

Implementation of Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty

This fact sheet describes the implementation of Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty, which obligates each State Party “to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.” In particular, the fact sheet assesses progress in implementation by affected States Parties that have been granted or have sought an extension to their Article 5 deadline.

States Parties with outstanding Article 5 obligations

There are as many as 43 States Parties with outstanding Article 5 obligations as set out in the table below. Of these, at least five States—Bhutan, Djibouti, Gambia, Namibia, and the Philippines—may no longer have mined areas containing antipersonnel mines on territory under their jurisdiction or control although further clarification is required before they will be deleted from the list of affected States Parties.

States Parties with Article 5 deadlines¹

State Party	Article 5 deadline	State Party	Article 5 deadline
Afghanistan	1 March 2013	Iraq	1 February 2018
Algeria	1 April 2012	Jordan	1 May 2012
Angola	1 January 2013	Mauritania	1 January 2011***
Argentina	1 March 2020	Moldova	1 March 2011
Bhutan	1 February 2016*	Montenegro	1 April 2017
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 March 2019	Mozambique	1 March 2014
Burundi	1 April 2014	Namibia	1 March 2009*
Cambodia	1 January 2020	Nigeria	1 March 2012
Chad	1 January 2011**	Peru	1 March 2017
Chile	1 March 2012	The Philippines	1 August 2010*
Colombia	1 March 2011***	Senegal	1 March 2016
Congo, Republic of	1 November 2011	Serbia	1 March 2014
Croatia	1 March 2019	Sudan	1 April 2014
Cyprus	1 July 2013	Tajikistan	1 April 2020
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	1 November 2012	Thailand	1 November 2018
Denmark	1 January 2011**	Turkey	1 March 2014
Djibouti	1 March 2009*	Uganda	1 August 2012
Ecuador	1 October 2017	United Kingdom	1 March 2019
Eritrea	1 February 2012	Venezuela	1 October 2014
Ethiopia	1 June 2015	Yemen	1 March 2015
The Gambia	1 March 2003*	Zimbabwe	1 January 2011**
Guinea-Bissau	1 November 2011***		

* Compliance with Article 5 uncertain

** Second extension request submitted

*** First extension request submitted for consideration at 10MSP

¹ Dates highlighted in bold are extensions granted to the original Article 5 deadline.

Summary of Article 5 extension requests

In 2008, 15 States Parties requested and were granted an extension to their deadline: Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Chad, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Thailand, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The length of period granted ranged from one year (Nicaragua) up to the maximum possible period under the treaty: 10 years (BiH, Croatia, and the UK). Three requesting States Parties—Chad, Denmark, and Zimbabwe—sought time to conduct additional survey, making it clear they would need a second extension to complete clearance operations.

In 2009, four other States Parties sought an extension to their deadline. Three of these States—Argentina, Cambodia, and Tajikistan—sought a 10-year extension, while Uganda sought three additional years. Uganda’s deadline expired on 1 August 2009. At the Standing Committee meetings in May 2009 Uganda had declared that it would meet its deadline, only to submit a three-year extension request on 19 August 2009. It was therefore in violation of the treaty until December 2009 when the Second Review Conference granted its extension request.

In 2010, three States Parties formally requested an extension to their Article 5 deadlines in 2010 for the first time: Colombia (10 years), Guinea-Bissau (two months), and Mauritania (five years). As of October 2010, it was not known if the Republic of Congo would also be seeking an extension. In addition, Chad, Denmark, and Zimbabwe submitted second extension requests. In June 2010, Denmark submitted a request for an additional 18 months through July 2012 to enable it to complete mine clearance operations.² In August 2010, Zimbabwe submitted a request for a further two years—particularly to enable additional survey, but not with a view to completing clearance—through 1 January 2013. In September 2010, Chad submitted a request for an additional three years to conduct both survey and clearance, but also without an expectation to finish clearance in the second extension period.

Progress in implementing Article 5 extensions

Many of the States Parties granted extensions in 2008 and 2009 have since made disappointing progress, with Nicaragua the only State Party granted an extension so far to report full compliance with its Article 5 obligations. Of greatest concern is Venezuela, which has not taken any meaningful steps to implement its Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 obligations either before or following the granting of a five-year extension to its Article 5 deadline in 2008. Indeed, Venezuela is the only mine-affected State Party that has yet to initiate formal clearance operations, more than 10 years after adhering to the treaty.

Argentina

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2010	None reported	1 March 2020	None reported

Argentina has declared that “illegal occupation” of the Falkland Islands/Malvinas by the UK has prevented it from conducting clearance operations.

² Denmark Second Article 5 deadline Extension Request, 18 June 2010, p. 3.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Clearance of 44.6km ² in 10 years leaving estimated contamination of 1,556km ² by the start of 2010	1 March 2019	Falling significantly behind; 2019 deadline already in jeopardy

BiH has so far failed to meet the targets set in its Mine Action Strategy 2009–2019, which provides for completing clearance within BiH’s extended Article 5 deadline. Demining organizations manually cleared 1.94km² in 2009, barely one-fifth of planned clearance for the year, an area of clearance that was 1.22km² (63%) less than the amount cleared in 2008.³ Based on available data, productivity per deminer appeared to be less than 10m² per day, far below the accepted industry average. In 2010, BiH planned manual clearance of 9.27km² but in June it reported it had completed clearance of only 1km².⁴

The ICBL has strongly recommended that the federal government invest directly in mine clearance. The ICBL has also recommended that Bosnia and Herzegovina make more effort to allocate funding for mine action operations from all levels of government, including from entities and local budgets, as set out in BiH’s extension request. The current lack of funding will surely mean BiH will fall further behind in meeting its targets, which will need to be readjusted in any case to correspond with levels of clearance that were lower than planned.

Cambodia

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 January 2010	Clearance of 266.5km ² by humanitarian demining agencies in 10 years leaving estimated contamination of 649km ² in January 2010	1 January 2020	On track

In the short time that has elapsed since Cambodia received its extension request, it appears to be on track in meeting the goals laid out in its extension request. The Cambodia Mine Action Authority (CMAA) and operators began Phase 1 of the Baseline Survey (BLS) in August 2009, and its findings should provide the basis for revisions to both the assessment of Cambodia’s residual mine contamination and for more detailed plans for tackling it. The BLS Phase 1 is expected to be completed on schedule by the end of 2010.

In addition to the BLS, clearance operations continue. Cambodia reported in its latest Article 7 report that in 2009, the four operators cleared 59.2km² of land, which surpasses the projected total clearance of 38.6km².⁵ The accreditation of the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces (RCAF), whose figures are included in this total, was listed as a priority in the extension request. RCAF has accredited one demining platoon with the CMAA but this has not fully allayed concerns about RCAF clearance, given the military’s sense of institutional seniority and resistance to accountability. RCAF still does not present detailed reports of its

³ Interview with Tarik Serak, Mine Action Planning Manager, BHMAC, Sarajevo, 2 June 2010; and “Bosnia and Herzegovina Mine Action Strategy 2009–2019,” April 2009, p. 12.

⁴ Statement of BiH, Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 21 June 2010.

⁵ Cambodia’s Revised Extension Request, Received 24 August 2009, p. 54. This figure included 9.28km² of battle area clearance by the Cambodian Mine Action Centre.

demining activities or submit to CMAA quality assurance. The CMAA will continue to need high level political support for its role as regulator.

Chad

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 November 2009	Clearance of only some 1.7km ² of mined areas in 10 years; no credible estimate for contamination as of November 2009	1 January 2011	Very little; second extension requested in September 2010 to conduct the survey which was the object of the first extension request

Chad is far behind on the plans submitted in its interim extension request, mainly because of delays in accessing international assistance in order to conduct the necessary survey. Chad asked for a short extension period (from 1 November 2009 to 1 January 2011) with the intention of conducting a new survey and submitting a second request in 2010 based on the results.

In March 2009, Japan had made a grant of almost \$5.6 million through the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action (VTF), managed by the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS). In December 2009, Chad urged UNDP “to reduce the administrative burdens” that had delayed the implementation of the planned contamination survey, the conduct of which was the aim of its initial extension request. After prolonged delays by the UN in processing the funds,⁶ a contract was finally signed with Mines Advisory Group (MAG) in April 2010. MAG returned under the new contract to conduct the survey and further demining later in the year, beginning work in September 2010 after a period of re-accreditation and retraining and the arrival of equipment.⁷

In September 2010, Chad submitted a request for an additional three years to conduct both survey and clearance, but without an expectation to finish clearance during this second extension period.

Croatia

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Clearance of 248.1km ² in 10 years; no precise estimate for residual contamination as of October 2010	1 March 2019	Falling slightly behind

Croatia appears to be falling behind on the ambitious targets in its extension request, but has designed a new plan for 2009–2019 that projects different rates of land release, which it met in 2009.⁸ The plan appears to lower expectations in the initial years, but predicts a sharp rise in land release through clearance and survey in 2012–2015.

⁶ According to the UN Mine Action Service, this was due to “prolonged internal discussions between the UN and UNDP on financial management of the project”. Email from Gustavo Laurie, Acting Chief of Policy and Advocacy Support, UNMAS, 29 September 2010. According to UNDP, the “bureaucracy of the VTF [UN Voluntary Trust Fund, managed by UNMAS] had led to delays in transferring the funds to UNDP for programme implementation.” Email from Sara Sekkenes, Senior Programme Advisor and Team Leader for Mine Action and Small Arms, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, UNDP, 29 September 2010.

⁷ Email from Sara Sekkenes, UNDP, 29 September 2010.

⁸ National Mine Action Strategy of the Republic of Croatia 2009-19, www.hcr.hr/pdf/Strategija%20eng.pdf.

According to Croatia’s Article 7 report for 2009, 37.87km² of land was released through clearance and technical survey, and an additional 24.71km² was cancelled through general survey activities. Therefore in 2009, a total 62.58m² was released, which is considerably below the total of 73km² predicted in the extension request. On the other hand, the new 2009–2019 plan projects a release of 57.4km², putting it ahead of this plan. All in all, Croatia reported a remaining suspected hazardous area of 887.7km² as of 31 December 2009, whereas the extension request predicted that 871km² would remain, and the new plan predicted 897.1km².

In its Article 7 report on 2009, Croatia reported clearing 76,361m² of mined areas around military barracks, training grounds, warehouses, radar stations and air fields, out of a remaining 2.74km² of suspected mined areas in such locations. Since keeping mines in areas that may have strategic utility is inconsistent with Article 1 of the treaty, they should all be cleared as a matter of priority.

Denmark

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 November 2009	Delays in initiating a clearance program led to the need for an extension.	1 January 2011	Second extension requested in June 2010 to complete clearance

Denmark’s initial extension request was for 22 months (until 1 January 2011) to allow for further survey and analysis that would permit it to develop a second request at the Tenth Meeting of States Parties. In November 2009, Denmark stated that they “expect to be ready to present a time schedule and a release plan at the next meeting of the Standing Committees in June 2010.”

There remains one mined area on the Skallingen peninsula of some 1.2km² to clear. No land was released in 2009. Instead, as was announced at the Cartagena Summit, Denmark has carried out terrain analysis which produced a better definition of the boundaries of the remaining mined area, and a better understanding of the types, depths and quality of the buried mines. Such analysis resulted in the size of the suspected area rising slightly from 1.2km² as of November 2008 to 1.246km² as of May 2009. It also conducted a special environmental assessment and is developing a plan to address the issues raised by it.

On 18 June 2010, Denmark submitted a second extension request, seeking an additional 18 months through July 2012 to enable it to complete mine clearance operations.⁹ On 22 June 2010, in its presentation of the request to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Denmark stated that a clearance contractor had been identified in a competitive tender process and that the contractor had been “given until the end of 2011 to complete the clearance. We have then added a six months buffer-period to allow weather-caused delays as well as to complete quality control of the area. Consequentially, Denmark will be able to release the area at latest by 1 of July 2012.”¹⁰ Clearance began in July 2010, as planned.¹¹

⁹ Second Article 5 deadline Extension Request, 18 June 2010, p. 3.

¹⁰ Statement of Denmark, Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 22 June 2010.

¹¹ Email from Erik Willadsen, Project Manager, Danish Coastal Authority, 28 October 2010.

Ecuador

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 October 2009	Clearance of only 0.133km ² in 10 years; an estimated 0.5 km ² remains.	1 October 2017	Very slow in the border areas; real progress cannot be measured until surveying is complete.

Ecuador has made little demining progress since receiving its extension, and it stated at the Cartagena Summit that it had fallen behind on objectives set out in its extension request. In 2009, Ecuador cleared only 8,191m², an area roughly the size of a football field, and only 2,000m² more than in 2008.¹² Its clearance goal for the first year of its extension period (October 2009 – September 2010) is 21,365m². At the Cartagena Summit, Ecuador indicated they had elaborated a calendar of activities to enable them to finish demining the border within their new deadline. At the end of 2009 Ecuador had 14 demining teams each comprising seven deminers (a total of 98). This is an increase from 60 deminers in 2008.¹³

Ecuador has left the survey of over half of its remaining suspected areas (323,390m²) until the last two years of its extension period. The ICBL has suggested that Ecuador carry out the necessary technical surveys as soon as possible in order to determine more accurately the remaining problem and possibly reduce the time needed to meet its Article 5 obligations.

Jordan

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 October 2009	Clearance of 6.17km ² since demining started in 2004; additional NGO clearance capacity significantly improved productivity	1 May 2012	Uneven, largely as a consequence of lack of funding

In Jordan, mine clearance dropped significantly in 2009, primarily as a result of funding shortfalls. By the end of 2009, Jordan estimated at 19.2km² the total extent of mine contamination, higher than two years earlier as a result of the need to verify clearance by the Armed Forces' Royal Engineer Corps.¹⁴ At the end of June 2010 this figure had fallen to 13.66km², of which 6km² was located in the Jordan Valley and 7.66km² along Jordan's northern border.

At the Second Review Conference, Jordan said it planned to complete clearance of its northern border with Syria by the end of 2011 but that the project faced a financial gap, and if it could not raise the required funds for 2010 and 2011, "the deadline for completing the project will in all probability have to be revisited." Jordan also said it needed to mobilize additional financial, technical, and human resources in order to complete clearance of mines in the Jordan Valley within its extended Article 5 deadline.¹⁵ At the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in June 2010, Jordan said it had attracted funding for 2010 and the first

¹² Article 7 Report, 28 April 2010, p. 13.

¹³ Article 7 Report, 28 April 2010, p. 2.

¹⁴ Email from Muna Alalul, Head of International Relations, National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation (NCDR), 28 April 2010; and NCDR, "Project Application, Jordan Valley Sampling and Verification Project," Amman, 16 February 2010, p. 4.

¹⁵ Statement of Jordan, Second Review Conference, Cartagena, 2 December 2009.

half of 2011 and, although it still needed to raise \$1.5 million to ensure completion, it expressed confidence it would meet its extended clearance deadline.¹⁶

Jordan stated at the May 2009 intersessional Standing Committee meetings that although border demarcation issues with Syria were not yet fully resolved they had received permission to proceed with clearance in disputed areas “without reservation.” The ICBL praises Jordan for this decision, which shows respect for its treaty obligations and is in line with Cartagena Action Plan Action #18.

Mozambique

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Clearance of four northern provinces and additional survey in the 6 remaining provinces helped to reduce the contamination from 561km ² in 2001 to 12km ² in 2008.	1 March 2014	Solid progress has been made with 2010 a key year in maintaining momentum in meeting its deadline as planned.

Mozambique is slightly behind schedule to finish clearance by its new deadline. In Mozambique’s extension request, it estimated that it had a remaining 12.17km² of contaminated land, plus a need to clear an 11km mine belt near the Cabora Bassa Dam, to clear a line of electrical power pylons in Maputo Province, and to survey and clear mined areas along Mozambique’s border with Zimbabwe. At the end of 2008 Mozambique had 10.28km² remaining.

In 2009, Mozambique released 3.87km² while adding 2.9km² from a survey HALO completed of the border areas with Zimbabwe. The remaining estimated size of mine contamination at the end of 2009 was 9.31km².¹⁷ As of 31 August 2010, however, HALO Trust was working with the National Demining Institute (IND) to clarify if approximately 1.5km² of surveyed roads, border minefields inside Mozambique, and the power pylon in Maputo province were included in the total surveyed area defined by the IND.¹⁸ According to its extension request, by the end of 2009 approximately 8.6km² would remain to be cleared. Although Mozambique is slightly behind schedule, if it averages the same amount of land released in 2009 in subsequent years, it should meet its extended deadline.

Nicaragua

Nicaragua was granted a one-year request to May 2010. At the intersessional Standing Committee meetings in June 2010 Nicaragua announced it had cleared all known mined areas and stated it was in full compliance with its Article 5 obligations.

Peru

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Clearance of 2,37km ² in 10 years; leaving an estimated 199,823m ² as of June 2010.	1 March 2017	Infrastructure clearance on schedule while clearance of border areas has fallen behind.

¹⁶ Statement of Jordan, Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, 22 June 2010.

¹⁷ Mozambique Article 7 Report, 22 April 2010, p. 7.

¹⁸ Email from Henrik Mathiesen, Project Officer, HALO, 31 August 2010.

Peru appears to be on track for clearing its infrastructure, though falling slightly behind on clearance of the border area with Ecuador. By the end of 2008, all of the mined pylons, transmission antennas, and substations had been cleared, as projected in its extension request. In terms of infrastructure, this leaves three prisons and two police bases to be demined. At the Cartagena Summit, Peru reported that in 2009, it had conducted impact surveys on the prisons and police bases and had begun technical surveys of the three prisons. In June 2010 around the Miguel Castro Castro Prison, it reported having cleared 2,591m², destroying 2,187 antipersonnel mines.

In the border region with Ecuador, Peru reported in Cartagena that in 2008–2009 it had cleared 7,995m² out of a projected total of 10,966m² for that period, putting Peru approximately 3,000m² behind schedule.

In order to complete clearance faster than the extension period, as encouraged by the 9MSP decision on Peru’s request, the ICBL has suggested Peru to redeploy police demining personnel to the border once they have finished clearing the mined infrastructure areas.

Senegal

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Clearance of only 0.09km ² in 10 years; no precise figure for residual contamination as of October 2010	1 March 2017	Slow with no additional demining capacity yet added despite the availability of funding

Senegal has made very little progress to date on demining the suspected hazardous areas in Casamance. Information produced for the Francophonie seminar organized by GICHD in Dakar in November 2009 reported that a total of 68,541m² has been cleared in Senegal, including 27,278m² in 2009. During the Cartagena Summit, Senegal reported clearing a total of 90,000m². Information supplied to Landmine Monitor in February 2010 reported just less than 85,000m² of clearance. In Senegal’s demining strategy, it predicted an ability to clear from 1.5km² to 4km² per year, depending on the number of demining teams available. Achieving this goal will necessitate a much faster pace of demining.

The impact survey conducted in Senegal located around 11km² of suspected hazardous areas (SHA), but since it did not cover all areas, they have extrapolated an SHA of 20km².¹⁹ Senegal’s Article 7 report submitted in April 2010 notes that of the 149 SHAs, 10 have since been surveyed and eight released without clearance. The report also signals that further general survey is ongoing to reach previously inaccessible areas and to gain a clearer picture of the previously identified SHAs contamination.

In the second half of 2009, the UNDP put out a request for tender for €3.35million funds from the European Commission, which had been allocated in 2007. The intention was to split this sum between two operators for a work schedule of three years. As of October 2010, no public announcement had been made on the tender.

At the Second Review Conference, Senegal expressed its hope that it would fulfill its Article 5 obligations before 2015 if the peace process continues.²⁰ Senegal previously stated its

¹⁹ Senegal Mine Action Strategy, November 2007, Annex 2.

²⁰ Statement of Senegal, Second Review Conference, Cartagena, 2 December 2009.

intention not to seek a second extension period, except for “truly exceptional circumstances.”²¹ In the past five years, demining has cleared only a very small extent of mine contamination, and the total estimate for mined areas to be released has almost doubled, leading to concerns that Senegal will not even meet its revised Article 5 deadline. In June 2010, Senegal stated that if additional funding were secured, it expected to meet its obligations in time.²²

Tajikistan

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 April 2010	Clearance of less than 2km ² in last five years; no precise figure for residual contamination as of October 2010	1 April 2020	Additional demining capacity should help to speed up productivity.

While mine clearance operations progressed slowly in 2009 (only 160,000m² cleared from a projected 300,000m²), new national and international demining capacity should speed up land release significantly, enabling Tajikistan to fulfill its Article 5 obligations well before its new 2020 deadline.

Re-survey of the Tajik-Afghan border was conducted during 2009. At the end of 2009, 217 mined areas covering some 8.5km² were reported to remain.²³ As of end 2009, re-survey of mine contamination in the Central region, 95% of which has been completed, confirmed 243 mined areas covering some 11km² in total. A further 57 suspected hazardous areas along the Uzbek border have not yet been re-surveyed.²⁴ No date has been set for the re-survey given outstanding border issues between Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

Thailand

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 May 2009	Clearance of less than 8.55km ² since 2003; no precise figure for residual contamination as of October 2010	1 November 2019	Very slow

Thailand has not provided the finances and other support needed to enable TMAC to implement an extremely ambitious extension plan and is therefore already falling far behind its targets. Indeed, the Ninth Meeting of States Parties in Geneva noted that achieving its 9.5 year plan was “contingent upon maintaining a sizeable increase in State funds dedicated to implementation and obtaining external support at a level that is at least 10 times greater than Thailand’s recent experience in acquiring such support.”

Thailand’s extension request said it would increase the area cleared in a single year to 43km² in 2009, but it actually cleared only 2.54km². To achieve this target the Thailand Mine Action

²¹ Statement of Senegal, Ninth Meeting of States Parties, Geneva, 25 November 2008; see also Senegal, “Observations on the Report of the Analysing Group,” 11 September 2008, pp. 2–3; and Response to Monitor questionnaire by Papa Omar Ndiaye, Senegalese National Mine Action Center, 1 May 2009.

²² Statement of Senegal, Standing Committee for Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 22 June 2010.

²³ Email from Parviz Mavlonkulov, TMAC, 28 April 2010.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

Center (TMAC) envisaged increasing its human resource capacity to 800 deminers by the end of April 2009,²⁵ but it did not receive the necessary financial support to carry this out.

TMAC took a number of initiatives in 2009 to accelerate progress in demining. Importantly, it has taken on external support. It reached agreement with UNDP for support in strategic planning. It also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Norwegian People's Aid to upgrade data management and develop its technical survey and land release procedures. This work is ongoing. It is clear, however, that without a sharp increase in resources and manpower Thailand will continue to fall far behind the plan submitted with its extension request.

Uganda

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 August 2009	Uganda declared in May 2009 that it would meet its 1 August 2009 deadline, only to submit a three-year extension request on 19 August 2009.	1 August 2012	On schedule to clear the four known mined areas; extent of residual contamination of scattered mines remains unknown.

At the Second Review Conference, Uganda said it would be free of landmines by August 2012 if sufficient funding was available. In April 2010, the director of the Uganda Mine Action Center reported that Uganda had one remaining mined area, in Agoro sub-county, which contained four separate suspected hazardous areas (SHAs) covering approximately 100,000m². Uganda expressed confidence the four SHAs were all the known mined areas remaining. However, even after clearance of the four SHAs is completed, Uganda faces a potential residual threat in other areas as small numbers of mines are believed to have been laid in a number of separate locations. Landmines continue to be found during unexploded ordnance disposal tasks. It is not known whether a new survey of suspected contamination will be conducted.

United Kingdom

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	The UK did not clear any mined areas before the expiry of its Article 5 deadline.	1 March 2019	Falling behind

No clearance operations had been initiated as of 1 March 2009, the expiry of the UK's initial Mine Ban Treaty Article 5 deadline for clearance. In mid-October 2009, however, the UK awarded a contract to BACTEC International Limited to clear four sites (Sapper Hill, Fox Bay, Goose Green and Surf Bay). The UK announced in late June 2010 that the clearance of these four areas had been completed on 4 June. A total of 1,246 mines were located and destroyed, of which 568 were antivehicle mines and 678 were antipersonnel mines. In addition two unexploded submunitions and nine items of UXO were destroyed.²⁶

The UK is not, though, complying with part of the terms of its 10-year extension request, which was granted in 2008. The UK has still to announce its clearance plans for the 113

²⁵ Thailand Article 5 deadline Extension Request (Revision), 7 August 2008, p. 23; and interview with Lt.-Gen. Tumrongsak Deemongkol, Director-General, TMAC, in Geneva, 26 November 2008.

²⁶ Statement of UK, Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 22 June 2010.

remaining mined areas. The UK had committed to providing “as soon as possible, but not later than 30 June 2010 a detailed explanation of ... the implications for future demining” in order to meet the UK’s obligations under Article 5 of the treaty. At the June 2010 Standing Committee meetings, the UK stated only that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office “will now analyse the data gathered from this project and make recommendations for future work based on this analysis to the new Government. We intend to report the findings of our analysis and agreed next steps to States Parties at the Meeting of States Parties in November 2010.”²⁷ In a statement to the meeting, the ICBL regretted the failure of the UK to meet its commitment by the stated deadline.

Venezuela

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 October 2009	Venezuela did not clear any mined areas before the expiry of its Article 5 deadline.	1 October 2014	Venezuela has not yet begun clearing any of its 14 mined areas.

As noted above, Venezuela is the only mine-affected State Party that has yet to initiate formal clearance operations, more than 11 years after adhering to the treaty. Four-year clearance operations at the six contaminated naval bases were planned to begin in October 2010, but in June 2010, at the Standing Committee meetings, Venezuela claimed a severe drought as one of the reasons demining could not begin as planned,²⁸ as well as a fall in its Gross National Product and new priorities for the government. In response, the ICBL stated that “the time for excuses is over; the time for clearance is now.”²⁹

Yemen

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	Yemen made significant progress in demining until the expiry of its Article 5 deadline	1 March 2015	Progress in releasing mined areas in Yemen appears to be slowing

The extent of Yemen’s residual threat remains unclear. According to the Yemen Executive Mine Action Center (YEMAC), as of end 2009, a total of 776km² had been released by clearance and survey³⁰ leaving remaining SHA totaling 146km².³¹ However, reported release of SHA in 2009 of only about 33km² means that this claim is unsubstantiated, and the figures for release appear to include SHAs that have been marked or which are suspended. Moreover, different figures have been provided by Yemen in its latest Article 7 transparency report, which variously suggests that as of March 2010, a total of 398.5km² or 145km² remained to be released.³²

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Previously, Venezuela cited wet weather as the main reason for not being able to conduct mine clearance.

²⁹ In 2007, Venezuela made statements indicating that it was still making active use of these emplaced antipersonnel mines, which is inconsistent with the Article 1 ban on use. During 2007 and 2008, the ICBL repeatedly stated its concern that Venezuela was purposefully keeping its antipersonnel mines in place in order to derive military benefit from them, and was not, as required by the treaty, clearing them as soon as possible. In June 2008, Venezuela stated that it was not using mines for defensive purposes, even though there are still “anti-state actors” across its border with Colombia.

³⁰ Email from Ahmed Alawi, Information Management System Officer, Operations Department, Yemen Executive Mine Action Center (YEMAC), 20 May 2010.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Compare the data in Forms C and I of Article 7 Report, 31 March 2010.

In addition, Yemen continues to cite technical difficulties it faces in clearing mines in shifting sand. Its Article 7 report describes clearance work in over 61km² as being “suspended,” which may be related to such areas. The report further notes that recent fighting led to the use by insurgents of landmines in the Sada’a governorate that YEMAC has been clearing since March 2010.

At the Cartagena Summit, Yemen noted it was facing difficulties in acquiring necessary funds for demining, despite its own increase in contributions from 50 to 60% of the budget. It said that if current funding shortfalls continued, it would not be able to meet its targets for 2010. Yemen did not attend the Standing Committee meetings in June 2010 to update States Parties on its progress and on challenges to fulfilling its Article 5 obligations.

Zimbabwe

Original deadline	Progress towards original deadline	Extended deadline	Progress towards extended deadline
1 March 2009	no precise estimate for contamination as of September 2010	1 January 2011	Very little; second extension requested in September 2010 to conduct the survey which was the object of the first extension request.

After receiving a 22-month deadline extension at the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties, Zimbabwe has been unable to make any progress towards meeting its clearance objectives. The States Parties granted Zimbabwe an extension until 1 January 2011 in order to re-survey its mined areas, which were last surveyed in 1994.

At the Standing Committee meetings in June 2010 Zimbabwe repeated that it would not be able to complete the surveying in the 22-month extension period and noted that it would be requesting another extension.³³ On 3 August 2010, Zimbabwe submitted a second extension request for a further two years—particularly to enable additional survey, but not with a view to completing clearance—through 1 January 2013.

Zimbabwe has not received any meaningful international funding for mine action since 2002, and reports that due to sanctions it cannot import the necessary equipment or contract with commercial demining companies. Zimbabwe is considering changing ZIMAC from a military to a civilian agency to increase its prospects for attracting international aid.

Future challenges

The ICBL has called on 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. It has also called on 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. It has further urged the international community to support their efforts by providing the necessary financial, technical and other support in a timely manner.

³³ Statement of Zimbabwe, Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Geneva, 22 June 2010.

But without enhanced efforts, future compliance with Article 5 deadlines seems likely to be similarly disappointing. Based on progress to date, the Monitor believes that the following States Parties are not on track to comply with their treaty obligations by their deadlines, indicated below in parentheses: Afghanistan (2013); Algeria (2012); Angola (2013); Chile (2012); Cyprus (2013); DRC (2012); Eritrea (2012); Sudan (2014); and Turkey (2014). In some cases, the problem is inadequate funding; more often, delays in initiating a program, poor management, and insufficient political will are the root causes. Regrettably, Article 5 clearance deadline extension requests are becoming the norm rather than the exception.