

26 June 2011

Update on Implementation of Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty

States Parties with Article 5 obligations or whose compliance is in doubt

Landmine Monitor believes that as many as 45 States Parties may have outstanding Article 5 mine clearance obligations. Of these, half are already taking advantage of one or more extensions to their original deadline, while four more States Parties have submitted requests to be considered by the Eleventh Meeting of States Parties in Cambodia later this year: Algeria, Chile, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Eritrea.¹ At the June 2011 intersessional Standing Committee meetings, the Republic of Congo declared that it would be seeking an extension to allow a survey of the suspected areas to be conducted.

States Parties confirmed or suspected to be affected by antipersonnel mines- as of June 2011²

Africa	Americas	Asia-Pacific	Europe & CIS	Middle East & North Africa
Angola	Argentina	Afghanistan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Algeria
Burundi	Chile	Bhutan	Croatia	Iraq
Chad	Colombia	Cambodia	Cyprus	Jordan
Djibouti	Ecuador	Palau	Denmark	Yemen
Dem. Rep. of Congo	Peru	Philippines	Germany	
Eritrea	Venezuela	Thailand	Greece	
Ethiopia			Moldova	
Guinea-Bissau			Montenegro	
Mauritania			Serbia	
Mozambique			Tajikistan	
Namibia			Turkey	
Rep. of Congo			United Kingdom	
Senegal				
Somalia				
Sudan				
Uganda				
Zimbabwe				
17 States Parties	6 States Parties	6 States Parties	12 States Parties	4 States Parties

- Landmine Monitor lists five States Parties that may be mine-affected, and thus whose compliance with Article 5 may be in doubt, but which have not formally declared themselves to have, or still have, Article 5 obligations: Djibouti,³ Greece (see below), Namibia,⁴ the Republic of Moldova,⁵ and the Philippines.⁶

¹ See the ICBL Critiques of the extension requests submitted by these States Parties.

² States Parties with a residual antipersonnel mine problem that is not contained in known mined areas are not included, such as Belarus, Honduras, Kuwait, Ukraine, and, since its declaration of compliance with Article 5, Tunisia. Both Argentina and the UK claim sovereignty over the Falkland Islands/Malvinas, which are antipersonnel mine-affected, and so both are included in the list.

³ Djibouti completed its clearance of known mined areas in 2003 and France declared it had cleared a military ammunition storage area in Djibouti in November 2008, but there are concerns that there may be mine

- At the June 2011 intersessional Standing Committee meetings, Germany informed the States Parties that it had suspected mined areas at a former Soviet military training range at Wittstock in Brandenburg. In addition, Bhutan reiterated that it had mined areas on its territory that had not yet been cleared.
- Palau submitted an Article 7 report in 2011 (for calendar year 2010) in which it declared for the first time that it had mined areas containing antipersonnel mines on its territory. These are mines remaining from combat during World War II.
- The precise extent to which the Republic of the Congo, whose Article 5 deadline expires on 1 November 2011, is mine-contaminated remains unclear as the necessary survey activities have not yet been conducted. At the June 2011 intersessional meetings, Congo announced plans to conduct the survey by February of 2012.
- Landmine Monitor does not list The Gambia, which has stated that it no longer have mined areas containing antipersonnel mines in areas under its jurisdiction or control, although it has not yet made a formal declaration of full compliance with Article 5 to a Meeting of States Parties.
- Landmine Monitor does not list Mali or Niger, both of which are believed to be contaminated by antivehicle mines only.

A total of 16 States Parties have reported full compliance with their respective Article 5 obligations, as set out in the table below. However, there remained concern about Greece’s compliance as of June 2011. Greece has an area on the island of Rhodes that is marked as being mined. It is required to ensure that this area has been fully cleared of all antipersonnel mines. It had informally committed to do so in February of this year when the continued existence of the minefield was brought to its attention. In June 2011, at the Standing Committee meetings, Greece stated that it had checked the area numerous times since clearance was originally conducted (in 1987), most recently in May 2011, as not all the mines had been accounted for, and a further examination of the area was planned for September 2011.

States Parties reporting compliance with treaty clearance obligations

State Party	Year of reported compliance	Article 5 deadline
Albania	2009	2010
Bulgaria	1999	2009
Costa Rica	2002	2009
El Salvador	1994*	2009
France	2008	2009
Greece	2009	2014
Guatemala	2006	2009
Honduras	2005	2009
FYR Macedonia	2006	2009

contamination along the Eritrean border following a border conflict between Djibouti and Eritrea in June 2008. Djibouti has not made a formal declaration of full compliance with its Article 5 obligations.

⁴ Despite a statement that Namibia was in full compliance with Article 5 at the Second Review Conference, questions remain as to whether there are mined areas in the north of the country, for example in the Caprivi region bordering Angola.

⁵ Moldova, which had a 1 March 2011 Article 5 deadline, made a statement in June 2008 which suggested that it had acknowledged its legal responsibility for clearance of any mined areas in the breakaway republic of Transnistria, where it continues to assert its jurisdiction. This statement was, however, later disavowed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁶ The Philippines, which has alleged use of antipersonnel mines by non-state armed groups (NSAGs) consistently over recent years, has not formally reported the presence of mined areas.

Malawi	2008	2009
Nicaragua	2010	2010 (extended from 2009)
Rwanda	2009	2010
Suriname	2005	2012
Swaziland	2007	2009
Tunisia	2009	2010
Zambia	2009	2011

* Date of completion of demining program (prior to entry into force of the Mine Ban Treaty)

States Parties having received an extension to their Article 5 deadline

A total of 22 States Parties have so far been granted one or more extension to their Article 5 clearance deadlines. The Article 5 extension requests approved by States Parties at the Ninth Meeting of States Parties, Second Review Conference, and Tenth Meeting of States Parties contained plans to finish clearance within less than one year through to ten years after their original deadline, though the ICBL found some of the timeframes to be unrealistic or unnecessarily long. Although detailed information is not yet always available, it appears eight States Parties are on track to fulfill the plans submitted in their extension requests, eight are falling behind on their goals, one state has finished (Nicaragua), and the others' status is as yet unclear.

The ICBL urges the States Parties that receive extensions to fully implement Action #13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, which calls on them to work towards rapid implementation of Article 5 "in accordance with the commitments made in their extension requests and the decisions taken on their requests," plus to report regularly on such progress. The ICBL also urges all States Parties that have received an extension to keep the time planned for completion under regular review with an aim to finishing as soon as possible, and urges the international community to support their efforts by providing the necessary financial, technical and other support in a timely manner.

The information below comes from *Landmine Monitor Report 2010*, more recent inquiries by Landmine Monitor, and updates made by States Parties at the Tenth Meeting of States Parties in Geneva.

Extensions at a Glance

States Parties	Original Deadline	Extension Period	New Deadline	Status
Argentina	1 March 2010	10 years	1 March 2020	No information
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Falling behind
Cambodia	1 January 2010	10 years	1 January 2020	Unclear
Chad	1 November 2009	14 months (1 st extn.) and then 3 years (2 nd extn.)	1 January 2014	Unclear
Colombia	1 March 2011	10 years	1 March 2021	On track
Croatia	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Falling behind
Denmark	1 March 2009	22 months (1 st extn.) and then 18 months (2 nd extn.)	1 July 2012	On track
Ecuador	1 October 2009	8 years	1 October 2017	Falling behind
Guinea-Bissau	1 November 2011	2 months	1 January 2012	On track
Jordan	1 May 2009	3 years	1 May 2012	On track
Mauritania	1 January 2011	5 years	1 January 2016	On track
Mozambique	1 March 2009	5 years	1 March 2014	On track
Nicaragua	1 May 2009	1 year	1 May 2010	Completed
Peru	1 March 2009	8 years	1 March 2017	On track
Senegal	1 March 2009	7 years	1 March 2016	Falling behind

Tajikistan	1 April 2010	10 years	1 April 2020	On track
Thailand	1 May 2009	9.5 years	1 November 2018	Falling behind
Uganda	1 August 2009	3 years	1 August 2012	On track
United Kingdom	1 March 2009	10 years	1 March 2019	Falling behind
Venezuela	1 October 2009	5 years	1 October 2014	On track
Yemen	1 March 2009	6 years	1 March 2015	Unclear
Zimbabwe	1 March 2009	22 months (1 st extn.) and then 2 years (2 nd extn.)	1 January 2013	Falling behind

Affected states not party

A total of 23 states not party to the Mine Ban Treaty are believed to be mine affected: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cuba, Egypt, Georgia, India, Iran, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, North Korea, Oman, Pakistan, Russia, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Syria, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.

In June 2011, Nepal announced that it had cleared its last known mined area, becoming only the second state not party after China to achieve this feat.⁷

Seven other areas not internationally recognized as states are also mine-affected: Abkhazia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, Somaliland, Taiwan, and Western Sahara.

⁷ There may be a residual mine threat in China as mine injuries have been reported along the border with Vietnam since its declaration that it had cleared its territory of all landmines.