

# States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention in the process of implementing Article 5

## Background

Article 5.1 of the Convention requires States Parties to undertake to “destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but no later than ten years after entry into force of this Convention.”

At the Third Review Conference held in Maputo, Mozambique, in 2014, the States Parties, in the Maputo +15 Declaration committed to *comply and complete* and confirmed their ambition to complete the respective time-bound obligations of the Convention with the urgency that the completion work requires and to meet this aspiration to the fullest extent possible by 2025, including fulfilment of their obligations to address all mined areas as soon as possible.

## Status of implementation

There are 32 States Parties that have reported mine clearance obligations under Article 5, 26 of which have deadlines no later than 31 December 2025. In addition Mozambique has four mined areas remaining under water and where no intervention can be carried out at present.

<b>2020</b>	Argentina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Niger , Tajikistan, Yemen
<b>2021</b>	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, DRC, Senegal, South Sudan, Ukraine
<b>2022</b>	Cyprus, Ecuador, Somalia, Turkey
<b>2023</b>	Afghanistan, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand
<b>2024</b>	Peru, the United Kingdom
<b>2025</b>	Angola, Oman, Zimbabwe
<b>2026</b>	Croatia
<b>2028</b>	Iraq, Palestine, Sri Lanka

## Achieving 2025

While each State Party face specific challenges, reaching 2025 can be aided by ensuring that the following two critical factors:

- National Ownership: defined by the States Parties at the 2009 Cartagena Summit as including:
  - i. High level interest and leadership in fulfilling obligations and addressing challenges;
  - ii. An existing or new State entity empowered and provided with the human, financial and material capacity to carry out its responsibilities;
  - iii. A clear understanding of the size, location and quality of the challenge or a commitment to promptly acquire such an understand;
  - iv. A realistic but not unambitious plan to address the challenge as soon as possible and;
  - v. A regular significant national financial commitment by the affected State itself.

While it is understood that the existence of these components will not guarantee that resources will flow in response to needs, demonstrating national ownership makes it significantly more likely that cooperation will flourish between those with needs and those in a position to provide assistance.

- Partnerships for Completion: the strengthening of partnerships at a national level will be critical to the 2025 goal. *Partnerships for Completion* is well encapsulated in Action 21 of the Maputo Action Plan which states that States “in a position to provide assistance and those seeking to receive assistance, where relevant and to the extent possible, will enter into partnerships for completion, with partners specifying their responsibility to each other, articulating age and gender –sensitive time bound objectives and targets, making financial or other commitments, if possible on a multi-year basis, and engaging regularly in a dialogue on progress and challenges in meeting goals.”

National ownership coupled with partnership for completion and robust national platforms for continuous stakeholder dialogue to support the steering of efforts in the right direction could ensure that 2025 is not simply an aspiration but an attainable goal in many of the States Parties implementing article 5.

### **General assessment**

States Parties implementing Article 5 face specific national circumstances which affect the implementation of Article 5 and for which a more detailed look at the individual circumstances is required. Below, States Parties are categorized by *very limited*, *limited* or *medium to heavy* contamination based on the information reported in their Article 7 transparency reports.

#### *Very limited contamination*

- I. States parties with very limited contamination which may be able to complete Article 5 in a very short period of time with a small level of external funding:
  1. DRC
  2. Niger
  3. Serbia

#### *Limited contamination*

- II. States Parties with limited contamination and which employ their own national financial resources to implement their Article 5 commitments and could complete prior to 2025:
  4. Chile
  5. Oman
  6. United Kingdom
- III. States Parties with limited contamination and which use their own national financial resources and which have indicated that, with the provision of external resources, they could accelerate operations:
  7. Ecuador
  8. Peru
- IV. States Parties with limited contamination and which face security issues:
  9. Senegal (2021)

*Medium to heavy contamination*

- V. States Parties with medium to heavy contamination and which face security issues:
  - 10. Chad
  - 11. Sudan
  - 12. South Sudan
  
- VI. States Parties with medium to heavy contamination and which use their own national financial resources:
  - 13. Turkey
  
- VII. States Parties with medium to heavy contamination and which would require a more coordinated approach, including external funding, to make significant progress towards 2025:
  - 14. Angola
  - 15. Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - 16. Croatia
  - 17. Cambodia
  - 18. Sri Lanka
  - 19. Tajikistan
  - 20. Thailand
  - 21. Zimbabwe
  
- VIII. States Parties with heavy contamination which face security issues and which would require a more coordinated approach, including external funding, to make significant progress towards 2025:
  - 22. Afghanistan
  - 23. Colombia
  - 24. Iraq
  - 25. Somalia
  - 26. Ukraine
  - 27. Yemen
  
- IX. Other States Parties:
  - 28. Argentina
  - 29. Cyprus
  - 30. Eritrea
  - 31. Ethiopia
  - 32. State of Palestine

Very limited contamination	Limited contamination	Medium to heavy contamination
DRC Niger Serbia	Chile Oman United Kingdom Ecuador Peru	Angola Bosnia and Herzegovina Cambodia Sri Lanka Tajikistan Thailand Zimbabwe Colombia Eritrea Ethiopia Croatia Turkey
	<b>States Parties which have reported matters concerning security</b>	
	Senegal	Chad Sudan South Sudan Afghanistan Iraq Yemen Somalia
	<b>States Parties that have reported matters concerning jurisdiction or control</b>	
<i>Argentina</i> <i>Cyprus</i>	Ukraine (falls into category above as well) Palestine, State of	