with the verdict open to an appeal process. Turkey committed to share with the States Parties further developments in due course.

37. Turkey also responded to the Co-Chairs’ invitation by indicating that another allegation that had appeared in the press on a possible use of a M2A4 type mine in the Sirnak Province on 9 April 2009 has also been addressed in a careful and in-depth manner. Turkey further indicated that a detailed investigation was undertaken which concluded that that there had not been an explosion and that the registry of Turkish Armed Forces showed that the mine allegedly in question was destroyed before the end of 2009, together with the stockpiled ones. Turkey also added that it is aware of news in the Turkish press regarding an explosion on 1 May 2013 and that it is currently being investigated. Turkey added that, as in other cases, any possible developments will be shared with the ISU and the States Parties in due course.

38. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention wrote to Yemen to recall that in 2012 the ICBL had brought to the States Parties’ attention allegations concerning the emplacement of anti-personnel mines at the Ministry of Industry building in Sana’a in 2011. The Co-Chairs invited Yemen to share information on the possible new use of anti-personnel mines, noting that any new use of
anti-personnel mines would be in contravention of one of the main provisions of the Convention – that anti-personnel mines shall not be used under any circumstances. The Co-Chairs also suggested that if such use is confirmed, they would encourage Yemen to share with States Parties efforts Yemen is undertaking to prosecute those involved and to take steps to prevent any additional prohibited activities from being undertaken in Yemen.

39. Several States Parties expressed deep concern about recent reports on use allegations concerning States Parties of the Convention. Particular concern was expressed with respect to reports of the use of anti-personnel mines in Yemen. Concerning this case, the 12MSP President reported that he had acted on States Parties’ obligations under Article 8.1 of the Convention “to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance,” meeting with Yemen’s delegation and expressing that the response by Yemen should contain the following six aspects: an immediate investigation into the use of anti-personnel mines in the area in question; the identification and prosecution those responsible for deploying anti-personnel mines; the identification of the source of the anti-personnel mines and how these mines were obtained, particularly given that Yemen had long ago reported the destruction of all stocks; the destruction of any additional stocks discovered and the clearance of the mined areas in question as soon as possible; action, as soon as possible, to prevent and suppress any possible future violation of the Convention; and, all of these matters being undertaken in an extremely timely and transparent matter. Yemen responded to this matter by reaffirming its commitment to full compliance with the Convention and by informing the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that Yemen will conduct a thorough investigation.

40. Canada informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that two Canadian citizens were criminally charged in March 2013 on numerous weapons-related offenses, after an illegal arms cache, which included landmines, was found at their private home in Canada. Canada indicated that while it was not able to comment further as the matter was still before the courts, the case demonstrates the effectiveness of the mechanisms which Canada has put in place to prosecute those who breach Convention obligations. Canada committed to report on the outcome of the case at the next meeting under the Convention, as appropriate.

41. Since the 12MSP, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) continued fulfilling the Secretary-General of the United Nations’ responsibility to prepare and update a list of names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts designated for fact finding missions authorised in accordance with Article 8.8. Since the 12MSP, […] provided new or updated information for the list of experts.

(d) Implementation Support

42. In adopting the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU”, the 10MSP agreed that the ISU shall “report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference, and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate.” At the 30 May 2013 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Director of the ISU provided a written and oral report. The report recorded the lengthy set of activities consistent with this mandate and the ISU’s 2013 work plan, and provided highlights of work undertaken by the ISU during the first five months of 2013.

43. With respect to its substantive efforts, in 2013 the ISU carried out its activities in accordance with its 2013 work plan and budget, which was adopted by the 12MSP. The ISU provided advice to State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance (including in-country support to States Parties regarding Article 5 implementation and applying the understandings adopted by the States Parties on victim assistance), assisting
States Parties in maximising participation in the Convention’s implementation processes, providing strategic direction to Co-Chairs and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, supporting the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests, supporting States Parties in preparing transparency reports, leading seminars and providing training on understanding the Convention and its operations, supporting the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalization efforts, providing advice on applying the lessons learned from implementing the Convention, supporting the 13MSP President-Designate and the Third Review Conference President-Designate, continuing to serve as the authoritative source of information on the Convention and maintaining the Convention’s Documentation Centre.

44. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would provide necessary financial resources for the effective operation of the Implementation Support Unit. In January 2013, the President used targeted fundraising appeals to complement common appeals which had been traditionally distributed to all States Parties. As of 9 September, contributions in support of the Implementation Support Unit’s 2013 work plan were received from the following States Parties: Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway and Turkey. As well, the following States Parties had made written commitments to contribute to the Implementation Support Unit’s 2013 work plan: Italy and Mexico.

45. In addition to carrying out its core work plan, the Implementation Support Unit executed other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, when additional funds were made available to fully fund these efforts. When funding previously received from Australia, the Implementation Support Unit continued work on two research projects related to victim assistance. The first initiative is examining the role of mine action programmes and national authorities in victim assistance, particularly with regard to the sustainability of efforts. The second initiative is advancing research undertaken by the Implementation Support Unit in 2011 on the role of development assistance in supporting victim assistance. In addition, the Implementation Support Unit received funding from Australia to carry out targeted implementation and universalization support efforts in the Pacific and to support Thailand in convening a June 2013 symposium on cooperation and assistance. As well, in December 2012, the Implementation Support Unit concluded administrative arrangements necessary to begin implementation of an European Union Council Decision in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Action Plan. This Council Decision involves the ISU supporting States Parties in fulfilling various Cartagena Action Plan commitments related to mine clearance, victim assistance and universalization.

46. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) on implementation support, the GICHD continued its roles in hosting the ISU as well as hosting the intersessional work programme and supporting the sponsorship programme. On 3 May 2013, Director of the GICHD provided the 12MSP President with a report on the agreement, with this report made available to all States Parties on the Convention’s website.

47. In keeping with established tradition, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention undertook the task of consulting with States Parties to identify a list of nominees to serve as new Co-Chairs following the 13MSP. On 11 March 2013, the Co-Chairs wrote to all States Parties to indicate that they were seeking one new State Party for each of the five Standing Committees. At the 27 May 2013 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the
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Convention, the Co-Chairs again reminded delegations of their written appeal. [On the basis of interest expressed to the Co-Chairs and consultations with interested delegations, the Co-Chairs proposed a set of five new States Parties which were elected at the 13MSP to serve two-year terms.]

48. At the 10MSP, the States Parties endorsed recommendations which included that “the States Parties should keep an open mind to how to restructure the week of meetings of the Standing Committees to ensure its on-going effectiveness.”

Pursuant to this, the meetings of the Standing Committees in 2013 were organized to last only four days. In addition, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance convened a parallel technical workshop on child mine victims.

49. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to support the efforts of the President and Coordinating Committee to ensure effective preparations and conduct of meetings of the Convention.

Since the 12MSP, the Coordinating Committee met […] times to fulfil its mandate to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the 13MSP.

50. At the 10MSP, the States Parties endorsed recommendations which included that “the States Parties, and in particular States Parties that are party to more than one related instrument, should pursue coherence in the scheduling of meetings of relevant instruments, particularly those meetings that deal with the clearance of explosive hazards and assistance to the victims of conventional weapons” and that “the States Parties should regularly evaluate the potential for synergy in the work of various related instruments, while acknowledging the distinct legal obligations of each.”

On the basis of discussion at the 30 May 2013 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Co-Chairs concluded that there was a strong support for the Coordinating Committees of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) aiming to schedule the intersessional meetings of each Convention during the same week in 2014. At the 3 July 2013 meeting of the Coordinating Committee, on the basis of a discussion of the idea of scheduling meetings of the Convention during the last 2.5 days of the week of 7 April 2014, the Chair concluded that the optimal proposal would be to see that intersessional work would take place the afternoon of 9 April, that a second preparatory meeting in advance of the Third Review Conference would take place all day on 10 April, and that additional intersessional work could take place on 11 April subject to the Coordinating Committee considering what, if any, additional intersessional work may be required given the short period of time between the Thirteenth Meeting of the States Parties and the Third Review Conference. It was noted that the approach to intersessional work to take place between the 13MSP and the Third Review Conference would be without prejudice to how the States Parties may wish to organize their meeting programme following the Third Review Conference.

51. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would contribute to the Sponsorship Programme thereby permitting widespread representation at meetings of the Convention, particularly by mine-affected developing States Parties. In 2013, the following States Parties contributed to the Australian coordinated Sponsorship Programme: […] At the May 2013 meetings of the Standing
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Committees, […] representatives of […] States Parties were sponsored. At the 13MSP, […] representatives of […] States Parties were sponsored as were […] representatives of […] States not parties. In 2013, the Sponsorship Programme again helped enable States Parties live up to the commitment they made at the Cartagena Summit to ensure the continued involvement and effective contribution in all relevant Convention related activities by health, rehabilitation, social services, education, employment, gender and disability rights experts.

52. Since the 12MSP, the States Parties, in keeping with their Cartagena Summit commitment, continued to recognise and further encourage the full participation in and contribution to the implementation of the Convention by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Committee of the Red Cross, national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and their International Federation, the United Nations, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, international and regional organisations, mine survivors and their organisations, and other civil society organisations.10

10 Cartagena Action Plan, action #62.