

**Ninth Annual Conference  
of the High Contracting Parties to  
Amended Protocol II to the Convention  
on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use  
of Certain Conventional Weapons Which  
May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious  
or to Have Indiscriminate Effects**

2 March 2010  
English  
Original: French

---

**Geneva, 6 November 2007**

**Summary record of the 1st meeting**

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 6 November 2007, at 10 a.m.

*Temporary President:* **Mr. Caughley** (Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and  
Director of the Geneva Branch of the Office for Disarmament Affairs)

*Acting President:* **Mr. Streuli** ..... (Switzerland)

**Contents**

Opening of the Conference  
Confirmation of the nomination of the President and other officers  
Adoption of the agenda  
Confirmation of the rules of procedure  
Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference  
Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference  
Organization of work including that of any subsidiary bodies of the Conference  
General exchange of views  
Message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations  
Review of the operation and status of the Protocol  
Consideration of matters arising from reports by High Contracting Parties according to  
paragraph 4 of article 13 of amended Protocol II  
Consideration of the development of technologies to protect civilians against indiscriminate  
effects of mines

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

*The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.*

**Opening of the Conference** (item 1 of the provisional agenda)

1. **The Temporary President**, acting on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Depositary of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and the Protocols thereto, declared open the Ninth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996, annexed to the Convention.

**Confirmation of the nomination of the President and other officers** (item 2 of the provisional agenda)

2. **The Temporary President** recalled that on 11 December 2002, at their Fourth Annual Conference, the Parties had amended rule 3 of the rules of procedure (CCW/AP.II/CONF.6/2) to read: "The Conference shall elect from among the States parties participating in the Conference a President and 3 Vice-Presidents." Rule 7 had been amended to ensure balanced representation of the geographical groups.

3. The Parties had also decided in 2002 that the incoming President and Vice-Presidents would be designated at the end of each conference, in order to ensure the continuity of the preparatory work by the presidency.

4. Consequently, at the Eighth Annual Conference the Ambassador of Jordan, Mr. Mousa Burayzat, had been designated as President of the Ninth Annual Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.8/2, para. 20). The Ambassador of China, Mr. Cheng Jingye, the Ambassador of Slovakia, Mr. Anton Pinter, and the Ambassador of Switzerland, Mr. Jürg Streuli, had been designated as Vice-Presidents. He invited delegations to confirm those decisions.

5. *It was so decided.*

6. **The Temporary President** informed Conference participants that the Permanent Mission of Jordan had addressed a note verbale (MD/15/3/2928) dated 10 October 2007 to the Bureau stating that Mr. Burayzat would not be able to preside over the current meeting and that he had designated the Ambassador of Switzerland, Mr. Streuli, as his replacement.

7. He recalled rule 4 of the rules of procedure, concerning the acting President, which provided that: "If the President finds it necessary to be absent from a meeting or any part thereof, he shall designate one of the Vice-Presidents to take his place. A Vice-President acting as President shall have the same powers and duties as the President."

8. *Mr. Streuli (Switzerland) took the Chair.*

9. **The President** said that all efforts were currently focused on the discussions on the issue of cluster munitions, and he invited delegations to reflect on ways of giving fresh impetus to future discussions on amended Protocol II. He suggested that a subsidiary body to consider the development of technologies to protect civilians against the indiscriminate effects of mines should be re-established and that a decision in that regard should be taken at the Conference of the High Contracting Parties in 2008.

10. He expressed regret that over half of States had not yet acceded to the Protocol. All participants in the Conference should urge non-signatory States to accede to the instrument.

**Adoption of the agenda** (item 3 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.9/1)

11. **The President** recalled that at the Eighth Annual Conference it had been agreed to recommend a provisional agenda to the Ninth Annual Conference (CCW/AP.II/CONF.9/1). He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the aforementioned provisional agenda.

12. *It was so decided.*

**Confirmation of the rules of procedure** (agenda item 4) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.6/2)

13. **The President** recalled that the rules of procedure for annual conferences of the States parties to amended Protocol II had been adopted in December 1999 by the First Annual Conference and had subsequently been amended on 11 December 2002 by the Fourth Annual Conference. An updated version of the rules of procedure, available in all the official languages, had been issued as document CCW/AP.II/CONF.6/2. Delegations could also refer to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons website (<http://www.unog.ch/disarmament/ccw>) and the United Nations Official Document System (<http://documents.un.org>). He suggested that the Conference should confirm the rules of procedure as amended on 11 December 2002 at the Fourth Annual Conference.

14. *It was so decided.*

**Appointment of the Secretary-General of the Conference** (agenda item 5)

15. **The President**, referring to rule 10 of the rules of procedure, said that it had emerged from his consultations that delegations agreed to the appointment of Mr. Peter Kolarov, Political Affairs Officer in the Geneva Branch of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, as Secretary-General of the Conference. He took it that the Conference wished to appoint Mr. Kolarov to that post.

16. *It was so decided.*

**Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference** (agenda item 6) (CCW/AP.II/CONF.8/2, annex IV)

17. **The President** said that the estimated costs of the Ninth Annual Conference had been considered in 2006 at the Eighth Annual Conference and were included in annex IV of the final document of that Conference. He took it that the Conference wished to approve the estimated costs.

18. *It was so decided.*

**Organization of work including that of any subsidiary bodies of the Conference** (agenda item 7)

19. **The President** said that, in view of the brevity of the Conference, he hesitated to propose the establishment of any subsidiary bodies. Instead, he invited participants to address all the substantive issues of concern to them that were included under agenda items 9, 10 and 11 during the traditional general exchange of views. He suggested that the exchange of views should continue, if necessary, at the afternoon meeting, followed by the consideration of the draft final document of the Conference. In the absence of objections from delegations, he would take it that the Conference wished to proceed in that manner.

20. *It was so decided.*

**General exchange of views** (agenda item 8)

21. **Mr. Pereira Gomes** (Portugal) said that he was speaking on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries (Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia), the countries of the stabilization and association process and eventual candidates (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia) – a process in which Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia remained involved, the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries members of the European Economic Area (EEA) (Iceland and Liechtenstein) and, in addition, Ukraine, Moldova and Armenia also associated themselves with his statement.

22. The European Union attached high priority to full implementation of the Protocol, which would contribute to enhancing the security of military ground operations and reducing the negative impact of mines, booby traps and other devices on civilians. The Protocol's provisions on international cooperation were essential in order to facilitate humanitarian aid, post-conflict recovery and the security of peacekeeping operations. It was clear that the Protocol could have a positive social and economic impact on countries affected by conflict.

23. Amended Protocol II and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention) were complementary. While that Convention absolutely prohibited the use of anti-personnel landmines, amended Protocol II covered all types of landmine, as well as booby traps and other similar devices.

24. The European Union welcomed the accession of Cameroon and invited States that had not yet done so to become parties to the Protocol as soon as possible. It also attached great importance to the timely submission of annual reports, which helped to encourage transparency and cooperation in the implementation of the Protocol. The European Union called on countries that were not parties to the Protocol to submit national reports on a voluntary basis.

25. The European Union recalled that the period provided for in paragraphs 2 (c) and 3 (c) of the technical annex, during which Parties could defer compliance with the provisions of article 4 on detectability and article 5 on self-destruction and self-deactivation, would end on 3 December 2007. It encouraged Parties that had made use of that option to indicate the status of implementation of the relevant provisions.

26. **Mr. Prasad** (India) said that his delegation welcomed the accession of Cameroon, the Niger and Tunisia to amended Protocol II, which India had ratified in September 1999. India fulfilled its obligations with regard to technical specifications and, since 1 January 1997, had not produced any non-detectable mines.

27. The Protocol was a comprehensive legally binding instrument that addressed the humanitarian risks posed by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel and anti-vehicle mines, while taking military needs into account. Its scope had been broadened to encompass armed conflicts not of an international character, and it included provisions designed to protect civilians (self-destruction, self-deactivation, marking and detectability, and so forth).

28. The Protocol's provisions were regularly disseminated to the armed forces by various means, including presentations, seminars and conferences. Training for military personnel of all ranks included courses on the area covered by the Protocol. Representatives from the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of External Affairs and the military staffs regularly exchanged information on the implementation of the Protocol.

29. India was committed to raising public awareness of the dangers posed by landmines, in particular anti-personnel landmines. The Indian army had put up signs around minefields, and awareness campaigns had been conducted in villages located close to mined areas. The army had issued guidelines to journalists for the broadcast of information on

measures designed to avoid accidental civilian casualties during military exercises or operations.

30. The Indian Armed Forces did not use mines to maintain order or to combat terrorism. Members of engineer units continued to assist civilian authorities in defusing and removing such devices. Mines used during defensive military operations had been laid inside fenced, perimeter-marked areas in accordance with the Protocol. Following those operations, the mines had been removed and the agricultural land restored to the owners as quickly as possible. Landmine victims received rehabilitation assistance (financial compensation, employment and provision of prosthetic devices).

31. India was a major contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations. It had participated in mine clearance operations in Cambodia, Angola and Afghanistan. It provided technical assistance and made its expertise with regard to mine removal and, also, rehabilitation programmes available in the context of demining efforts at the international level. In March 2007, an Indian army team had trained Cambodian army units, which had then carried out mine clearance operations in the Sudan under the auspices of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS).

32. Lastly, India hoped that the exchange of technologies and experience between Parties would promote the universalization of the Protocol.

#### **Message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations**

33. **Mr. Ordzhonikidze** (Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva and Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament) read out a message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In his message, the Secretary-General said that landmines and booby traps were among the most distressing and pernicious armaments used in armed conflicts. Both during and after hostilities, they killed and maimed civilians. They caused excessive, yet random, suffering to combatants. They prolonged the horrendous consequences of armed conflicts. Their development and humanitarian impact on post-conflict societies threatened future generations.

Such weapons also aggravated the heavy economic and human toll of war. Their complete elimination remained an international priority. For its part, the United Nations would continue to support efforts to eliminate landmines worldwide.

Amended Protocol II was an essential element of that process. The eve of the tenth anniversary of its entry into force was an excellent opportunity to review its status and operation, to address concerns associated with the weapons it covered and to exchange information on developments and technologies aimed at protecting civilians against the inherent indiscriminate effect of landmines.

Universal adherence to the instrument was of primary importance. To date, 88 States had consented to be bound by the Protocol. More efforts were required to expand that number, especially among developing countries and States affected by mines and explosive remnants of war. The Secretary-General was strongly encouraged by the steps taken at the Third Review Conference, in particular the adoption of the plan of action to promote the universality of the Convention and the Sponsorship Programme.

However, more action was needed. He strongly appealed to those countries that had not yet signed amended Protocol II to do so as soon as possible, particularly those States that had acceded to the original Protocol II.

He also took the opportunity to call on those States that had not yet done so to ratify the other international treaties that formed the legal framework for mine action, namely,

Protocol V to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, the Ottawa Convention and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

He urged participants to spare no efforts to rid the earth of landmines and wished them every success in their deliberations.

**General exchange of views** (agenda item 8) (*continued*)

34. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that his country attached great importance to amended Protocol II because of its broad scope — it applied not only to anti-personnel mines but also to other types of mine, namely, anti-vehicle mines and mines laid to prevent access to beaches, waterways or watercourses, in addition to booby traps — and because of the balance that it struck between humanitarian concerns and the security requirements of States, the effectiveness of the non-intrusive and non-discriminatory optional mechanism that it established to ensure respect for its provisions, and the fact that it brought together the main producer and user countries. Pakistan was convinced of the need to rid the world of the scourge of mines, as advocated by the United Nations, in order to allow individuals and communities to live in a safe environment that was conducive to development. It was therefore scrupulous in its implementation of the Protocol and, in particular, of the provisions relating to technical requirements (it manufactured only detectable anti-personnel mines) and submitted its annual reports regularly.

35. In Pakistan, the production and sale of mines was the exclusive preserve of the public sector, while specialized units in the armed forces were responsible for mine storage and mine deployment during active hostilities. All the necessary steps had been taken to protect civilians and military personnel from mines, including informing members of the armed forces about the Protocol and the risks posed by mines to civilians; marking, monitoring and fencing minefields in peacetime; raising awareness among civilians living near minefields; and providing mine victims, Afghan refugees, with assistance and, as appropriate, with compensation and prosthetics.

36. The Parties to the Protocol should make every effort to universalize the instrument by emphasizing its benefits in terms of assistance for mine clearance and victim rehabilitation.

37. **Mr. Tarui** (Japan) said that his country remained convinced that only a universal ban on anti-personnel mines could end the suffering caused by such devices. It attached great importance to the Ottawa Convention and had sought to encourage those States that had not yet done so to become parties to that Convention. However, it was also convinced that amended Protocol II offered a realistic and logical means of reducing the humanitarian problems caused by anti-personnel mines. Accordingly, those countries that would find it difficult to become parties to the Ottawa Convention should consider acceding to amended Protocol II and in that way contributing to the work of the international community to reduce the suffering caused by mines. At the approach of the tenth anniversary of the entry into force of amended Protocol II, which regulated not only anti-personnel landmines but also other types of mine, in addition to booby traps and other devices, Japan invited all Parties to reaffirm the importance of the Protocol and to work towards its consistent implementation and gradual universalization.

38. **Mr. Bersheda** (Ukraine), recalling that Ukraine had associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union, said that his country, which was a Party not only to the Convention but also to the five Protocols thereto, was deeply attached to strict respect for and proper implementation of those instruments at the national level. Amended Protocol II, in particular, offered an important means of stemming the frequently disastrous repercussions of armed conflicts, as much for

combatants during hostilities as for civilians after hostilities had ceased. His country submitted its annual reports in a timely manner.

39. Ukraine considered that the presence of mines and other dangerous explosive devices was a direct, long-term threat to civilians and posed a serious obstacle to the smooth running of humanitarian operations. Even to date, many countries continued to suffer the consequences of the problems posed by mines, both in the social and economic sphere and in respect of security and development. It was therefore to be hoped that there would be universal commitment to the fight against anti-personnel mines.

40. On the ground, Ukrainian mine clearance experts, who had extensive experience of modern mine clearance technologies and applied United Nations standards and procedures, were recognized throughout the world, particularly in the former Yugoslavia, Angola, Sierra Leone and Lebanon. They were also most willing to provide technical assistance and to share their experience with United Nations missions in various countries.

41. **Mr. Cheng Jingye** (China) emphasized that, some nine years after its entry into force, amended Protocol II played a vital role in reducing the number of accidents caused by landmines among civilians. He observed that the Protocol struck a good balance between humanitarian concerns and the legitimate military needs of States, which guaranteed its effectiveness and universality.

42. For its part, China was committed to fulfilling its obligations under the Protocol. At the national level, it had continued to conduct awareness and education campaigns, in particular by organizing a competition testing knowledge of the Protocol, and had produced a television programme for broadcast to the armed forces and the civilian population on implementation of the Protocol. The Chinese Armed Forces had destroyed more than 50 tons of obsolete anti-personnel mines and had begun to modify stockpiled mines that were still functional to bring them into line with the technical requirements of the Protocol. China would thus be able to respect its obligations by the end of the deferral period for the implementation of certain technical requirements established by the Protocol.

43. At the international level, China had been actively involved in mine clearance, particularly in Africa. It had provided financial and material assistance to various countries and in October 2007 had organized training in humanitarian mine clearance for one and a half months for 47 future mine clearance experts from Angola, Burundi, Chad, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. In 2006, a Chinese contingent had taken part in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon and had removed some 100,000 landmines and other explosive remnants of war.

44. Convinced of the urgent need for mine action, China was ready to work with the High Contracting Parties and the international community to promote the implementation and universalization of the Protocol.

45. **Mr. Chang Dong-hee** (Republic of Korea) reaffirmed his country's strong commitment to the spirit and the letter of amended Protocol II, which struck a good balance between humanitarian concerns and the security needs of States. He observed that even though the number of Parties to the Protocol was constantly growing and demonstrated the importance that the international community attached to reducing the suffering caused by mines, efforts should nevertheless be redoubled to ensure the universality of the instrument.

46. For its part, the Republic of Korea, which had ratified the Protocol in 2001, had destroyed more than 2,200 landmines in 2007; it was continuing mine clearance operations at 14 military bases or sites, including 3 non-confirmed minefields, and expected to complete its mine clearance operations by 2009. Since 1997 it had faithfully observed a moratorium on the export of those devices. At the international level, it had supported humanitarian mine clearance projects since 1993 through contributions to the United

Nations Trust Fund, the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance and the International Reconstruction Fund Facility for Iraq. It had also considered ways of making its experience and the techniques that it had developed available to countries affected by mines.

47. The Republic of Korea appreciated the efforts made by international and non-governmental organizations to tackle the humanitarian risks posed by landmines and wished to emphasize that it was open to opinions from various different sources.

48. **Mr. Koshelev** (Russian Federation) noted that, despite the changes that had taken place in the world, amended Protocol II continued with some success to reconcile the interests of all States, whether their focus was on humanitarian or security concerns. He considered that, in order to secure the universality of the Protocol, it was necessary to cooperate with States that had not yet acceded because of difficult military and political situations. The provisions of the Protocol should also be better implemented. The Russian Federation was convinced that reasonable implementation of the requirements and prohibitions established by the Protocol would help to reduce considerably the number of victims and the devastation caused by landmines.

49. The Russian Federation had ratified the Protocol in December 2004 but had been taking practical measures designed to reduce the threat posed by mines for many years. More than 10 years previously, it had ceased to produce blast mines and, in recent years, had destroyed some 9 million anti-personnel mines. The Ministry of Defence had drafted recommendations on laying and marking mines, as well as on fencing minefields. In addition, the armed forces had been trained to put the requirements of the Protocol into effect. The Russian Federation had started to develop new, improved tools for mine detection and disposal, had established a national system of technical requirements for landmines and had developed a plan for the destruction of obsolete mines.

50. Within the framework of international cooperation, the Russian Federation offered to assist in carrying out humanitarian mine clearance operations, including by sending teams of explosives experts, providing equipment and training foreign mine clearance specialists. The field engineers of the Ministry of Emergency Situations (EMERCOM), which currently employed various techniques, including the use of dogs, had already taken part in mine clearance operations in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Afghanistan. Their contribution could be particularly effective in countries where ammunition of Soviet manufacture had been used.

51. **Mr. Veillard** (Switzerland) said that the importance of amended Protocol II had been noted on numerous occasions and that many States had taken the necessary measures to implement its provisions, whether with regard to legal or technical issues or to cooperation and assistance. Those achievements must now be sustained, in particular through continuing efforts to ensure that civilians benefited from the guarantees afforded them under the Protocol. In that connection, Switzerland considered that the submission to the Depositary by the Parties of an annual report on activities was an effective instrument. Switzerland had recently submitted its annual report for the period from October 2006 to October 2007 in that spirit and encouraged other Parties to do the same.

52. Switzerland welcomed the steady increase in the number of Parties to amended Protocol II, while it regretted that only two additional States had ratified the instrument in the past year. It called on all States that had not yet done so to ratify the Protocol. If some States were reluctant to take that step for technical reasons, Switzerland wished to remind them of the potential advantages of international cooperation; it was ready to cooperate actively with those States on a bilateral or multilateral basis.



53. In 2007, his Government had allocated some 14 million dollars to anti-personnel mine projects and a similar amount had been included in the 2008 budget. Switzerland also provided mine clearance missions in many countries with experts and equipment.

54. **Mr. MacLachlan** (Australia) acknowledged the humanitarian progress that had been achieved under amended Protocol II. That progress had been all the more considerable as States that used and those that produced mines had acceded to the Protocol. He welcomed the statements made by Parties with regard to their efforts to implement the instrument. For its part, Australia had submitted its report for the period 2006–2007 under amended Protocol II. It was one of the few countries that had made multi-year funding commitments to mine action. Through its 2005 strategy, to which 75 million dollars had been allocated for five years, Australia was funding integrated mine action programmes in Cambodia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Moreover, the Australian authorities and private sector continued actively to research and develop mine clearance technology.

55. Having presided over the Seventh Meeting of States Parties to the Ottawa Convention, Australia welcomed the fact that new States had acceded to that instrument, including a number of States in the Middle East, a region that had previously been underrepresented. Australia was convinced that universal accession to and implementation of the Ottawa Convention were the best way to end the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines.

56. **Mr. Laassel** (Morocco) said that his country had submitted its national report in accordance with article 13, paragraph 4 (b), of the Protocol. He added that Morocco, some areas of which, in the southern provinces, had been mined by rebels between 1975 and 1987, had started mine clearance activities in 1975, focusing primarily on settled areas, water sources, grazing sites, logistical centres and lines of communication. Since early 2007, it had deployed significant material and human resources as part of a major mine clearance programme. Eleven thousand mine clearance personnel had been involved in a large-scale operation to decontaminate and rehabilitate suspect areas. As a result of those efforts, 65,382 landmines had been defused and destroyed since the southern provinces had been recovered. That information had been included by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his report to the Security Council, contained in document S/2007/619, in which he emphasized that the local population remained at risk and that the Royal Moroccan Army, which continued to cooperate with the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) for the purpose of marking and destroying mines, unexploded ordnance and expired ammunition, had undertaken an extensive mine clearance campaign in the Sahara that had focused on the most dangerous areas. The Secretary-General also noted that between April and October 2007, the United Nations Mission had discovered and marked 270 mines, pieces of unexploded ordnance and dangerous areas.

57. The Moroccan military authorities were taking measures to prevent and combat the risks posed by mines. Mine victims were cared for by the authorities and received compensation. The Royal Armed Forces were conducting a programme to disseminate information on affected areas to the civilian population, and a module entitled "Law of Armed Conflicts" had recently been introduced in the Royal Military Academy curriculum.

58. The Conference coincided with the end of the deferral period, which would expire on 3 December 2007. This delegation took the opportunity to call on countries that had not yet done so to notify their consent to be bound by amended Protocol II.

59. **Ms. Baker** (United States of America) said that the United States was determined to eliminate the risks associated with the indiscriminate use of landmines. At the same time, it recognized the military utility of landmines and authorized their acquisition and use, provided that they were detectable, short-lived and equipped with self-destruction or self-deactivation mechanisms. The United States had thus adopted an overall approach more

stringent than that stipulated under amended Protocol II, prohibiting the indiscriminate use and proliferation of all long-lived anti-vehicle or anti-personnel mines.

60. In view of its abiding desire to protect civilians, the United States focused the resources that it allocated to mine action on areas where they would have the greatest humanitarian impact. Those resources were deployed with some flexibility in order to be able to respond to emergency needs. Since 1993, the United States had allocated more than 1.2 billion dollars to mine action in some 50 of the 80 affected countries. In the fiscal year 2007, 8.3 million dollars had been allocated to 39 countries in four continents. Allocations for the fiscal year 2008 should be approximately equivalent.

61. **Mr. MacBride** (Canada) said that, as a State party to the Ottawa Convention, Canada had obligations that went beyond those stipulated under amended Protocol II. It had supported mine clearance programmes for 10 years. The Canadian Landmine Fund had already been endowed with more than 220 million dollars. Some 34 million dollars had been allocated to that cause in 2007, and Canada hoped that that level of support could be sustained.

62. **Mr. Laurie** (United Nations Mine Action Service) expressed regret that the problem of mines other than anti-personnel mines had not received due attention during recent conferences of the High Contracting Parties to amended Protocol II. He wished to take the opportunity to recall the position of the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) with regard to the minimum standards that should ideally be adopted for mines other than anti-personnel mines, which he had first presented to the Group of Governmental Experts in March 2004: all such mines should be equipped with a self-destruct mechanism or at least a self-neutralization or self-deactivation mechanism; they should be detectable by commonly available detection equipment; and they should not be equipped with anti-handling devices or with sensitive fuses that could be triggered by the presence of, proximity to or contact with a person. It was to be hoped that the High Contracting Parties to amended Protocol II would take note of the concerns of UNMAS and make use of the annual conferences to exchange information and take concerted action.

63. **Mr. Herby** (International Committee of the Red Cross) said that one of the great advances made under amended Protocol II had been the requirement that anti-personnel mines should be detectable and that those located outside marked areas should be equipped with self-destruction and self-deactivation mechanisms. Nevertheless, a number of countries had taken the opportunity to defer that obligation for a transitional period of nine years. He requested confirmation that that period would expire on 3 December 2007 for all countries that had benefited from it.

64. **Mr. Goose** (Human Rights Watch) said that amended Protocol II did not provide adequate protection for civilians: while it contained restrictions on anti-personnel and anti-vehicle mines, as well as provisions on post-conflict situations, most of those situations were better covered by Protocol V and the Ottawa Convention. Indeed, the Ottawa Convention was ahead in almost all areas covered by the Protocol. Only 10 Parties to amended Protocol II did not have more stringent obligations under the Ottawa Convention, which meant that, in reality, amended Protocol II was valid for only 10 countries. It could not be seen as complementary to the Ottawa Convention as any use, stockpiling, production or transfer of anti-personnel mines was unacceptable under that instrument. Human Rights Watch welcomed the fact that many countries behaved as if they were parties to the Ottawa Convention although they were not. To its knowledge, only two countries had laid anti-personnel mines in 2007, namely, Myanmar and the Russian Federation.

65. Having reiterated the question posed by the previous speaker, he expressed the hope that the 10 Parties to amended Protocol II that were not yet parties to the Ottawa Convention would become so soon.

66. **Mr. Landman** (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands was party to both amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention and that the Protocol formed an integral part of the basic training of all the country's armed forces. In 2006, the Netherlands had devoted some 21.4 million euros to mine action activities, which were described in its annual report. Part of that aid was for the care, rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration of victims. The total amount had been slightly larger than in previous years, mainly due to a one-time donation of over 4 million euros to the Lebanese UNMAS unit for the removal of mines, unexploded ordnance and cluster munitions following the August 2006 conflict between Israel and Hizbullah. That donation, which was the largest allocated by his Government specifically for the removal of cluster munitions, demonstrated the importance of having a new, legally binding international instrument that would address the humanitarian problems posed by such munitions. Amended Protocol II would be 10 years old in 2008; on such an occasion, the Netherlands could not but call for a new protocol on cluster munitions.

#### **Review of the operation and status of the Protocol** (agenda item 9)

67. **The President** said that as at 6 November 2007, 88 States had notified the Depositary of their consent to be bound by the Protocol, a relatively modest figure in view of the importance of that international instrument. He invited the Parties to consider ways of fostering universal accession to the Protocol, particularly taking into account the plan of action to promote the universality of the Convention and its Protocols. He informed delegations that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had addressed a letter to the Heads of States not parties to the Convention inviting them to consider acceding to the Convention and its Protocols, including amended Protocol II.

68. Recalling the possibility available to the Parties to defer compliance with article 4 on detectability and article 5 on the self-destruction and self-deactivation of anti-personnel mines for a period of nine months from the entry into force of amended Protocol II, he called on States that had opted for the deferral period, which ended for all concerned on 3 December 2007, to indicate the point that they had reached in implementing those provisions.

69. **Mr. Li Song** (China) referred to the statement made earlier by the Ambassador of China, the text of which had been distributed to delegations and which set out China's official position on the issue. Given that the Chinese authorities and armed forces had recently intensified their efforts and made new progress in implementing the provisions contained in the technical annex to amended Protocol II, landmines in China were now assured to meet the requirements of the instrument before the nine-year period had elapsed.

70. **The President** said, in response to a question from Mr. Goose (Human Rights Watch), that, as Latvia had officially announced that its deferral period would end on 19 July 2007, it was no longer one of the States benefiting from the aforementioned deferral.

71. **Mr. Decarcaval** (Observer for Guinea-Bissau) said that his country had been a party to the Ottawa Convention since 2001, and that the Council of Ministers had decided three weeks previously to accede to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and to Protocols II and V thereto. He called on the Parties to provide assistance to Guinea-Bissau to remedy the problem of mines and explosive remnants of war on its soil.

72. **Mr. Herby** (International Committee of the Red Cross) thanked the Chinese delegation for having clarified the country's position. He emphasized the importance of knowing the status of implementation of the provisions on detectability, self-destruction and self-deactivation of anti-personnel mines, which were one of the chief obligations under amended Protocol II. If it was not possible to ascertain the point reached by Parties that had opted to defer implementation of the provisions, that fact should be duly noted in the meeting report and the issue made a priority agenda item in the future.

73. **Mr. Uhorich** (Belarus) said that anti-personnel mines that did not respect the provisions of the technical annex to amended Protocol II were no longer used in his country. In cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and with financial support from Canada and Lithuania, Belarus had managed to destroy its stockpile of anti-personnel mines and, with assistance from the European Commission, it was continuing to destroy PFM mines with specific technical features.

**Consideration of matters arising from reports by High Contracting Parties according to paragraph 4 of article 13 of amended Protocol II** (agenda item 10)

74. **The President** noted that 46 of the 88 States that had notified the Depositary of their consent to be bound by amended Protocol II had submitted the national annual report required under article 13. To date, 18 such reports had been issued as official Conference documents (CCW/AP.II/CONF.9/NAR.1-18). All of those reports could be consulted on the Convention website, and the list of countries that had submitted them would be included in the Conference report.

75. He recalled that, at the Fifth Annual Conference, the Parties had decided to simplify the submission of national annual reports (CCW/AP.II/CONF.5/2, para. 20). Thus, Parties could simply indicate on the summary sheet that certain information remained unchanged from previous years. They would then need to submit only the new summary, the cover page and the forms containing new information. He recalled further that annual reports must be submitted at the latest eight weeks before the convening of the annual conference and urged the Parties to respect that deadline.

76. Turning to developments in information technology, he invited the Parties to comment on the option not to issue annual reports in hard copy. The annual conference budget would be slightly reduced as a result, but reports would not have the status of official documents and would therefore no longer be accessible through the United Nations Official Document System.

77. Mr. Wensley (South Africa), Mr. Haupt (Germany), Ms. Baker (United States of America), Mr. Landman (Netherlands) and Mr. Duncan (United Kingdom) having expressed support for the non-issuance of national reports, the President suggested that if there were no objections from delegations, those documents should cease to be issued and should be available in electronic form only, on the Convention website.

78. *It was so decided.*

**Consideration of the development of technologies to protect civilians against indiscriminate effects of mines** (agenda item 11)

79. **The President** noted that no delegation wished to speak under the item.

*The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.*