

**Third Review Conference of the States Parties to
the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use,
Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of
Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction**

23 June 2014

Original: English

Maputo, 23–27 June 2014

Item 7 of the agenda

Review of the operation and status of the Convention

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, 2010–2014**

Part IV

Submitted by the President of the Third Review Conference

Cooperation and assistance

1. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recognised that the need for partnerships to achieve the aims of the Convention had become more important than ever. They expressed the view that strong national ownership is essential for ensuring that cooperation can flourish and developed a clear understanding of what national ownership means. In addition, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties recorded that ensuring sufficient resources exist and seeing that available resources meet well expressed needs by States Parties demonstrating strong ownership over their implementation efforts may be the most significant challenge facing the States Parties during the period 2010 to 2014.

2. To address this and related challenges, over one-quarter of the commitments agreed to in the Cartagena Action Plan concerned international cooperation and assistance¹. In acting upon this clear expression of interest in reinvigorating international cooperation and assistance in the life of the Convention, and, paying particular regard to the commitment made at the Cartagena to ensure that the Convention and its informal mechanisms include and provide a specific and effective framework for identifying needs and mobilising national and international resources to meet these needs, the President of the Second Review Conference placed a high priority on this matter in 2010.² With the cooperation of the Co-Chairs, the President convened a special session on international cooperation and

¹ Cartagena Action Plan, actions #34 through #52. In addition, part of action #28 concerns cooperation and assistance.

² Cartagena Action Plan, action #48.

GE.14-06946 (E)



* 1 4 0 6 9 4 6 *

Please recycle 



assistance during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in June 2010 as well as an experts' workshop on this matter in May 2010. Numerous important points were raised at this special session which provided the States Parties with a rich agenda on cooperation and assistance for possible follow up.

3. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted the need for two distinct discussions – one that concerns Article 5 implementation and one that concerns victim assistance. It was noted that while both matters belong to the larger family of mine action, mine clearance and victim assistance have different timelines, involve distinct national and international actors and relate to different national institutional and regulatory frameworks and budget lines. It was further noted that the whole notion of mine action as an integrated field of practice may have hampered attempts to utilise available resources in the most effective manner. In addition, it was noted that there is a need for an increased focus on results in addition to demands for increased efficiency and effectiveness.

4. With respect to enhancing international cooperation and assistance as concerns victim assistance, it was recalled that victim assistance is the most complex and challenging issue for the States Parties and it is fundamentally distinct from the collection of activities referred to as humanitarian demining. It was also recalled that at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties recognised that guaranteeing the rights and addressing the needs of mine victims requires a long term commitment and that this involves sustained political, financial and material commitments, both made by affected States themselves and through international cooperation and assistance, in accordance with Article 6 obligations. It was further recalled that three actions in the Cartagena Action Plan's cooperation and assistance section relate specifically to assisting the victims.³

5. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted a number of issues and opportunities concerning victim assistance:

(a) It was recalled that the ultimate responsibility of guaranteeing the rights and meeting the needs of landmine victims within a particular state rests with that state. Within a particular affected State, we must appreciate that victim assistance-related activities concern a wide range of ministries and agencies responsible for health, social affairs, labour, education, transport, justice, planning, finance, and possibly others. In States in a position to assist, the main actors are usually development agencies and ministries that engage in international cooperation efforts. However, within these agencies, there could be multiple relevant sub actors, including those responsible for bilateral development assistance or for providing assistance through multilateral entities; it was noted that States Parties in a position to assist include any State Party that has any form of assistance that it could offer to another to help in improving its response to landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities. It was highlighted that cooperation and assistance is not only about financial resources, with the provision of technical support, support for national capacity building and contributions of equipment and supplies all considered important;

(b) It was noted that in addition to all States Parties potentially being in a position to fulfil Article 6.3 obligations, other actors such as international organisations play a key role in generating resources or implementing programmes and that, like States, these organisations can be complex with several aspects of the work of any particular organisation being relevant to what the States Parties consider "assisting the victims". It was also noted that associations of landmine survivors and disabled persons organisations are important stakeholders in victim assistance-related activities, as are other non-well

³ Cartagena Action Plan, actions #39, #41 and #46.

known members of the Convention community, others that are actively involved at the national level working on disability and/or development issues may not see themselves as working on what the States Parties define as “victim assistance”. It was suggested that in order to better understand the scope of services available in affected States, a comprehensive mapping of all actors involved in services relevant to “assisting the victims” is needed;

(c) It was highlighted that with respect to victim assistance there is no clarity on the true magnitude of what is provided by States Parties in a position to assist because the bulk of what is made available for activities considered consistent with “assisting the victims” is not captured in any assessment of mine action funding. It was noted that the bulk of what is provided is through bilateral cooperation between States to enhance healthcare systems, physical rehabilitation programmes, mental health services, the exercise of rights by persons with disabilities, et cetera. In this regard, it was suggested that a dialogue on enhanced cooperation and assistance on victim assistance could itself be enhanced if those giving and receiving development assistance, including core budget support, could provide greater clarity regarding the true magnitude of the effort being made to assist States in developing the responses necessary to meet the rights and needs of all individuals who are injured or who live with disabilities;

(d) It was noted that while the vast majority of resources to support activities considered consistent with “assisting the victims” undoubtedly flows through development cooperation, the States Parties had previously recorded that more than US\$ 232 million had been reported invested between 2004 and 2009 in support of emergency medical care, physical rehabilitation and other assistance carried out by international service providers such as the ICRC including in some instances with national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Handicap International, other NGOs and relevant UN agencies. It was suggested that a dialogue on cooperation and assistance and the further mobilisation of resources could benefit from knowing how effectively these resources have been used, how such efforts could be part of national CRPD implementation and what lessons have been learned;

(e) It was noted that while some have called for a specific percentage of mine action funding to be dedicated to victim assistance, others have pointed out that doing so may be counterproductive, in particular because this may result in diverting funds from humanitarian demining, which is one of the main activities to address the victimisation of communities in war-torn societies and to prevent additional victims. It was suggested that what is required is to gain a better understanding of the true level of need and then to fund accordingly, rather than robbing from one aspect of Convention implementation to support another;

(f) It was recalled that while the States Parties, at the Cartagena Summit, adopted an understanding regarding “national ownership” as concerns article 5 implementation, there was an opportunity to do the same in defining what the Convention community expects from affected States in terms of “national ownership” as concerns victim assistance. As noted above, at the June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance, elements for national ownership in relation to victim assistance were proposed.

6. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted a number of issues and opportunities concerning article 5 implementation:

(a) It was recalled that 32 of the 38 States Parties that must still complete implementation of article 5 obligations have indicated a need for assistance in fulfilling their obligations and that the gap between projected needs and anticipated contributions poses several challenges in for the effort to ensure compliance by these States Parties;

(b) It was acknowledged that States Parties and mine clearance operators have come far in their understanding of the challenges posed by the obligation to clear all mined areas, that impressive progress has been made in making mine clearance more efficient and effective, and that the amount of area cleared or otherwise released in recent years has increased substantially. It was noted that, while many States Parties have not yet defined the precise locations of mined areas despite massive investments made in surveys, there is a great potential for increasing productivity by employing the full range of methods previously recognised by the States Parties to release suspected hazardous areas. It was also noted that there is scope to increase efficiency across the breadth of the humanitarian demining sector;

(c) It was suggested that the definition of national ownership as concerns Article 5 implementation which was adopted at the Cartagena Summit, along with the relevant commitments made in the Cartagena Action Plan, provide the States Parties with a roadmap for the practical implementation of Article 6 in support of mine clearance, with this including the following components:

- (i) claiming national ownership;
- (ii) identifying the task;⁴
- (iii) mapping the resources needed to address the task;⁵
- (iv) communicating the needs for international cooperation and assistance;⁶
- (v) making the case for assistance;⁷
- (vi) responding to the needs;⁸ and
- (vii) seeking peer support;⁹

(d) It was noted that while mapping financial requests for and contributions to mine clearance may draw attention to a problem in a manner that is easy to communicate, it does not provide information that can help determine how needs in affected States Parties can be matched with relevant resources. It was suggested that meaningful discussions on Article 6 as concerns Article 5 implementation must have a broader scope than just money and move towards a better understanding of what effective and efficient international cooperation entails.

7. While time did not permit a discussion on stockpile destruction during the June 2010 special session on cooperation and assistance, it remained clear in 2010 that addressing questions related to cooperation and assistance were central to ensuring that two States Parties could fulfil their article 4 obligations. It was recalled that as these two States Parties had sought assistance in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 1, the matter of ensuring compliance on the part of both is the business of all States Parties.

8. At the Cartagena Summit, Zambia, with the support of other actors, proposed that a new Standing Committee be established to address the challenges related to international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention. Support for this proposal was expressed by several delegations at the June 2010 special session on cooperation and assistance. Zambia elaborated on this proposal at the Tenth Meeting of the State Parties,

⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, action #14.

⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, action #34.

⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, action #35.

⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, actions #35 and #50.

⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, action #37 and #38.

⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, action #36.

calling for the establishment of a new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance in order to exchange information and develop plans and strategies to ensure: (a) adequate and predictable levels of human, technical and financial support for mine action from affected States and the donor community (resource mobilization); and, (b) the efficient and effective use of resources (resource utilization).¹⁰ In response to this proposal, the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties established the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, to be supported like other mechanisms established by the States Parties by the Implementation Support Unit, and, to be presided over in 2011 by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, with the leadership of this Standing Committee being regularised as of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties.

9. In assuming the role of as the first Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties indicated that his aim was to advance the cooperation and assistance agenda that was spelled out in 2010 at the special sessions on cooperation and assistance which were held both in June 2010 and at the Tenth Meeting. With a view to advancing the Convention's cooperation and assistance agenda as concerns victim assistance, the Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance convened an international symposium in Albania from 30 May to 1 June 2011. The purpose of the Tirana Symposium was to follow up on the recognition made in 2010 of the need for two distinct discussions – one that concerns Article 5 implementation and one that concerns victim assistance. It was again noted that while both matters belong to the larger family of mine action, mine clearance and victim assistance have different timelines, involve distinct national and international actors and relate to different national institutional and regulatory frameworks and budget lines.

10. All States Parties and relevant organisations were invited to the Tirana Symposium with approximately 100 delegates from every corner of the world taking part in the event. The Tirana Symposium dealt with opportunities presented by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) to enhance victim assistance-related efforts. It was noted that the States Parties are fortunate to have experts who work largely outside of the Convention community sharing how Article 32 of the CRPD spells out measures concerning international cooperation and assistance. These experts represent organisations such as the United Nations Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Disability Alliance and the International Disability and Development Alliance. It was noted that they, along with the ICBL, have helped the States Parties increase their understanding of how the CRPD can assist in our cooperation and assistance efforts as concerns victim assistance.

11. The Tirana Symposium also dealt with the role of development cooperation as concerns victim assistance. It was recalled that development agencies likely are responsible for the bulk of what truly amounts to resources for victim assistance-related efforts, even if this is not captured in surveys of mine action assistance. Through research prepared by the Implementation Support Unit, it was illustrated that the wealth of data already provided by OECD DAC Member States may be a good starting point in understanding the broader magnitude of efforts as concerns health care and human rights. It was also noted that the States Parties' acceptance of the concept of inclusive development meant that ultimately development assistance in its entirety should take disability into account. This point was well demonstrated at the Tirana Symposium through presentations delivered by representatives of the Austrian and Australian development agencies.

¹⁰ Final Report of the 2010 Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, annex IV.

12. The Tirana Symposium also dealt with national capacity and national ownership. Albanian experts, as well as those from Handicap International and the ICRC, highlighted that support for national capacity building is essential for sustainability and accessibility and that capacity building is a long term activity, that it is multifaceted and that multi-year financial commitments are essential. It was also recognised that national ownership is essential to the long-term sustainability of victim assistance-related activities.

13. The final topic dealt with at the Tirana Symposium was the importance of peer support and psycho-social rehabilitation. It was recalled that at the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recorded that “psychological support, including peer support, is necessary in the immediate aftermath of (an) accident and may be needed at different times throughout the lifetime of the survivor.”¹¹ Experts from three continents participating in the symposium helped increase understanding of the main elements of and challenges to delivering psychosocial assistance, shared the benefits of peer-to-peer programmes, and highlighted an example of bilateral cooperation between two affected States on psycho-social support.

14. The Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance provided an opportunity during the Standing Committee’s 24 June 2011 meeting for delegations to explore, in greater detail, two topics identified in 2010: partnerships and coordination, and, ensuring a high level of efficiency in cooperation and assistance. With respect to partnerships and coordination, it was recalled that in 2010 the recognition was made that coordination of assistance and cooperation is a central aspect of national ownership and that, the emphasis should be on partner responsibilities rather than donor priorities. At the Standing Committee meeting, the Chair called upon two States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 – Cambodia and Mozambique – along with key partners to illustrate key lessons concerning partnership and coordination.

15. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, it was illustrated how a mine-affected, developing country and its development partners together recognised the need for adequate coordination and national ownership and what steps have been taken in Cambodia to enhance both of these aspects. The Cambodian case highlighted the importance of measures taken such as the establishment of a national authority to lead, coordinate and regulate the mine action sector and the adoption of national mine action standards (NMAS) as a single strategic framework for policy and assistance coordination. The Cambodian case also provided an example of the introduction of “Partnership Principles”, which in a manner consistent with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, reaffirms development partners’ respect for national ownership and leadership, commits development partners to support capacity development, and, requires development partners to align their support with Cambodian NMAS and consult the government on project / programme formulation.

16. At the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, the case of cooperation between Mozambique and Norway also illustrated how the principles of the Paris Declaration are being applied through a partnership arrangement that concerns itself with Article 5 implementation. Mozambique and Norway provided an example of how cooperating States Parties can establish a framework that, in focusing in an unwavering manner on Article 5 implementation, reinforces national ownership, respects national priorities, and, provides the assurance of multi-year support.

17. With respect to ensuring a high level of efficiency in cooperation and assistance, at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and

¹¹ Final Report of the 2009 Second Review Conference, part II: Review of the operation and status of the Convention: 2005-2009, paragraph 142.

Assistance, the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) gave an update on the numerous steps it has taken to improve the expedient and efficient flow of funding through the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Mine Action, provided an example of how this has worked well, and highlighted possible variables within and external to the United Nations system that may affect the timely flow of support. In addition, the ICBL drew attention to inefficiencies in the expenditure of funds related to Article 5 implementation, recommended to donors that their efforts are consistent with national priorities and ensure a timely flow of funds, and, called for accountability on the part of implementing partners. The ICBL also highlighted that the size, structure and placement of coordinating mechanisms should reflect actual needs. In addition, the ICBL noted that many efficiency issues they have raised touch upon the role of the United Nations and, in this regard, expressed appreciation for a constructive dialogue that has started in recent months between non-governmental organisations and the United Nations.

18. Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, a number of delegations raised topics related to cooperation and assistance that may be pursued by the Standing Committee in the future. These included: identifying and prioritising mine action resource requirements; identifying and promoting mine action resources including from non-traditional sources (such as the private sector); identifying and promoting mechanisms, approaches and best practice models for coordinated global and national level mine action assistance; promoting and supporting national ownership and coordination of mine action programs; identifying, promoting and sharing knowledge and experience on effective cooperation and assistance; exploring possible limitations to mainstreaming mine action into development budgets; exploring the possibility of establishing new funding mechanisms; examining ways to better exchange information on the availability of equipment, technical expertise and best practices; and, examining in more detail South-South cooperation.

19. Also at the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, Thailand recalled the proposals it had suggested at the Cartagena Summit to develop a concept paper on explore the idea of the establishment of a trust fund for implementation and to establish a database mechanism regarding available assistance. It further recalled that possibility of requesting the ISU to take on these tasks. A number of delegations expressed support for Thailand's proposals. The Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties took note of and encouraged action on the concrete ideas suggested by the in-coming Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (Albania and Thailand) as well as by others, to make the best possible use of this new Standing Committee.

20. In 2012, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance used a small-group format to provide an interactive forum for in-depth discussion on the possibility of developing an information exchange tool. With respect to this, it was recalled that at the 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, Thailand stated that, while financial assistance is very much needed and appreciated, other types of non-financial assistance – such as material, equipment, expertise, et cetera – are also essential, and that a tool to exchange information on these other types of assistance may be beneficial. To frame the discussion, the Co-Chairs asked participants to consider three questions: If an information exchange tool was to be established, what information should it contain? How should it be organized? What experiences have actors had in accessing information about available funding, technical support, or other forms of cooperation and assistance for implementation? What are the gaps in information about available assistance?

21. In terms of perceived gaps in available information and suggestions for information to be contained in an information exchange tool, it was noted that all States Parties are

potential contributors and therefore any information exchange tool should house information on the assistance that any State Party may be in a position to provide. Additional information on available financial assistance may be desirable, but a key aim of the information exchange tool should be to serve as a place where those with needs can search for the full range of possible assistance, including technical support and equipment. “Match-making” could be facilitated by the information tool containing national contact points. Information contained should facilitate “south-south” cooperation, including the availability of financial resources necessary to fuel such cooperation. While the pre-occupation with information on available resources appears to relate mainly to Article 5 implementation, victim assistance should be included in any information exchange tool.

22. In terms of ways and means of developing an information exchange tool, the means suggested most frequently by discussion participants was an internet tool, with many suggesting that it need not be a complicated endeavour. It was noted that the more complex this effort was, the more expensive it may be. Some suggested that the ISU could house such an information tool as part of the Convention’s existing website. Some suggested that the information tool could simply link to other sites, while others suggested that to make it more user-friendly the information tool itself should house information.

23. On the basis of the discussion, the Co-Chairs sought to investigate with the Implementation Support Unit the development an information exchange tool on a trial basis with an evaluation made after a certain period of time, including by drawing up data related to the number of visits and types of information accessed. The Co-Chairs acknowledged that in proceeding, care would have to be taken to fill an actual information gap and not duplicate the wealth of existing on-line and other information sources, including Landmine Monitor and Article 7 reports. Also with respect to preventing duplication, it was noted, as concerns victim assistance, efforts should be made to liaise with those supporting the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities given the central place of cooperation and assistance in that instrument.

24. In the second half of 2012, at the request of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance and in the context of the commitment of the States Parties in Action #36 of the Cartagena Action Plan to promote technical cooperation, information exchange on good practices and other forms of mutual assistance with other affected States Parties to take advantage of the knowledge and expertise acquired in the course of fulfilling their obligations, the Implementation Support Unit established the *Platform for Partnerships* information exchange tool as part of the Convention’s existing website.¹² The Twelfth Meeting of the State Parties welcomed the initiative of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance in developing, on a trial basis, this tool on assistance available to support the implementation of the Convention and encouraged States Parties to make use of this tool.

25. In 2013, 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. The Co-Chairs again 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. In 2014, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (Ecuador and Indonesia)

¹² <http://www.apminebanconvention.org/platform-for-partnerships/> CHECK THIS

announced that they were extending the trial phase of the *Platform for Partnerships* until the Third Review Conference.

26. In 2012, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (Albania and Thailand) focused attention on options of trust funds to ensure the continuity of resources. The Co-Chairs commissioned the Implementation Support Unit to prepare a discussion paper entitled “Exploring the options of trust funds to ensure the continuity of resources”, which was presented to the Standing Committee on 25 May 2012.¹³ In response, many States Parties, while expressing the view that there was no need to establish a new trust fund, agreed with the paper’s conclusion that a great deal of potential exists with respect to mechanisms that are already in place or that could easily come into being at the national level. It was highlighted that the States Parties are, with few exceptions, all Member States of the United Nations and have the opportunity to voice their preferences with regarding to existing UN mechanisms. It was further highlighted that States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention make up a majority of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and therefore could help ensure that a sound link is made between these instruments once the UN Partnership to promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Multi-Donor Trust Fund becomes operational. In addition, it was highlighted that the international community as a whole has largely embraced the international aid effectiveness agenda and could do what it can to relate demining and victim assistance with national development strategies and cooperation programmes, and the funds established to implement them.

27. In follow-up to the 2012 discussion on regarding the pros and cons of existing or possible new funding mechanisms, in 2013 the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and 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 United Nations 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.

28. The UNOHCHR 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.

29. With a view to continuing to enhance cooperation and assistance under the Convention, particularly in light of the Convention’s 2014 Third Review Conference, in 2013, 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

¹³ <http://www.apminebanconvention.org/fileadmin/pdf/mbc/IWP/SC-may12/Discussion-papers/SC-May2012-e-Trust-Funds-Draft.pdf>

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.

30. In the Cartagena Action Plan, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will support the national efforts of those States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs to develop their capacities to provide assistance to mine victims and other persons with disabilities by providing where possible multi-year financial, material or technical assistance in response to the priorities of the affected State to facilitate long-term planning, implementation and monitoring of victim assistance-related activities.¹⁴ In the context of this commitment, since the Cartagena Summit the States Parties continued to note the importance of a complementary twin-track approach to victim assistance, 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.

¹⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, action #39.

31. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties committed to make their needs known to other States Parties and relevant organisations if they require financial, technical or other forms of international cooperation and assistance to meet obligations.¹⁵ In addition, States Parties with obligations to fulfil committed to map the national resources available to meet their obligations and their needs for international cooperation and assistance and States Parties, in a position to do so, committed to promptly assist States Parties that have communicated needs for support.¹⁶ On the basis of information provided by States Parties in their transparency reports, in updates at the meetings of the Standing Committees and through other means, the following 25 States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 of the Convention have expressed requirements for financial, technical or other forms of assistance: Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

32. At the Cartagena Summit, States Parties in a position to do so made a commitment, in the spirit of the Convention's aims, to endeavour to continue supporting States Parties that have completed their Article 5 obligations in their efforts to address the humanitarian consequences resulting from mine and other explosive remnants of war contamination.¹⁷ Since the Cartagena Summit, one State Party that has completed implementation of Article 5 – Albania – has expressed the need for assistance in addressing the needs of victims of mines and other explosive remnants of war, and one other State Party – Palau – has expressed appreciation for support it receives from States Parties for addressing its challenges related to unexploded ordnance. In addition, Zambia, which reported completion of its mine clearance obligations at the Cartagena Summit, received support from Norway for Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) to follow up on each UXO report obtained through the course of executing Zambia's 2009 landmines survey.

33. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will ensure that international cooperation and assistance, including development cooperation, is age-appropriate and gender-sensitive and inclusive of, and accessible to, persons with disabilities, including mine survivors.¹⁸ Furthermore, it was agreed that all States Parties will ensure that assistance in mine action is based on appropriate surveys, needs analysis, age-appropriate and gender-sensitive strategies and cost-effective approaches.¹⁹ Since the Cartagena Summit, it was recalled that United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted over a decade ago, emphasised "... the need for all parties to ensure that mine clearance and mine awareness programmes take into account the special needs of women and girls." In this context, it was suggested that both States Parties and the broader implementation community need to make sure that this actually happens, including moving beyond the general discussions of how to ensure that girls, boys, women and men have equal access to the resources generated through implementation of the Convention, and, by asking why progress has been so slow.

34. Since the Cartagena Summit, the United Nations developed *Gender Guidelines for Mine Action Programmes* to help mine-action policymakers and field personnel incorporate gender perspectives into all operations of mine action. In addition since the Cartagena Summit, Australia, Norway and Switzerland [CHECK THIS LIST] supported the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP), which has since the Cartagena Summit become an

¹⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, action #35.

¹⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, actions #34 and 37.

¹⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, action #40.

¹⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, action #41.

¹⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, action #52.

independent association. The GMAP has continued to support training, capacity building and advocacy activities with States Parties in order to make mine action more inclusive, non-discriminatory, accurate and effective by mainstreaming gender into all interventions. The GMAP has provided training and technical assistance on gender and mine action to mine action programmes and national authorities, operators and non-governmental organisations in several countries since the Cartagena Summit.

35. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will support the further investigation and development of technical solutions to overcome the particular challenges associated with destroying PFM mines.²⁰ Since the Cartagena Summit, Norway has assisted Ukraine and the European Union has continued its partnerships with both Ukraine and Belarus to assist these two States Parties in overcoming the unique challenges they face in the destruction of this type of anti-personnel mine.

36. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties in a position to do so will continue to support, as appropriate, mine action to assist populations in areas where armed non-State actors operate including by facilitating access for humanitarian organisations.²¹ Since the Cartagena Summit, the Geneva Call has reported that its assistance resulted in the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines and has ensured that mine risk education is being implemented according to national standards and that a physical rehabilitation project has been launched.

37. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will ensure that mine action activities of the United Nations, national and international non-governmental organizations and other actors, where relevant, are incorporated into national mine action planning frameworks and are consistent with national priorities and international obligations.²² Since the Cartagena Summit, the 14 members of the United Nations' Inter-Agency Coordination Group on Mine Action have continued to play an important role in assisting many States Parties in implementing the Convention. Moreover, in December 2012, the United Nations' Inter-Agency Coordination Group on Mine Action finalised a new United Nations mine action strategy covering the period 2013 to 2018. The strategy presents the common objectives and commitments that will guide the United Nations in mine action during this period and sees the United Nations focus its resources and priorities in mine action around four major strategic objectives. The United Nations' strategy reinforces its commitment to support affected countries and territories, especially taking into account compliance with international normative frameworks, as well as reinforcing the impact of mine action across peace and security, human rights, humanitarian and development responses.

38. Also since the Cartagena Summit, the Organisation of American States continued to play important role in assisting States Parties in implementing the Convention. In addition, the African Union and the Association of South East Asian Nations have initiated efforts to support their respective mine-affected Member States.

39. 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.²³ In a manner that relates to this commitment, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), further developed

²⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, action #42.

²¹ Cartagena Action Plan, action #43.

²² Cartagena Action Plan, action #44.

²³ Cartagena Action Plan, action #47.

its Francophone Language Outreach Programme and launched its Arabic Language Outreach Programme and Persian Language Outreach Programme.

40. 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.²⁴ As noted, since the Cartagena Summit, important amendments were made to the IMAS on land release. In addition since the Cartagena Summit, a number of other International Mine Action Standards have been developed or enhanced. As well, 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.

41. In recognition of the pivotal role of mine action in meeting the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties agreed to continue to promote the inclusion of mine action activities into ongoing development programmes, bearing in mind the international aid effectiveness agenda, and to promote the identification of mine action as a priority in local, national and international development actions, in cooperation with regional and international organisations and international financial institutions.²⁵ Since the Cartagena Summit, the GICHD continued carrying out landmines and livelihoods surveys of mine-affected communities in Afghanistan to gain a better understanding of the development outcomes stemming from demining, and to enhance the contribution that the Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA) makes towards Afghanistan's development. These surveys provided insight into the costs of explosives contamination and the benefits of mine action, and documented the type of development investments that are valued by this sample of rural communities. Partnership agreements with the Afghan Institute for Rural Development and the Central Statistics Office mean that expertise exists in the country to design implement and report on similar surveys in the future.

42. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties committed to ensure cooperation among all relevant actors to improve national and international policies and development strategies, enhance effectiveness in mine action and reduce the need to rely on international personnel.²⁶ In this context, and based on the findings of case studies, the GICHD published a policy brief which provides mine action practitioners with an outline of key messages, main issues and recommendations related to transitioning mine action programmes to full national ownership.

Transparency and the exchange of information

43. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that while it is an obligation for all States Parties to provide updated information on implementation, this is particularly important for States Parties in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4, for those States Parties in the process of clearing mined areas in accordance with Article 5, for those States Parties that are retaining anti-personnel mines for purposes permitted by Article 3 and for those undertaking measures in accordance with Article 9.

²⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #49.

²⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #50.

²⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #51.

44. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties noted that several States Parties that were in the process of implementing article 5, that have retained anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes and/or that have not yet reported having taken legal or other measures in accordance with article 9 were not up to date in providing transparency information as required. In addition, the annual transparency reporting rate has continued falling since the Cartagena Summit. Since the Cartagena Summit, States Parties agreed that renewed attention will need to be given to the ongoing fulfilment of transparency obligations. In addition, following the Second Review Conference, effective informal exchanges of information would be equally crucial.

45. Since the Cartagena Summit, States Parties have continued recognising that transparency and the open exchange of information, through both formal and informal means existing in the context of the Convention, are essential to ensuring the full implementation of the Convention. The States Parties have also recognised that the provision of accurate and high quality information can support resource mobilisation efforts and hence can contribute to the acceleration of the Convention's implementation.

46. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not submitted their initial Article 7 reports will immediately fulfil their obligation to initially submit and annually update their Article 7 transparency reports. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, all 156 States Parties that had ratified or acceded to the Convention and had been required to submit initial transparency information in accordance with Article 7 paragraph 1 of the Convention had done so to the exception of Equatorial Guinea. Since the Cartagena Summit, 5 additional States ratified or acceded to the Convention – Finland, Poland, Somalia and South Sudan and Tuvalu – all but for Tuvalu submitted an initial transparency report as required.

47. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recalled that States Parties must annually update Article 7 transparency reports. It was recorded that all but 55 States Parties obliged to provide such a report in 2009 had done so. In 2014, each State Party obliged to provide updated information did so with the exception of the following [98] States Parties: [Albania, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Republic of the, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Somalia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen and Zambia].

48. Most types of information provided by States Parties in the context of fulfilling their Article 7 obligations have been referred to elsewhere in this review. Three areas not previously covered include information related to the conversion or decommissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities, the technical characteristics of mines at one time produced or currently held by States Parties and mines retained or transferred for permitted purposes as described in Article 3.

49. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that 25 States Parties had provided information on the conversion or decommissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities. Since that time, the following information was provided by States Parties: Finland

reported that it has not produced anti-personnel mines since 1981 and the production lines were destroyed. Poland reported that it has completed ceased production of anti-personnel mines since 1988. Somalia and South Sudan reported that there are no and never have been anti-personnel mine production facilities in their respective countries.

50. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that 72 States Parties had provided information on technical characteristics of anti-personnel mines produced or currently held, giving information as may facilitate identification and clearance of anti-personnel mines. Since that time, the following four additional States Parties have provided such information, as required by Article 7, paragraph 1.h: Finland, Poland, Somalia and South Sudan.

51. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that 76 States Parties had reported, as required by Article 7, paragraph 1 d), anti-personnel mines retained for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques in accordance with Article 3. Since that time the following has transpired:

(a) The following [four] States Parties have reported for the first time that they now retain anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes: Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Finland.

(b) The following [five] States Parties which had previously reported that they had retained anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes now report that they do not retain any mines: Afghanistan, Colombia, Latvia, Luxembourg and Niger].

(c) An additional [three] States Parties have reported for the first time that they do not retain anti-personnel mines: Poland, Somalia and South Sudan.

(d) The following [three] States Parties have not yet declared whether they retain antipersonnel mines for permitted purposes: Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea and Tuvalu.

52. There are now 75 States Parties that have reported that they retain anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The number of anti-personnel mines reported retained by the States Parties is contained in annex [...].

53. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will annually report, on a voluntary basis, on the plans for and actual use of antipersonnel mines retained, explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained antipersonnel mines²⁷. Since the Cartagena Summit, Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention have continued promoting the use of their Standing Committee as a vehicle to volunteer additional information on retained anti-personnel mines. Of the 75 States Parties that retain anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes, [...] have since the Cartagena Summit provided information on the permitted use and / or results of such use as follows:

²⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, action #57.

(a) The following [...] States Parties have volunteered information on the use of retained anti-personnel mines for the training in mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques: [...].

(b) The following [...] States Parties have volunteered information on the use of retained anti-personnel mines for the development of mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques: [...]. (See annex ...).

54. At the Cartagena Summit, States Parties agreed to regularly review the number of anti-personnel mines retained to ensure that they constitute the minimum number absolutely necessary for the purposes permitted by the Convention and destroy all those exceeding that number. States Parties also agreed to encourage States Parties that have maintained 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 to report on such use and such plans.²⁸ Since the Cartagena Summit, the numbers of anti-personnel mines retained for permitted purposes by [...] States Parties have been constant.

55. States Parties have acted on the commitment they made at the Cartagena Summit to “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 sensitization in all aspects of mine action²⁹. Since the Cartagena Summit, the following States Parties made use of “Form J” to provide information on matters related to resources, cooperation and assistance:[...]. Since the Cartagena Summit, the following States Parties made use of “Form J” to provide information on victim assistance efforts and needs: [...]. Since the Cartagena Summit, the following States Parties made use of “Form J” to provide information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitisation in all aspects of mine action: [...].

56. At the Cartagena Summit, given the undertakings assumed in the Cartagena Action Plan, Belgium, as the coordinator of an informal article 7 contact group, expressed the wish to focus greater attention to the ongoing fulfilment of article 7 obligations and place the emphasis on producing high quality transparency reports. To this end, Belgium presented to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties a paper which highlighted the importance of further discussions on a number of matters concerning the Convention’s transparency provisions and the reporting process, including ways and means to increase both the reporting rate and the quality of information reported. Since the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, Belgium continued these discussions through consultations with delegations and through its ongoing efforts in coordinating the informal Article 7 Contact Group. At the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties, Belgium presented roadmap for better reporting with objectives to be achieved by the Third Review Conference, including that all initial reports should have been submitted and all States Parties with key obligations to implement should have provided updated information. In parallel, 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.

²⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, actions #56 and #58.

²⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, action #55.