

Keep your Word

9MSP 24-28 November 2008
Geneva, Switzerland

ICBL Messages Booklet for Campaigners

9th Meeting of the States Parties

24-28 November 2008

Geneva, Switzerland



Abbreviations:

- APM: Antipersonnel mines
AVM: Antivehicle mines
CCW: Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons
LM: Landmine Monitor
MBT: Mine Ban Treaty
MSP: Meeting of the States Parties
NAP: Nairobi Action Plan
SCs: Standing Committees
SPs: States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty
SNPs: States not Party to the Mine Ban Treaty
VA: Victim assistance
VA26: 26 States Parties self-identified as having the greatest responsibility for landmine victims
- The use of the word “mines” in this booklet refers only to antipersonnel mines

For more information, contact:

Sylvie Brigot, Executive Director: brigot@icbl.org
Simona Beltrami, Advocacy Director: simona@icbl.org
Tamar Gabelnick, Treaty Implementation Director: tamar@icbl.org
Firoz Alizada, Treaty Implementation Officer, firoz@icbl.org
Amélie Chayer, Communications Officer, amelie@icbl.org
Kasia Derlicka, Advocacy and Campaigning Officer: kasia@icbl.org

Or visit the ICBL website: <http://www.icbl.org>

More information on the 9th Meeting of State Parties can be found at:

<http://www.icbl.org/treaty/meetings/9msp/>

Or <http://www.apminebanconvention.org/meetings-of-the-state-parties/9msp/>

Where to find key documents:

- **Landmine Monitor Reports and Fact Sheets:** <http://www.icbl.org/lm/>
- **Mine Ban Treaty:** <http://www.icbl.org/treaty/text>
- **Nairobi Action Plan:** <http://www.icbl.org/content/download/20685/392413/file/NairobiActionPlan.pdf>
- **Text of the Convention on Cluster Munitions:** <http://www.clustermunitionsdublin.ie/pdf/ENGLISHfinaltext.pdf>

Mine Ban Treaty Co-Chairs & Co-Rapporteurs 2007-08 (co-rapporteurs will become co-chairs after the 9MSP)

General Status of the Convention: Co-chairs: Germany & Kenya; Co-rapporteurs: Chile & Japan

Mine Clearance: Co-chairs: Canada & Peru; Co-rapporteurs: Argentina & Australia

Stockpile Destruction: Co-chairs: Lithuania & Serbia; Co-rapporteurs: Italy & Zambia

Victim Assistance: Co-chairs: Cambodia & New Zealand; Co-rapporteurs: Belgium & Thailand

Contact Group Chairs:

Article 7 Contact Group: Belgium

Linking Mine Action and Development Contact Group: Canada

Resource Utilization Contact Group: Norway

Universalization Contact Group: Canada

The 9MSP will be particularly important because State Parties will have to face unprecedented challenges:

- Belarus, Greece and Turkey missed their 1 March 2008 Stockpile Destruction deadline, leaving millions of landmines in their stocks; Belarus and Turkey have no target date for destroying their stocks.
- This is the first year mine-affected States Parties that will not be able to meet their 10-year clearance deadline will be asking the other States Parties for an extension. A total of 15 states will be making such requests, several without sufficiently good reasons for the need for an extension or the time requested.
- With the 2nd Review Conference around the corner, we are seeing little progress on the victim assistance objectives the VA25 states set out for themselves to meet by then.

We are therefore asking States Parties to **keep their word** to honor the treaty and its deadlines and to speak out against violations and abuses. We are also asking States Parties to keep their promise to the people whose lives are affected by landmines by working as quickly as possible to destroy their stockpiles, clear the land of mines, and protect the rights of landmine survivors.

How to use the booklet:

This booklet provides an overview of the key ICBL messages for campaigners to pass on to governments in Geneva and beyond. In general, there is a short presentation of each key issue followed by a list of messages to governments. These messages are followed by one or more lists of countries for which the points are relevant. The relevant action points from the Nairobi Action Plan are listed at the bottom of each page. The goal is to give you a tool to use when lobbying governments – listing for you the main points to be made and the priority governments to speak with.

*** Most of the information comes from Landmine Monitor Report 2008 and recent LM fact sheets. ***

Your comments and suggestions on this booklet are very welcome. This is a work in progress!

Article 1: “Assist, encourage or induce”

Article 1 of the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) prohibits the use, development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention, or transfer of antipersonnel mines (APM). This includes a ban on taking military advantage of *existing* mined areas, such as those along borders. But some countries are delaying the clearance of mined areas because they still are making use of them to protect military installations or prevent movement across borders.

Message to States Parties:

- SPs must clear all mined areas as soon as possible, even if they still have strategic utility.

Venezuela does not aim to clear any mines in its territory before its 10-year deadline because it has been waiting to install an alternative security mechanism to protect its soldiers from cross-border attacks. Other states that have delayed clearing mined areas because of the strategic position of the mines include Croatia, Jordan, Mozambique, and Peru (around prisons).

Article 1 also bans States Parties from assisting, encouraging, or inducing “in any way, anyone” from engaging in an activity prohibited by the MBT. But some SPs believe that this language gives them a considerable amount of freedom in their relations with States not Party to the treaty. The ICBL and most SPs that have expressed their views on the matter believe in a much more restrictive interpretation.

Messages to States Parties:

- SPs must not participate in **planning or implementation** of activities related to the use of antipersonnel mines in **joint operations, exercises, or other military activities** with a State not Party to the MBT that may use antipersonnel mines.
- SPs must not give **support**—either direct or indirect, military or otherwise—to any state or group that is using APM.
- SPs must not allow **transfer** through, foreign stockpiling on, or authorizing of foreign antipersonnel mines on national territory.
- SPs should make known their views on Article 1 if they have not already done so.
- SPs should report on foreign stockpiles in order to be consistent with the spirit of the convention aimed at no possession of antipersonnel mines by anyone, even if these stocks are not under their jurisdiction or control.

Countries	Issue
Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, New Zealand, Serbia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Zambia, Zimbabwe	Have declared that only “active” or “direct participation” in joint operations in which antipersonnel mines are used is prohibited.
Germany, Japan, Qatar, United Kingdom	Have APM stocks from a State not Party, but argue that the stocks are not under their jurisdiction or control

* **Tajikistan** is the only State Party to declare the number of antipersonnel mines (18,200) stockpiled by a State not Party on its territory.

Article 2: Defining “anti-personnel mine”

Article 2 of the MBT defines “anti-personnel mine” for the purposes of the treaty. The ICBL and States Parties have affirmed that according to the treaty’s definition, *any* mine equipped with a fuze or anti-handling device that causes the mine to explode from an unintentional or innocent act of a person is considered to be an antipersonnel mine and therefore prohibited. This means that antivehicle mines equipped with trip wires, break wires, tilt rods, or highly sensitive anti-handling devices should be considered banned under treaty. Bounding fragmentation mines that can be set off on command or by a trip wire (such as Claymore and OZM-72 mines) can only be considered legal when used in command-detonated mode.

But a small number of States Parties disagree. They believe that mines should be defined by name or design, not their actual function. The precise definition is obviously critical since the ban and destruction duties of the treaty only apply only to antipersonnel mines as defined by the treaty. Currently, some SPs are keeping or transferring mines that others consider banned and have destroyed.

Messages to States Parties:

- Destroy all mines that function as antipersonnel mines regardless of what they are called
- Destroy all fuzes that can be attached to antivehicle mines to make them victim-activated
- Make sure that mines with both command and person-activated fuzes are permanently modified so that they can only function as command-detonated munitions and that the country’s armed forces are informed about their legal obligations
- Report clearly on the destruction of these mines and fuzes in Article 7 reports
- Make known their views on the subject if they have not already done so
- Do not support agreements in CCW or elsewhere that would place less strict restrictions on “anti-vehicle” mines equipped with sensitive fuzes or anti-handling devices

Examples of countries with practices that diverge from these views:

Czech Republic	Does not consider the use of tripwires with AVMs to be a violation of the treaty. A Czech company markets this type of mine. The Czech Republic also acknowledged possessing tilt rod fuzes.
Denmark, France, Japan and United Kingdom	Publicly stated that the APM definition does not include any AVMs, even if they are used with sensitive fuzes or antihandling devices
Sweden	Has AVMs with tilt rods, but has not made a public statement on their legality under the MBT.

Article 3: Retaining mines for training and research

Article 3 of the MBT allows States Parties to keep or transfer mines for training and research in mine clearance. This number should “not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary,” which ICBL believes should be in the hundreds or thousands or less, but not tens of thousands. In fact, the ICBL encourages SPs to keep none at all since training and research do not necessarily depend on using live mines. As of August 2008, 71 SPs have reported keeping over 216,000 mines under Article 3. At least 80 SP do not retain mines under article 3.

The ICBL has long urged states keeping antipersonnel mines under Article 3 to declare the intended purposes and actual uses of these mines. States Parties agreed to this in the Nairobi Action Plan, and at the 6th Meeting of the States Parties, they agreed to amend Form D of the Article 7 report to include a place for this information. The ICBL also believes that states that retain antipersonnel mines and do not use any of these mines for permitted purposes abuse the exception permitted by Article 3. SPs reported destroying over 9500 mines retained for training and research in 2007.

ICBL Messages to States Parties:

- Use the expanded format of Form D for annual transparency reporting
- Also declare the intended purposes and actual uses of antipersonnel mines retained under Article 3 in statements at Meetings of States Parties, intersessional Standing Committee meetings, or in communications with Landmine Monitor
- Carry out a detailed evaluation of the precise number of antipersonnel mines needed for specific activities. Provide the justification for why and how a particular number was arrived at
- Regularly re-evaluate the number of retained mines to ensure that it is the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes
- Reduce the number of retained mines to a level consistent with an annual requirement for live mines actually being used in training and research activities
- Explore available alternatives to using live mines for training and research activities.
- Do not retain any antipersonnel mines as a contingency for possible future needs, as opposed to demonstrated current needs
- Make known your views on the appropriate number of mines to keep under Article 3

4 States Parties are retaining over 10,000 mines: Turkey (15,150), Algeria* (15,030), Brazil (12,381) and Bangladesh (12,500). **Another 6 States Parties retain between 5,000 and 10,000 mines:** Sweden (7,531), Greece (7,224), Australia (6,998), Croatia (6,103), Belarus (6,030), Algeria (6,000) and Serbia (5,565).

* Algeria recently stated that it will destroy 9,000 of its retained mines.

14 countries have not reported consuming any mines for permitted purposes since entry into force for that country:

Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Djibouti, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Serbia, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia.

As of August 2008, only 15 countries have used the expanded voluntary Form D to report on the intended purposes and actual use of mines retained in 2007:

Afghanistan, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Peru, Rwanda, Tajikistan and the United Kingdom.

Article 4: Stockpile destruction

Article 4 requires States Parties to destroy their antipersonnel mines no later than four years after joining the treaty. Stockpile destruction is the most effective form of preventive mine action: destroyed mines will never claim any victims! This is also the most successful provision of the treaty so far—83 SPs have finished destroying their stockpiles, destroying more than 42 million mines. But around 14 million mines remain to be destroyed by State Parties with upcoming deadlines.

This year three states missed their 1 March 2008 destruction deadline with very large quantities of mines remaining in their stocks: Belarus (3.4 million), Turkey (2.6 million), and Greece (1.6 million). Ukraine also forecasts problems with on-time destruction of its 6.4 million mines. Belarus and Ukraine have PFM mines, which contain chemicals that make them dangerous and difficult to destroy. Ethiopia has a deadline of 1 June 2009 but has not reported how many mines it has to destroy.

Messages to States Parties with remaining stockpiles:

- SPs that missed their deadlines should fix a target end date for destruction and report frequently on progress made towards that goal
- Destroy the stockpiles as quickly as possible. Join the many states that finished destruction before their deadlines. There is no extension possible for the 4-year deadline!
- Hold public destruction events in order to promote transparency and regional confidence-building
- Report on and seek help in addressing any technical problems in destroying stockpiles
- Report on foreign stockpiles, even if not under their jurisdiction or control
- Report on stockpiled Claymore-type and OZM-72 mines and steps taken to ensure their use in command-detonated mode only

Belarus, 01/03/2008

Ukraine, 1/06/2010

Greece, 01/03/2008

Indonesia, 1/08/2011

Turkey, 01/03/2008

Kuwait, 1/1/2012

Ethiopia, 1/06/2009

Countries with remaining stockpiles and their deadlines (countries in bold missed their deadlines):

Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Palau and The Gambia have not informed States Parties if they have stockpiled antipersonnel mines though they are not believed to have any. Iraq reported it had no stocks, though it is expected to find unknown stocks that will need to be destroyed by 1/2/2012.

Countries that have finished their formal stockpile destruction program still have obligations under the treaty. A number of States Parties have discovered, captured, seized or received additional mines, but have not reported on what they have done with them. SPs must account for the destruction of any mines, even after it has finished its formal stockpile destruction program. At the 8MSP, States Parties agreed to changes to Forms B and G of the Article 7 reports to include information on the discovery and destruction of additional stocks.

Message to States Parties that have finished their official stockpile destruction program:

- Use updated Forms B and G plus MBT meetings to report on the discovery and destruction of all stockpiles that were found, turned in, or seized after its stockpile destruction program ended

Countries that have discovered or captured, but not reported on, new stockpiles include:

Algeria, Colombia, Iraq, Peru and Uganda

Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, Actions #9–16



Article 5: Mine Clearance

Article 5 states that States Parties must make every effort to identify mined areas under their jurisdiction or control and to destroy all antipersonnel mines within them as soon as possible, but no later than 10 years after joining the treaty. Yet many states are not respecting this duty to work quickly, and too many will be missing their deadline. In addition, some SPs are still using terms like “mine-safe” or “impact-free”, which are not consistent with the treaty.

ICBL calls on mine-affected States Parties to:

- Finish mine clearance operations *as soon as possible* and make every effort to meet their deadline
- Develop national mine action plans that are consistent with their Article 5 obligation to destroy *all* APMs in *all* known or suspected mined areas. “Mine-safe” or “impact-free” is not enough!
- Use the most efficient means to identify mined areas, including area reduction and cancellation techniques, as appropriate and in close consultation with the affected community
- Mobilize sufficient resources to ensure that demining can be carried out until Article 5 obligations are completely met. Make known to donors that mine action is a development priority by including it in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and other national development plans
- Make sure there is a national capacity for handling residual APMs found after Article 5 obligations are officially declared done.

States Parties that have declared they are mine-affected and their deadlines:

Afghanistan, 1/3/2013	Croatia, 1/3/2009	Rwanda, 1/12/2010
Albania, 1/8/2010	Cyprus, 1/7/2013	Senegal, 1/3/2009
Algeria, 1/4/2012	Denmark, 1/3/2009	Serbia, 1/3/2014
Angola, 1/1/2013	Djibouti, 1/3/2009	Sudan, 1/4/2014
Argentina, 1/3/2010	Ecuador, 1/10/2009	Tajikistan, 1/4/2010
Bhutan, 1/2/2016	Eritrea, 1/2/2012	Thailand, 1/5/2009
Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1/3/2009	Ethiopia, 1/6/2015	Tunisia, 1/1/2010
Burundi, 1/4/2014	Greece, 1/3/2014	Turkey, 1/3/2014
Cambodia, 1/1/2010	Guinea-Bissau, 1/11/2011	Uganda, 1/8/2009
Chad, 1/11/2009	Iraq, 1/2/2018	United Kingdom, 1/3/2009
Chile, 1/3/2012	Jordan, 1/5/2009	Venezuela, 1/10/2009
Colombia, 1/3/2011	Mauritania, 1/1/2011	Yemen, 1/3/2009
Congo, Democratic Republic of, 1/11/2012	Mozambique, 1/3/2009	Zambia, 1/8/2011
Congo, Republic of, 1/11/2011	Nicaragua, 1/5/2009	Zimbabwe, 1/3/2009
	Niger, 1/9/2009	
	Peru, 1/3/2009	

The following States Parties have been identified by LM as possibly having mined areas even though they have declared that they never had, or no longer have, mined areas: The Gambia, Mali, Moldova, Montenegro, Namibia, and the Philippines.

ICBL therefore encourages States Parties to:

- Use the common statement agreed upon at the 7MSP to announce completion of Article 5 obligations so as to avoid ambiguous Article 5 status
- Create a process for determining the facts when a SP declares it has never had, or no longer has, mined areas but there is information to the contrary



Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Clearing mined areas, Actions # 17–22, 24–28

Article 5: Mine Clearance Extension Requests

While all mine-affected states must do their best to respect their 10-year deadline, it has been clear from the beginning that some countries would not be able to clear all their land in that time. States Parties can request an extension of their deadline for up to 10 more years. But this year 15 countries will be making an extension request, much more than ever expected. Several requests would probably not have been needed if the countries had started the work earlier or had been more efficient. The United Kingdom and Venezuela do not even plan to begin demining operations until *after* their initial 10-year deadline.

The following State Parties have submitted an Article 5 extension request for the 9MSP (number of years requested in parentheses): Bosnia and Herzegovina (10), Chad (1.2), Croatia (10), Denmark (1.8), Ecuador (8), Jordan (3), Mozambique (5), Nicaragua (1), Peru (8), Senegal (7), Thailand (9.5), United Kingdom (10), Venezuela (5), Yemen (5) and Zimbabwe (7).

The other States Parties at the 9MSP must assess and decide on each request. In addition to a yes/no vote on each request, the 9MSP may also agree to a set of comments on each request. At the past two MSPs, SPs agreed on a process to help make sure that extensions are carefully prepared and considered. An “analyzing group” (the MSP president and the co-chairs and co-rapporteurs of the Standing Committees) was set up to prepare comments on each request to help the other SPs make their decisions. The ICBL gave some input to the group and also prepared its own critiques of the requests.

ICBL encourages States Parties to take seriously their role in deciding on extension requests by:

- Reviewing all of the requests, the analyzing group’s comments and the ICBL’s critiques;
- Preparing comments and questions for requesting states during the informal 9MSP session on the requests, especially when the current status or future plans presented in the request are unclear or do not show the state’s ambition to clear the land “as soon as possible”;
- Agreeing to comments on each request that point out any remaining concerns and require reporting on the state’s yearly demining objectives;
- Asking states to revise their requests if they do include plans to begin demining operations before their initial 10-year deadline (UK and Venezuela) or do not have any plans to begin or finance the demining within the extension period (UK). If the states do not revise their requests before the

Art. 6: International Cooperation and Assistance

Article 6 states that all States Parties in a position to do so must provide support and technical assistance to mine-affected states for mine action. Although the main responsibility for ensuring that Art. 5 obligations are met lays with the mine-affected state, Article 6 recognizes that many mine-affected SPs—emerging from conflicts and/or struggling with other humanitarian and development needs—may need assistance from other SPs in order to finish this work. This assistance should be structured in a way that helps the mine-affected state build its own mine action capacity and finish its obligations as quickly and efficiently as possible. Some donor states and organizations are mainstreaming mine action into their development budgets in order to ensure longer-term availability of funds, but there is a risk that this could end up decreasing funds available for mine action if the donor and/or recipient do not prioritize mine action within development budgets.

Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Clearing mines areas, Actions #23–28, Assisting the victims, cooperation and assistance Actions #36–39, 45

ICBL calls on donor countries to:

- Communicate clearly the “new rules of the game” to all actors on the funding and receiving sides when mainstreaming mine action budgets into development;
- Work with recipient states to ensure that they have a national mine action plan that is consistent with their obligations under Article 5;
- Encourage recipient states to use the most cost-efficient means to identify mined areas and destroy mines in mined areas (including greater use of area reduction and cancellation when appropriate);
- Provide assistance responding to priorities articulated by mine-affected States Parties, including ensuring that existing clearance teams are consistently funded and effectively and fully deployed;
- Commit to continue funding mine-affected states until either all Article 5 obligations are met or the recipient state can provide all resources themselves to finish the job. Provide multi-year allocations to help states plan their work.
- Develop or use mine action technology which is cost-efficient, affordable, effective, sustainable and appropriate to local conditions.

Article 6: Int’l Cooperation & Assistance—Victim Assistance

The inclusion of assistance to landmine victims in the Mine Ban Treaty was a great victory that strengthened the humanitarian side of the treaty. Article 6.3 of the MBT calls on States Parties in a position to do so to give assistance “for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims.” However, because few details are associated with this requirement and victim assistance can’t have any deadlines, the treaty’s obligations have not generally turned into real changes for survivors, their families or communities.

At the 2004 Nairobi Summit, 23 SPs (now 26) reported that they were responsible for large numbers of survivors and therefore had the greatest responsibility to act and the greatest need for assistance. The VA SC co-chairs have worked with them since 2005 on defining VA objectives to meet before the 2nd Review Conference and their plans to achieve them. But while many of the VA26 have presented ambitious objectives and some have presented plans, they must be matched with concrete actions and the necessary resources to achieve the plans. With one year left until the Review Conference, they need to sharply increase their efforts to make the maximum possible progress towards their goals.

Note: The term “landmine victims” is used to refer to the individuals involved in a landmine accident as well as their families and communities.

List of the VA26 States Parties

Afghanistan	Colombia	Iraq*	Sudan
Albania	Condo, DR	Jordan	Tajikistan
Angola	Croatia	Mozambique	Thailand
Bosnia & Herzegovina	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Uganda
Burundi	Eritrea	Peru	Yemen
Cambodia	Ethiopia	Senegal	
Chad	Guinea-Bissau	Serbia	

* Iraq is now considered a de facto member of this group given the high number of victims it reported in its initial Article 7 report.

Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Assisting the victims, cooperation and assistance Actions #36–39, 45, Assisting the victims, Actions #29–35

A

rticle 6: Int’l Cooperation & Assistance—Victim Assistance

ICBL calls on the VA26 and other mine-affected SPs to take action in the six components of VA:

Emergency and continuing medical care

- Ensure that emergency vehicles and medical facilities with trained staff and sufficient equipment and supplies are available in mine-affected areas
- Ensure that survivors can get access to affordable follow-up medical care and medication
- Ensure that referral systems exist for the medical care and other assistance to survivors

Physical rehabilitation

- Make a special effort to ensure that survivors everywhere have access to physical rehabilitation and prosthetic and orthopedic services
- Ensure that states cover the costs of physical rehabilitation, including prostheses, orthoses and other mobility devices, repairs and replacements of devices, transportation and accommodation costs
- Ensure that the quality of prosthetic and orthopaedic services is maintained through training for rehabilitation staff plus adequate resources for materials, staff and management costs
- Complement center-based services with community-based rehabilitation programs

Psychological support and social reintegration

- Increase the availability of trauma recovery, formal counseling and peer support for survivors and families
- Ensure that physical rehabilitation teams also include counselors and social workers
- Ensure that survivors and other persons with disabilities can access public buildings, services and information.
- Ensure that persons with disabilities are included in social events, such as sports, culture and arts
- Facilitate access to inclusive and specialized education as well as vocational training for survivors or family members and other persons with disabilities

Economic reintegration

- Ensure landmine victims have equal access to microfinance opportunities, employment creation programs and other economic development initiatives
- Ensure survivors and other persons with disabilities have access to appropriate vocational training
- Design economic reintegration activities that take into account the labor market and provide follow-up to ensure employment opportunities or business sustainability
- Ensure respect for employment quotas for persons with disabilities

Laws and public policies

- Promote a human-rights based approach to victim assistance that recognizes that landmine survivors have a *right* to access medical, psychological, rehabilitation and social services, as well as to protection from discrimination.
- Educate community members about the rights and needs of survivors and other persons with disabilities to avoid discrimination and societal stigma
- Work to adopt and fully implement national disability legislation and plans based on the needs of persons with disabilities and ensure that these documents are in line with relevant international treaties(such as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Convention on Cluster Munitions).

Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Assisting the victims, Actions #29–35

A

rticle 6: Int’l Cooperation & Assistance—Victim Assistance

- Include survivors and persons with disabilities in law-making and implementation
- Sign, ratify and implement the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Convention on Cluster Munitions

Data collection

- Put in place adequate and effective data collection systems that can track not only statistical information about landmine victims, but also on their needs to ensure better delivery of services

And in general..

- Treat the 2005-09 process as a work in progress, not an end result, knowing that providing assistance to and protecting the rights of landmine victims must continue as long as needed
- Ensure that survivors and persons with disabilities as well as relevant ministries (including health, education, finance, social welfare, development, foreign affairs, etc.) work in a coordinated manner on developing VA objectives and plans, their implementation and monitoring of progress
- Make sure the organization or body in charge of coordinating VA activities has a clear mandate and sufficient authority and resources to carry its mission.
- Use voluntary Form J of the Article 7 reports to report on progress in achieving these activities
- Make sure that gender/age balance is respected from planning to implementation and evaluation.
- Make sure that states in coordination with survivors, disabled persons organizations and NGOs prepare their objectives and plans for the next five years (beyond 2009) by the 2nd Review Conference so that these can be implemented immediately after the Review Conference

While mine-affected states have the main responsibility for providing aid and protecting the rights of survivors, Article 6.3 of the treaty requires *all* States Parties in a position to do so to provide assistance. One area that ICBL needs to carefully monitor is the “mainstreaming” of aid to survivors into other humanitarian or development programs. While it is often appropriate to incorporate services for survivors into existing programs, their special needs must not be forgotten, and funds to directly meet these needs will remain crucial.

ICBL calls on all States Parties, and donors in particular, to:

- Keep up high levels of assistance to landmine survivors, their families and their communities
- Increasingly allocate national funds to make the VA programs sustainable
- Earmark funding for VA as part of a larger mine action grant or development aid package
- When VA is mainstreamed, make sure to keep specialized services when needed alongside the general programs to ensure that survivors’ particular needs are still met (the “twin-track” approach)
- Establish and improve a good monitoring mechanism for VA
- Continue to monitor implementation of the Nairobi Action Plan in the VA26 states
- Improve the national coordination mechanism, and for states who don’t have a VA/disability focal point, appoint a focal point as soon as possible (when relevant)
- Do not forget landmine victims in States Parties that are not part of the VA26 and in States not Parties.
- Urge mine-affected countries to include VA and/or disability programs in their national development and health plans and priorities where relevant.

Nairobi Action Plan Headings / Action Points: Assisting the victims, Actions #29–35

Mine Risk Education

Mine Risk Education (MRE) seeks to reduce the risk of injury from mines/UXO by raising awareness and promoting behavioral change, including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison. MRE is mentioned in the Mine Ban Treaty in three places: Article 5 (SPs must “ensure the effective exclusion of civilians” from mined areas), Article 6 (SPs “shall provide assistance ... for mine awareness programs.”), and Article 7 (SPs shall report on “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population...” about mined areas.) The Nairobi Action Plan provides more specific guidance, calling on SPs to provide mine risk education to all at-risk communities, to integrate MRE into education systems and development activities and to ensure consistency with international and national mine action standards.

The ICBL also emphasizes the importance of integrating MRE with other mine action and development activities. Mine clearance teams should have a community liaison component so that communities can provide critical information on mined areas, and they in turn can learn about the activities of clearance teams in their area. Liaison teams should also identify mine survivors and family members of fatal mine casualties and refer them to available services if needed. In addition, the ICBL has found that community-based MRE, where local residents of mine-affected areas provide messages to their own communities, can enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of MRE. MRE should also include risk reduction components, including involving local stakeholders to identify concrete alternatives to risk-taking behavior.

The ICBL encourages governments to:

- Integrate MRE programs into other mine action activities, including survey, marking and clearance
- Include MRE in official school curricula
- Include members of mine-affected communities in the provision of MRE and train them to continue MRE on their own
- Design MRE programs that take into account age, gender, social, cultural, and political factors
- Hold public handover ceremonies to ensure the land users have confidence in the released land
- Develop alternatives to risk-taking behavior with local stakeholders, especially those targeted to people taking risks out of economic necessity

MRE was given in 61 countries in 2007, including 42 States Parties. But the Landmine Monitor found that many countries had inadequate programs, meaning that the MRE approach taken was too basic, or that MRE was on a too limited scale or did not reach some geographical areas in need.

Countries/areas with inadequate programs include:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo DR, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran, Iraq, Lao PDR, Liberia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestine, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine, Yemen, Vietnam, Western Sahara, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

23 states believed to be mine/ERW-affected by LM 2008, have no MRE programs at all, though formal programs may not be necessary:

Argentina, Bhutan, Congo (Rep. of), Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Georgia, Libya, Mali, Moldova, Montenegro, Namibia, Niger, North Korea, Oman, Serbia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan and Venezuela.

Article 7: Annual reports

Article 7 requires States Parties to provide a report to the United Nations no later than 180 days after the treaty comes into force for them on a number of issues related to implementation of the treaty including: national implementation measures, stockpiles, location of mined areas, types and numbers of mines retained under Article 3, status of former mine production facilities, status of mine destruction programs under Articles 4 and 5, types and quantities of destroyed mines, technical characteristics of past mines produced, and mine risk education measures. Annual updates for the previous calendar year are due on 30 April from all States Parties.

The ICBL calls on governments to:

- Turn in initial reports on time.
- Turn in detailed annual reports every year by 30 April (covering the entire previous calendar year)
- Send in reports, preferably in electronic format, to the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs in **GENEVA** at these addresses (an electronic version is preferred):

apl.c.article7report@unog.ch or APLC Secretariat

Fax: +41 22 917 0034

UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (Geneva Branch)

Palais des Nations, Room C-113.1

1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

- Use revised Form D to report on the intended and actual use of mines retained under Article 3.
- Use amended Forms B and G to report on the discovery and destruction of antipersonnel mines after the completion of stockpile destruction programs.
- Use voluntary Form J for reporting on:
 - Victim assistance
 - Mine action funding
 - Steps taken to ensure Claymore and OZM-72 mines are used in command-detonated mode only
 - Foreign stockpiles of antipersonnel mines
- **Call on these 5 States Parties to turn in their late initial reports urgently!**

Equatorial Guinea (due 28 August 1999), Cape Verde (30 April 2002), Gambia (28 August 2003), Haiti (28 January 2007) and Palau (due 28 October 2008)

- **Call on these States Parties to turn in their late 2007 reports (due 30 April 2008) urgently!**

Andorra, Angola, Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cook Islands, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & Grenadines, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad & Tobago and Turkmenistan.

Article 8: Ensuring compliance

Article 8 of the Mine Ban Treaty - its longest provision - calls for both informal and formal processes for “facilitation and clarification of compliance” with the treaty. But so far States Parties have been reluctant to make use of this Article, even the informal consultations called for in its first paragraph. Yet there are many potential compliance issues that need urgent attention including:

- States that missed their stockpile destruction deadline
- States suspected of laying antipersonnel mines
- States suspected of transferring antipersonnel mines
- States suspected of assisting or encouraging other states or non-state actors to use, transfer, or stockpile mines
- States suspected of keeping operational stockpiles of APMs
- States that continue to take active military advantage of mined areas along borders or surrounding security installations.
- States that have never declared mined areas but are thought to have them
- States that do not take responsibility for clearing mines in territory under their jurisdiction or control
- (Post 2009) States that do not clear known or suspected mined areas but fail to ask for an extension

Messages to governments:

- Elaborate on the procedures in Art. 8 so that they can be invoked quickly if necessary (in areas such as sources of information and standards of evidence, financing and processes for special MSPs and fact-finding missions, the list of experts for fact-finding missions, and defining mandates for fact-finding missions).
- Consider less formal steps to address potential compliance cases including:
 - Seeking bilateral meetings with suspected violators
 - Recommending to the co-chairs of the SC on the General Status and Operation of the Convention or the MSP President to approach the suspected SP for clarification
 - Trying to elicit an explanation from the SP at intersessionals or MSPs

The ICBL encourages States Parties to assign the responsibility for taking initial steps on compliance issues to a small group of States Parties. For example, this task could be given to the co-chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention or the past, present and designate Presidents of the MSP. Another solution may be a new Contact Group on compliance. In addition to ensuring that compliance matters are investigated and treated when needed, having point persons or a special group for compliance would help encourage dialogue about what it means precisely to be in full compliance with the treaty (when there are grey areas), as well as how best to address these issues.

ICBL campaigners and LM researchers have a special role to play in compliance. Researchers can help establish the facts and establish credible evidence of a treaty breach. Campaigners can advocate for full compliance with the concerned state.

Article 9: National Legislation

Under Article 9 of the MBT, States Parties are required to “take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited” by the treaty. To date less than one-third of States Parties have passed domestic laws to implement the treaty. Some States Parties say that they do not believe an implementation law is required because, for example, they have never possessed or produced antipersonnel mines or because international treaties like the MBT are “self-enacting” under their domestic law. Yet ICBL believes all States Parties should pass national legislation that includes penal sanctions for potential future violations of the treaty and provides for full implementation of all aspects of the treaty.

The following states have indicated that they do not believe any new law is required to implement the treaty. They should be reminded about the need to impose penal sanctions for treaty violations and to ensure that all aspects of treaty implementation are covered by national laws:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua & Barbuda, Bulgaria, Bhutan, Central African Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Indonesia, Kiribati, Lesotho, FYR Macedonia, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Venezuela.

The following 27 SPs are in the process of developing national legislation, and should be encouraged to finish as soon as possible. (Countries in italics have had legislation in process for over two years and should be encouraged to finish the process quickly.):

Angola, Argentina, Bolivia, Brunei, Chile, DR Congo, Ecuador, Haiti, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Suriname, Swaziland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda and Vanuatu.

The following 39 SPs have not shown any progress or given any information about enacting national legislation and should be asked to start the process immediately:

Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Comoros, Republic of Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Iraq, Liberia, Maldives, Namibia, Nauru, Niue, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, São Tomé e Príncipe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, and Uruguay.

(States in italics are States Parties that have not yet submitted their initial Article 7 report with information on national implementation measures.)

The ICRC developed a kit for national legislation development to help SPs comply with Article 9, which is available on their web site at: [http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JR2C?](http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JR2C?OpenDocument)

U niversalization

Universalization of the convention is key to ensure that the emerging international norm of a total ban on antipersonnel landmines continues to take hold and that lives continue to be saved. 80% of the world's states have now joined the Mine Ban Treaty. As of 1 November 2008, there were 156 States Parties and 39 States not Party, including 2 Signatory States, which must still ratify. "JOIN THE CONVENTION!" is our message to ALL States not Parties. We also want to spread the norm of the treaty by encouraging non-state armed groups to accept the obligations of the treaty, especially the duties to stop using mines, clear mined areas, destroy stocks and provide assistance to survivors.

The following two states signed the treaty on 4 December 1997, which means they made a political commitment to join the treaty 11 years ago. They should be strongly encouraged to finish the ratification process as rapidly as possible.

- Marshall Islands
- Poland

The following States not Parties showed their support for the treaty by voting for the draft UN General Assembly Resolution on the implementation of the MBT in the First Committee session held in New York in October 2008.

Armenia	Georgia	Mongolia	Sri Lanka
Azerbaijan	Kazakhstan	Morocco	United Arab Emirates
Bahrain	Lao PDR	Oman	
China	Marshall Islands	Poland	
Finland	Micronesia	Singapore	

States not Parties that are not likely to join now should be asked to adopt the following interim measures to contribute to the global effort to eradicate landmines and show their solidarity with landmine survivors:

- Adopt a moratorium on the use, production, and transfer of antipersonnel mines
- Draft national legislation or begin other process needed for accession to or ratification of (by the remaining two signatories) the treaty
- Vote in favor of the annual United Nations General Assembly resolution on the treaty in 1st Committee (October) and the full General Assembly (December)
- Assist landmine survivors, their families and communities
- Engage in mine clearance and mine risk education where it is needed
- Submit a voluntary Article 7 (transparency) report with *all* relevant information*
- Provide information about its antipersonnel mine stockpiles and start plans for stockpile destruction
- Share information on victim assistance, mine clearance, mine risk education
- Attend (as observers) Meetings of the States Parties and the intersessional Standing Committee meetings

* Countries that have submitted voluntary Article 7 reports before becoming States Parties include Cameroon (2001), Gambia (2002), Lithuania (2002), Latvia (2003-05), Mongolia (2007), Morocco (2006 & 2008), Poland (since 2003), and Sri Lanka (2005, not including stockpiles)

Nairobi Action Plan Heading / Action Points: Universalization, Actions #1-8, 57

C luster Munitions

A cluster munition is a weapon designed to disperse or release many smaller explosive submunitions. It can be dropped from the air or fired from the ground. It breaks open in mid-air and releases submunitions covering a very wide area. Cluster munitions are prone to inaccurate and indiscriminate attacks and leave behind large numbers of unexploded landmine-like 'duds', posing serious threat to civilians and impeding reconstruction and development decades after a conflict ends.

In February 2007, Norway began a process to negotiate a new legal instrument on cluster munitions that "cause unacceptable harm to civilians." The process ended successfully on 30 May 2008 with the adoption in Dublin of a new convention that bans cluster munitions. The signing ceremony for the Convention on Cluster Munitions will take place in Oslo on 2-3 December 2008.

The key provisions of the Convention on Cluster Munitions are:

- A ban on the production, stockpiling, use and transfer of all cluster munitions. States must not assist, encourage or persuade anyone to engage in any activity banned by the Convention.
- States must destroy all cluster bomb stockpiles as soon as possible but no later than eight years after joining the Convention.
- States must clear areas contaminated by cluster bombs as soon as possible but no later than ten years after joining the Convention. States must report yearly on their clearance programs and educate local people to the risks of cluster bombs.
- States that have used cluster munitions are "strongly encouraged" to help clear and destroy these munitions, including providing detailed information on the location and nature of the use.
- States must respect the human rights of all cluster bomb victims—including those directly injured, their families and communities—by providing medical care, rehabilitation, psychological and financial support. They must also put in place the practical means to provide such care, including developing a national plan of action, mobilizing resources and appointing a focal point
- All states able to do so must assist states affected by cluster munitions with clearance, risk education, stockpile destruction and victim assistance.
- States must report in detail to the United Nations every year on their work under the treaty.

ICBL calls on states that have not yet done so to:

- Adopt an immediate moratorium on the use, transfer and production of cluster munitions
- Sign the new Convention on Cluster Munitions in Oslo and ratify and implement it as quickly as possible.

States and territories affected by cluster munitions (32):

Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chechnya, Croatia, Congo DR, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Falklands / Malvinas, Georgia, Grenada, Iraq, Israel, Kosovo, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Montenegro, Nagorno-Karabakh, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Uganda, Vietnam and Western Sahara.

States that have used cluster munitions (15):

Eritrea, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Israel, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, United States.

Cluster Munitions

States that have produced or are still producing cluster munitions (34): *(In italics are countries that no longer produce cluster munitions)*

Argentina, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Chile, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, North Korea, *Netherlands*, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, *Switzerland*, Turkey, United Kingdom, USA.

States that stockpile cluster munitions (78): *(in italics are countries that are in the process of destroying their stockpiled cluster munitions)*

Algeria, Angola, *Austria*, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, *Belgium*, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, *Canada*, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Libya, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, *Netherlands*, Nigeria, *Norway*, North Korea, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, UAE, UK, USA, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

107 states adopted the Convention on Cluster Munitions in Dublin, 30 May 2008: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo-Brazzaville, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, DR Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia FYR, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome e Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, UK, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, and Zambia.

20 states attended the Dublin negotiations as observers: Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Greece, Iraq, Kuwait, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Libya, Oman, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine and Vietnam.

States Parties (156) to the Mine Ban Treaty as of 1 November 2008, and their entry into force dates:

Afghanistan, 1/3/2003	Cote D'Ivoire, 1/12/2000	Kuwait, 1/1/2008	St. Lucia, 1/10/1999
Albania, 1/8/2000	Croatia, 1/3/1999	Latvia, 1/1/2006	St. Vincent & the Grenadines, 1/2/2002
Algeria, 1/4/2002	Cyprus, 1/7/2003	Lesotho, 1/6/1999	Samoa, 1/3/1999
Andorra, 1/3/1999	Czech Republic, 1/4/2000	Liberia, 1/6/2000	San Marino, 1/3/1999
Angola, 1/1/2003	Denmark, 1/3/1999	Liechtenstein, 1/4/2000	Sao Tome and Principe, 1/9/2003
Antigua and Barbuda, 1/11/1999	Djibouti, 1/3/1999	Lithuania, 1/11/2003	Senegal, 1/3/1999
Argentina, 1/3/2000	Dominica, 1/9/1999	Luxembourg, 1/12/1999	Serbia, 1/3/2004
Australia, 1/7/1999	Dominican Republic, 1/12/2000	Macedonia, FYR, 1/3/1999	Seychelles, 1/12/2000
Austria, 1/3/1999	Ecuador, 1/10/1999	Madagascar, 1/3/2000	Sierra Leone, 1/10/2001
Bahamas, 1/3/1999	El Salvador, 1/7/1999	Malawi, 1/3/1999	Slovakia, 1/8/1999
Bangladesh, 1/3/2001	Equatorial Guinea, 1/3/1999	Malaysia, 1/10/1999	Slovenia, 1/4/1999
Barbados, 1/7/1999	Eritrea, 1/2/2002	Maldives, 1/3/2001	Solomon Islands, 1/7/1999
Belarus, 1/3/2004	Estonia, 1/11/2004	Mali, 1/3/1999	South Africa, 1/3/1999
Belgium, 1/3/1999	Ethiopia, 1/6/2005	Malta, 1/11/2001	Spain, 1/7/1999
Belize, 1/3/1999	Fiji, 1/3/1999	Mauritania, 1/1/2001	Sudan, 1/4/2004
Benin, 1/3/1999	France, 1/3/1999	Mauritius, 1/3/1999	Suriname, 1/11/2002
Bhutan, 1/2/2006	Gabon, 1/3/2001	Mexico, 1/3/1999	Swaziland, 1/6/1999
Bolivia, 1/3/1999	Gambia, 1/3/2003	Moldova, 1/3/2001	Sweden, 1/5/1999
Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1/3/1999	Germany, 1/3/1999	Monaco, 1/5/1999	Switzerland, 1/3/1999
Botswana, 1/9/2000	Ghana, 1/12/2000	Montenegro, 1/4/07	Tajikistan, 1/4/2000
Brazil, 1/10/1999	Greece, 1/3/2004	Mozambique, 1/3/1999	Tanzania, 1/5/2001
Brunei, 1/10/2006	Grenada, 1/3/1999	Namibia, 1/3/1999	Thailand, 1/5/1999
Bulgaria, 1/3/1999	Guatemala, 1/9/1999	Nauru, 1/2/2001	Timor Leste, 1/11/2003
Burkina Faso, 1/3/1999	Guinea, 1/4/1999	Netherlands, 1/10/1999	Togo, 1/9/2000
Burundi, 1/4/2004	Guinea-Bissau, 1/11/2001	New Zealand, 1/7/1999	Trinidad and Tobago, 1/3/1999
Cambodia, 1/1/2000	Guyana, 1/2/2004	Nicaragua, 1/5/1999	Tunisia, 1/1/2000
Cameroon, 1/3/2003	Haiti, 1/8/2006	Niger, 1/9/1999	Turkey, 1/3/2004
Canada, 1/3/1999	Holy See, 1/3/1999	Niue, 1/3/1999	Turkmenistan, 1/3/1999
Cape Verde, 1/11/2001	Honduras, 1/3/1999	Norway, 1/3/1999	Uganda, 1/8/1999
Central African Republic, 1/5/2003	Hungary, 1/3/1999	Palau, 1/5/2008	Ukraine, 1/6/2006
Chad, 1/11/1999	Iceland, 1/11/1999	Panama, 1/4/1999	United Kingdom, 1/3/1999
Chile, 1/3/2002	Indonesia, 1/8/2007	Papua New Guinea, 1/12/2004	Uruguay, 1/12/2001
Colombia, 1/3/2001	Iraq, 1/2/2008	Paraguay, 1/5/1999	Vanuatu, 1/3/2006
Comoros, 1/3/2003	Ireland, 1/3/1999	Peru, 1/3/1999	Venezuela, 1/10/1999
Congo, Dem. Republic of, 1/11/2002	Italy, 1/10/1999	Philippines, 1/8/2000	Yemen, 1/3/1999
Congo, Republic of, 1/11/2001	Jamaica, 1/3/1999	Portugal, 1/8/1999	Zambia, 1/8/2001
Cook Islands, 1/9/2006	Japan, 1/3/1999	Qatar, 1/4/1999	Zimbabwe, 1/3/1999
Costa Rica, 1/9/1999	Jordan, 1/5/1999	Romania, 1/5/2001	
	Kenya, 1/7/2001	Rwanda, 1/12/2000	
	Kiribati, 1/3/2001	St. Kitts and Nevis, 1/6/1999	

States not party to the MBT (39). The countries in italics are signatories (2), which means they have a legal responsibility not to take actions that would violate the treaty. Their date of signature is in parentheses.

Armenia	India	Lebanon	Mongolia	Somalia
Azerbaijan	Iran	Libya	Nepal	Syria
Bahrain	Israel	Sri Lanka	Oman	Tonga
China	Kazakhstan	Morocco	Pakistan	Tuvalu
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	<i>Marshall Islands</i>	<i>Poland</i> (4/12/1997)	United Arab Emirates
Egypt	Korea, North	(4/12/1997)	Russia	United States
Finland	Korea, South	Micronesia	Saudi Arabia	Uzbekistan
Georgia	Laos	Myanmar	Singapore	Vietnam