



A GUIDE TO THE OSLO ACTION PLAN AND RESULTS OF 2022 MONITORING: SURVEY AND CLEARANCE

A REPORT BY MINE ACTION REVIEW FOR THE TWENTIETH MEETING OF STATES PARTIES TO THE ANTI-PERSONNEL MINE BAN CONVENTION

THIS REPORT IS AVAILABLE FOR DOWNLOAD
AT WWW.MINEACTIONREVIEW.ORG

1 November 2022 (*draft report of provisional 2022 results*)

MINE ACTION REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD:



Norwegian People's Aid



FUNDED BY THE ROYAL NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS;
THE SWISS FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS; AND
GLOBAL AFFAIRS CANADA



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA

Canada

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction and States Parties Assessed | 3 |
| Oslo Action Plan Section II: Best Practices for Implementing the Convention..... | 4 |
| National Ownership | 4 |
| National Strategies and Work Plans | 5 |
| Gender and Diversity | 6 |
| National Standards Reflecting IMAS | 7 |
| Information Management | 8 |
| Oslo Action Plan Section V: Survey and Clearance of Mined Areas..... | 8 |
| An Accurate Baseline of Contamination | 9 |
| A Plan for Completion | 9 |
| Updating of Work Plans | 10 |
| Anti-Personnel Mines of an Improvised Nature | 11 |
| Reporting Consistent with IMAS | 11 |
| Accurate and Timely Extension Requests | 12 |
| Declarations of Completion | 12 |
| Residual Demining Capacity | 13 |
| Innovation and Efficiency | 14 |
| Oslo Action Plan Section VIII: International Cooperation and Assistance | 15 |
| Seeking Assistance | 15 |
| National Coordination and Dialogue | 15 |
| Oslo Action Plan Section IX: Measures to Ensure Compliance | 16 |
| Compliance in Reporting..... | 16 |
| Annex 1: 2022 Provisional Assessment by Mine Action Review of Implementation of Oslo Action Plan (OAP) Action Items Related to Survey and Clearance | 17 |

Introduction and States Parties Assessed

This Guide, which includes results of provisional monitoring in 2022 by Mine Action Review, aims to assess and support the implementation of Article 5 of the 1997 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC). It does so by focusing on the Oslo Action Plan, adopted at the Fourth Review Conference in November 2019, describing how the Action Plan addresses survey and clearance, and explaining how progress in implementing those commitments in the Action Plan will be assessed. This Guide follows the Oslo Action Plan's approach by detailing commitments that apply specifically to survey and clearance operations in all affected States Parties, as well as general best practices in mine action that are cross-cutting in nature.

Mine Action Review's formal assessment of progress under the Oslo Action Plan is published annually before each Meeting of the States Parties, through to the Convention's Fifth Review Conference in 2024. Our annual assessment, which draws on research conducted for Mine Action Review's annual *Clearing the Mines* reports,¹ monitors the 24 indicators from the Oslo Action Plan that are relevant to survey and clearance. These include indicators from Section II (best practices for implementing the Convention); Section V (survey and clearance of mined areas); Section VII (international cooperation and assistance); and Section IX (measures to ensure compliance). **A summary table of the 2022 provisional results of Mine Action Review's Oslo Action Plan monitoring is in Annex 1.** The 2022 provisional results will be finalised after the conclusion of the Twentieth Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC (20MSP) taking place in Geneva on 21–25 November 2022.

Sources for the monitoring of progress according to the 24 indicators include official Convention reporting (Article 7 reports and statements in both intersessional meetings and meetings of States Parties); statements in the annual United Nations (UN) National Mine Action Directors meetings and other relevant fora; and information provided directly to Mine Action Review by national authorities, clearance operators, the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS), the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and other key stakeholders.

This report is offered in the spirit of openness and constructive dialogue, accountability, and measurability. Viewed alongside Mine Action Review's annual *Clearing the Mines* report, we hope it will enable the mine action community to determine what measures are needed to improve the rate of progress in Article 5 implementation in affected States Parties between now and the Fifth Review Conference. Successful national ownership of mine action programmes requires political engagement by both the affected nation and supporting states. It also often requires support from implementing partners, be it financial, technical, or strategic, as well as honest reflection on challenges to progress. Different actors can add value in different ways in supporting affected States Parties to achieve their Article 5 obligations efficiently and effectively. It is intended that Mine Action Review's constructive monitoring and analysis serve as a strategic tool in these endeavours.

Mine Action Review welcomes feedback from States Parties and other stakeholders on the results of the assessment. Please email MineActionReview@npaid.org with any feedback and/or additional information for our consideration.

States Parties Assessed: For the purposes of Mine Action Review's assessment for Oslo Action Plan (OAP) indicators related to survey and clearance, Mine Action Review has generally assessed 30 of the

¹ See: www.mineactionreview.org.

34 affected States Parties, namely: Afghanistan,* Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH),* Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo), Ecuador, Eritrea,* Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria,* Oman,* Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia,* South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye (formerly known as Turkey), Ukraine,* Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

States Parties Not Assessed: Cyprus and Palestine* have not been assessed (except with respect to the indicator under Action Item #20 (indicator #2) on fulfilment of Article 5 obligations, as they do not have control over remaining mined areas under their Article 5 obligations. States Parties Cameroon* and Mali,* both of which have new mined areas as a result of new use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, but which have no new Article 5 deadline yet in place, have also not been assessed. This is the case except with respect to indicators under: Action Item #20 (indicator #2), on fulfilment of Article 5 obligations; Action Item #21 (indicator #1) on applying the provisions of the Convention to anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature; and Action Item #26 (indicator #3) on discovery of previously unknown mined areas.

States Parties marked with an * are those which had still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022 (covering 2021) as at 1 November 2022.

Mine Action Review is an independent project supported by Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) and funded by Global Affairs Canada, the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs. The HALO Trust, Mines Advisory Group (MAG), and NPA form Mine Action Review's Advisory Board. Any queries or feedback relating to our work should be emailed to MineActionReview@npaid.org.

Oslo Action Plan Section II: Best Practices for Implementing the Convention

Since the entry into force of the Convention in 1999, the States Parties have identified best practices that are key to the successful implementation of the Convention's obligations. The following cross-cutting issues apply to survey and clearance under the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, as they do to other thematic issues (e.g. stockpile destruction, victim assistance). At the heart of the Convention is national ownership, which has been defined to include political will, the provision of funding, and implementing the Convention inclusively, efficiently, and expediently, as well as overcoming any challenges that need to be addressed. Information management is critical to any mine action programme, informing work plans and multi-year strategies, while the adoption and revision of national standards promote efficient methodologies, safety, and security. A progressive approach to gender and diversity ensures the benefits of mine action are shared by all.

National Ownership

Action #1 *Demonstrate high levels of national ownership,² including by integrating Convention implementation activities into national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, humanitarian response plans and national strategies for the inclusion of persons with disabilities as appropriate, and by making financial and other commitments to implementation.*

² Ibid.

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #2: The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report making national financial commitments to the implementation of their [Article 5] obligations under the Convention.**

Commentary

National ownership encompasses a wide-ranging set of activities that enable and support the implementation of the Convention's obligations. Support from central government and relevant regional authorities should be of both a financial and a political nature.

With respect to survey and clearance, there are two overarching institutions that the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) identify as being of critical importance: a national mine action authority³ and a national mine action centre.⁴ The national mine action authority is an interministerial body that should ensure a whole-of-government approach to mine action. It sets overall strategy and policy for the mine action programme and helps to ensure that national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, and humanitarian response plans duly reflect the impact of landmines and action to ensure their speedy removal and destruction.

The national mine action centre is an operational coordinating body that ensures that all mine action stakeholders follow national standards and procedures, are tasked according to appropriate priorities, and are monitored during their work. The national mine action centre will normally house and maintain the national mine action database, whether that be the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) or another system. While not a specified indicator in the Oslo Action Plan, the number of mine-affected States Parties having a functioning and effective mine action authority and mine action centre is also a good reflection of their commitment to national ownership, along with their national financial commitments.

For the purposes of measuring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have made a financial contribution to their own Article 5 implementation in 2021 or 2022. Governments support their mine action programmes to varying degrees, with some States Parties funding all mine clearance, while others support both the national mine action centre and in part survey and clearance efforts, which are then also funded by external sources, including international donors.

National Strategies and Work Plans

Action #2 *Develop evidence-based, costed and time-bound national strategies and work plans to fulfil and implement Convention obligations as soon as possible.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report having evidence-based, costed, and time-bound national strategies and work plans in place.**

³ A national mine action authority should be supported by regional action, especially in federal or devolved systems or where jurisdiction over a territory is contested.

⁴ The national mine action centre may be supported and complemented by regional mine action centres.

Commentary

Every mine-affected State Party should have an evidence-based, multi-year mine action strategic plan and a realistic annual work plan in place. A national mine action strategy is a multi-year plan that identifies goals for the mine action programme and strategic priorities for achieving them. Five years is a common time period for a strategic plan, though this period can legitimately differ (such as a consequence of a State Party's Article 5 deadline). As the Oslo Action Plan indicates, the national mine action strategic plan should also be evidence-based and costed, with its own in-built indicators to enable progress to be assessed.

Within the context and parameters of the national mine action strategy, a work plan is typically an annual plan that sets detailed objectives for survey, clearance, information management, training, standardisation, and quality management (quality assurance and quality control). As is the case with the multi-year strategy, the annual work plan should be evidence-based and costed. Where, as often occurs, other forms of contamination exist, such as cluster munition remnants or other explosive remnants of war (ERW), work plans should ensure that synergies exist between mine clearance and battle area clearance capacities, priorities, and tasking.

Gender and Diversity

Action #3 *Ensure that the different needs and perspectives of women, girls, boys and men are considered and inform all areas of Convention implementation and mine action programmes, in order to deliver an inclusive approach. Strive to remove barriers to full, equal and gender balanced participation in mine action and in Convention meetings.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of affected States Parties whose national work plans and strategies integrate gender and take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account.

Commentary

It is increasingly understood that duly reflecting broader gender and diversity considerations in survey and clearance operations, as well as in the personnel staffing of the mine action programme, can have a significant and positive impact on its overall effectiveness. National authorities and their implementing partners should ensure that mine action is conducted in a way that involves, benefits, and protects everyone and that the barriers are removed to enable full and equal participation. Integrating and mainstreaming gender and diversity considerations into a programme is not something that just happens, it takes proactive, practical steps and proper consideration at each and every stage of programme planning – project design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Every affected State Party should therefore ensure that gender and diversity needs, in particular of minorities, are effectively taken into account in the implementation of their mine action programme, including determination of clearance priorities and tasks.

While there has been considerable progress in promoting gender equality in mine action over the last few years, the same cannot yet be said for diversity. Minorities are often marginalised both in terms of clearance priorities and with respect to employment and participation in the mine action sector. Mine action can and should counteract systemic discrimination based on diversity factors such as race, ethnicity, language, religion, disability, sexual orientation, social class, and age. Mine action

programmes should ensure that diversity is mainstreamed alongside gender, and taking an intersectional approach can help identify where different diversity aspects are overlapping and creating interdependent systems of discrimination. Steps are being taken in some mine action programmes to factor in diversity considerations, at the least, raising awareness of the issues, but significant challenges remain.

For the purposes of establishing the OAP baseline value for this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have either a work plan or a strategy that integrates gender and takes into account diverse needs. States Parties have included gender and diversity to varying degrees in their national strategies and plans.

National Standards Reflecting IMAS

Action #5 *Keep national mine action standards up to date in accordance with the latest International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), adapt them to new challenges and employ best practices to ensure efficient and effective implementation.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that have updated their national standards to address new challenges and ensure the employment of best practices, taking into consideration the latest IMAS.

Commentary

The IMAS⁵ have been developed to improve safety, efficiency and effectiveness in mine action and to promote a common and consistent approach to the conduct of mine action operations.⁶ They constitute industry best practice for safe and effective mine action operations. Published and overseen by UNMAS with the support of other UN and mine action agencies (commercial and non-governmental organisations), national authorities and the GICHD, they set out in detail how survey and clearance operations should be designed, managed, and implemented. Particularly important are IMAS 02.10 on the establishment of a mine action programme; the glossary of mine action terms in IMAS 04.10; IMAS 07.11 on Land Release; the IMAS on technical and non-technical survey (08.20 and 08.10, respectively); and clearance requirements (09.10).

The IMAS are intended to be adapted to the national context in the form of national mine action standards (NMAS), so that programmes can take due account of local circumstances on issues such as clearance depth and training requirements. They are also updated regularly to take account of lessons learned in other programmes, as reflected in international best practice. The framework of standards is developed and maintained by an international Review Board that is chaired by UNMAS, supported by a dedicated secretariat based at the GICHD, and comprises experts from across the mine action sector. Executive oversight is provided by a director-level Steering Group composed of members from four UN agencies and the GICHD.

Accordingly, Action 5 of the Oslo Action Plan is emphasising the need for national programmes to be alert to changes that may be relevant for their own national standards. In each mine-affected State

⁵ At: <https://www.mineactionstandards.org/>.

⁶ IMAS 01.10: "Guide for the application of International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)", March 2018, at: bit.ly/3ktNlne, para. 5.

Party, the IMAS on survey and clearance should be formally reviewed, and if necessary updated, at least once every three years.

For the purposes of establishing the OAP baseline value for this indicator, Mine Action Review has focused our assessment on whether or not States Parties have updated national standards to allow for evidence-based land release through both survey and clearance.

Information Management

Action #9 *Establish and maintain a national information management system containing accurate and up-to-date data at the national level on the status of implementation. The design and implementation of information management systems will ensure that they are nationally owned, sustainable and take into account the need for data that can be accessed, managed and analysed post-completion.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report having a sustainable national information management system in place.

Commentary

Information management is at the core of mine action. No mine action programme can be either efficient or effective (or indeed sustainable) if it is not supported by a national information management system that identifies accurately the location of suspected and confirmed hazardous areas and records (and disaggregates) details of cancellation by non-technical survey, reduction by technical survey, and release by clearance. Every mine-affected State Party should ensure the national mine action information management system is both accurate and up-to-date.

The Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) has become the *de facto* standard database for mine action programmes. Over two-thirds of States Parties with Article 5 obligations are using IMSMA. A State Party is, however, free to choose any system that is effective and which is maintained to ensure accuracy. A sustainable information management system is one that is nationally owned. It needs to be maintained not just throughout the implementation of Article 5 of the Convention but also afterwards as the risk of encountering residual contamination (or other forms of contamination) will often be significant.

For the purposes of measuring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have a functioning, and not just sustainable, mine action database. A well-managed information management system is one in which information is entered in a timely manner by trained personnel, is subject to quality assurance, and is accessible and transparent.

Oslo Action Plan Section V: Survey and Clearance of Mined Areas

In their introduction to Section V of the Oslo Action Plan, on Survey and Clearance of Mined, States Parties acknowledged the “considerable progress” made by affected States in addressing mined areas, but called for an increase in the pace of survey and clearance so that all Parties may meet their Article 5 obligations as soon as possible. In reiterating the ambition of completing their clearance obligations

“to the fullest extent possible by 2025”, they noted the challenge arising from new use of anti-personnel mines in recent conflicts, including those of an improvised nature.

An Accurate Baseline of Contamination

Action #18 *States Parties that have not yet done so will identify the precise perimeter of mined areas, to the extent possible, and establish evidence-based, accurate baselines of contamination based on information collected from all relevant sources no later than by the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2021.*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of affected States Parties that have established an accurate and evidence-based contamination baseline no later than the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2021 (and by each year thereafter if not all affected States Parties have done so by 19MSP).**
- **Indicator #2: The percentage of affected States Parties that report having established their baseline through inclusive consultations with women, girls, boys, and men.**

Commentary

The national mine action information system cannot be accurate and up-to-date if it is not informed by a representative baseline of contamination nationwide. Mistakes in survey can exaggerate hugely the extent of the problem and lead to clearance resources being wasted on uncontaminated areas. High-quality survey can be achieved without excessive expenditure. An accurate baseline is, or should be, the starting point for all successful national mine action programmes, established through a combination of evidence-based non-technical and technical survey. In general, a high proportion of confirmed hazardous areas to suspected hazardous areas indicates a more reliable baseline. To a varying extent, insecurity can sometimes prevent or hinder conflict-affected States Parties from accessing some mined areas under their jurisdiction or control.

The Oslo Action Plan calls for all mine-affected States Parties that have not yet done so to establish an accurate and evidence-based contamination baseline by the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties (19MSP) in 2021 and by each year thereafter. This includes anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, as reflected in Action Item 21 (see below). The methodology of the survey must be inclusive, which calls for age- and gender-appropriate consultations at local level, as well as inclusion of marginalised groups. While many States Parties have established a baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination, in many instances the baseline is assessed not to be accurate or evidence-based, or inclusive, and therefore does not meet the OAP indicator(s).

A Plan for Completion

Action #19 *Develop evidence-based and costed national work plans, including projections of the number of areas and the amount of mined area to be addressed annually to achieve completion as soon as possible, and no later than their Article 5 deadline, to be presented at the Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2020.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of affected States Parties presenting work plans for the implementation of Article 5 by the Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties (and MSPs thereafter if not all affected States Parties have done so by 18MSP).

Commentary

A multi-year strategic plan sets long-term goals for mine action, in particular with a view to fulfilling Article 5 obligations as soon as possible. This multi-year plan is then broken down into a series of annual work plans that detail which areas will be cleared within a calendar year. Both plans should be evidence-based and costed.

Of course, it is hoped that each mine-affected State Party will fulfil its survey and clearance obligations within its initial 10-year deadline. Unfortunately, that has so far proved to be the exception rather than the rule. At the least, every mine-affected State Party should have a realistic plan in place to fulfil its Article 5 obligations as soon as possible.

The plan should also reflect synergies with efforts to tackle other forms of contamination, Convention reporting obligations, and links to broader development.

Updating of Work Plans

Action #20 *Annually update their national work plans based on new evidence and report on adjusted milestones in their Article 7 reports by 30 April each year, including information on the number of areas and amount of mined area to be addressed annually and on how priorities have been established.*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of affected States Parties that have reported annual updates and adjusted milestones to their national work plans in their 30 April transparency reports.
- **Indicator #2:** The number of States Parties that have fulfilled their obligations under Article 5.

Commentary

Article 7 transparency reports are an important source of information on the amount of mined area released through survey and clearance in the previous year, the amount of anti-personnel mine contamination remaining, and planned land release outputs to release it. Often, however, Article 7 reports are not accurate. Annual survey and clearance data provided to Mine Action Review are often more accurate than are the annual data included in the Article 7 reports. This is, in part, due to the fact that where possible our researchers double check all of the information with that provided by the different clearance operators engaged in-country in survey and clearance.

Every mine-affected State Party should have an annual work plan to support implementation of its multi-year strategic plan for the fulfilment of its Article 5 obligations. On a regular basis (preferably annually), multi-year national mine action strategies will need to be reviewed to take account of progress that is either quicker or slower than that originally envisaged. “Fail to plan: plan to fail” as the cliché has it. Accompanying annual work plans should be updated/elaborated annually. It may be that annual work plans are also updated during the course of the year to take account of changing circumstances, but this is more rarely done, at least in a formal manner. Article 7 transparency reports provide an excellent opportunity to provide adjusted milestones for planned survey and clearance outputs.

Anti-Personnel Mines of an Improvised Nature

Action #21 *States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature will ensure that they apply all provisions and obligations under the Convention to such contamination as they do for all other types of anti-personnel mines, including during survey and clearance in fulfilment of Article 5 and disaggregate by types of mines when reporting in fulfilment of Article 7 obligations.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1: The number of [affected] States Parties that apply the provisions of the Convention to anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature (for the purpose of this indicator: survey, clear and report).**

Commentary

All mines that fit the definition of Article 2(1) of the 1997 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention must be cleared and destroyed in accordance with Article 5 and reported upon in accordance with Article 7. It does not matter whether the mines were manufactured, artisanally produced, or home-made. Thus, Paragraph 6 of the Oslo Declaration, adopted at the final plenary meeting of the Fourth Review Conference on 29 November 2019, stipulates that States Parties “will continue and strengthen our efforts to stigmatise and end the use of these weapons banned under the Convention, including new use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, for which all the Convention’s provisions apply.”

Every affected State Party with an improvised mine threat must include survey and clearance in the fulfilment of its Article 5 obligations and in its reporting on implementation.

Reporting Consistent with IMAS

Action #22 *Report in a manner consistent with IMAS by providing information on the remaining challenges, disaggregating by “suspected hazardous areas” and “confirmed hazardous areas” and their relative size, as well as by the type of contamination. Report on progress in accordance with the land release methodology employed (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, or cleared through clearance).*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of affected States Parties reporting on the remaining challenge and progress made in accordance with IMAS.**
- **Indicator #2: The percentage of affected States Parties providing survey and clearance data in Article 5 extension requests and Article 7 reports that disaggregates by type of contamination.**

Commentary

Common problems in reporting on progress in implementing Article 5 include an inability to distinguish a suspected hazardous area (SHA) from a confirmed hazardous area (CHA). In the context of Article 5, a SHA is an area where there is reasonable suspicion of contamination on the basis of indirect evidence of the presence of anti-personnel mines; and a CHA refers to an area where the presence of contamination has been confirmed on the basis of direct evidence of the presence of anti-personnel mines. A CHA should be established by high-quality evidence-based non-technical survey, supplemented as necessary by technical survey.

Reporting must clearly disaggregate anti-personnel mined areas from areas with other types of explosive ordnance (e.g. anti-vehicle mines or ERW). Anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature should be reported as anti-personnel mines and not as IEDs [improvised explosive devices].

Land release output data should be clearly disaggregated by the land release methodology employed (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, or released through clearance).

An initial survey of a large, previously unsurveyed area (even a district) that, it was thought, might contain contamination but which in fact does not, may not be reported as land release under IMAS.

Accurate and Timely Extension Requests

Action #23 *States Parties submitting requests for extensions will ensure that these requests contain detailed, costed and multi-year work plans for the extension period and are developed through an inclusive process, in line with the decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties⁷ and the recommendations endorsed by the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties in the paper “Reflections on the Article 5 Extensions Process”.⁸*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of extension requests that include detailed, costed, and multi-year work plans for the extension period.**
- **Indicator #2: The percentage of extension requests that are submitted in accordance with the process established by the States Parties.**

Commentary

Every mine-affected State Party that submits an extension request should ensure that it is accurate and contains data that are internally consistent. According to the procedure agreed by States Parties for the submission of Article 5 extension requests, any request should be submitted at the latest by the end of March in the year within which a meeting of States Parties or a Review Conference is being asked to consider it. The request should be detailed and include among others, the nature and extent of remaining mined areas; a detailed work plan covering the amount of time requested, with measurable benchmarks; existing national demining structures and capacities; and the expected resources available and/or required in order to address the remaining challenge.

Submission of deadline extension requests in a timely manner gives the APMBC Committee on Article 5 Implementation and States Parties the opportunity to review the request carefully and seek clarification from the requesting State Party on any points that are unclear. One of the main problems in requests is that the data they contain are either not consistent with the State’s other reporting or they are contradicted by other data presented elsewhere in the same extension request.

For the purposes of measuring this indicator, Mine Action Review’s assessment is based on Article 5 extension requests submitted in 2022.

Declarations of Completion

⁷ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.7/2006/L.3, at: bit.ly/2Nlvksm.

⁸ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.12/2012/4, at: bit.ly/36QGr4j.

Action #25 *States Parties who complete their clearance obligations will continue the best practice of submitting voluntary declarations of completion and give due consideration to the paper “Reflections and understandings on the implementation and completion of Article 5 mine clearance obligations”⁹ in that regard.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of States Parties that have completed their Article 5 obligations and that submit voluntary declarations of completion.**

Commentary

Every mine-affected State Party that completes survey and clearance of all mined areas containing anti-personnel mines should submit a declaration of completion that reflects fulfilment of all clearance obligations. But a mine-affected State Party should only declare fulfilment of its Article 5 obligations when it is convinced that it has done so. Premature declaration of completion may lead subsequently to compliance concerns, as was the case in the past with Jordan and Mozambique, for example.

To have duly fulfilled their Article 5 obligations, a State Party must have made every effort to identify all mined areas suspected or confirmed to contain anti-personnel mines and then to have released all of those areas by an appropriate combination of non-technical survey, technical survey, and clearance.

For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review’s assessment is based on the number of States Parties that have fulfilled their obligations under Article 5 since the start of the 19MSP presidency in November 2021.

Residual Demining Capacity

Action #26 *Ensure that national strategies and work plans for completion make provisions for a sustainable national capacity to address previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas discovered following completion. In addressing these areas, they will consider the commitments made at the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties as contained in the paper “Proposed rational response to States Parties discovering previously unknown mined areas after deadlines have passed”.¹⁰*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1: The percentage of affected States Parties that include provisions for addressing previously unknown mined areas in their national strategies and/or completion plans.**
- **Indicator #2: The percentage of affected States Parties that report having put in place sustainable national capacities to address the discovery of previously unknown mined areas**
- **Indicator #3: The percentage of States Parties that discover previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas, that apply the decision of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.**

Commentary

⁹ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.17/2018/10, at: bit.ly/2tdtmDM.

¹⁰ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.12/2012/7, at: bit.ly/2QMODwU.

Even if a State Party has duly fulfilled its Article 5 obligations, individual mines and small mined areas may not have been discovered and reported during survey. If previously unknown mined areas are later encountered, they must be accurately reported through Convention mechanisms and released. (There may also be new contamination resulting from armed conflict, such as occurred in Ukraine.) This means that a State must prepare for a sustainable demining capacity to address such areas even when it believes that its demining is complete. This is the residual demining capacity. Such capacity may exist within the armed forces, the police, or civil defence organisations (or other competent departments or services). It could potentially be part of a cooperation agreement with a neighbouring country. It is also important to maintain the national mine action information database for this purpose.

While some States Parties have varying degrees of national clearance capacity (for example in the Armed Forces or Civil Defence), they have not stated publicly in their national strategies or completion plans how previously unknown mined areas will be addressed. There should be an agreed plan in place specifying which national entity is responsible for addressing residual contamination, under which circumstances, and which ensures provision is made for long-term access to the national information management database.

Innovation and Efficiency

Action #27 *Take appropriate steps to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of survey and clearance, including by promoting the research, application and sharing of innovative technological means to this effect.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The number of States Parties that report promoting research, application, and sharing of innovative technological means.

Commentary

The mine action sector has proved itself adept at innovating to improve efficiency and effectiveness. The use of remote sensing technology such as unmanned aerial systems, animal detection systems, and mechanical techniques to identify mined areas, and the development of dual-sensor mine detectors that use ground-penetrating radar to reduce false positive signals, are just a few examples of where innovation and technology have benefitted the sector as a whole. This readiness to embrace new techniques and approaches is one that must be sustained for as long as there is contamination to address. Every mine-affected State Party that achieves significant efficiency gains through innovation should share its experiences with the other States Parties.

For the purposes of measuring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on available information. States Parties may have promoted the research, application, and sharing of innovative methodologies without reporting publicly on them.

Oslo Action Plan Section VIII: International Cooperation and Assistance

In their introduction to Section VIII of the Oslo Action Plan, on International Cooperation and Assistance, States Parties stressed that enhanced cooperation can support implementation of Convention obligations as soon as possible. This applies to survey and clearance, as it does to other thematic areas.

Seeking Assistance

Action #43 *States Parties seeking assistance will develop resource mobilisation plans and use all mechanisms within the Convention to disseminate information on challenges and requirements for assistance, including through their annual Article 7 transparency reports and by taking advantage of the individualised approach. States Parties will share the outcomes of the individualised approach with the wider mine action community in order to maximise its impact.*

Action Plan Indicators

- **Indicator #1:** The number of States Parties requiring support that provide information on progress, challenges and requirements for assistance in Article 7 reports and Convention meetings.
- **Indicator #2:** The number of States Parties that have taken advantage of the individualised approach and that report having received follow-up and/or increased support to meet the needs identified.

Commentary

Few States have the necessary resources to address their mine contamination on their own. The collaborative approach to implementing Article 5 obligations is one that has stood the Convention in good stead. Donors have been remarkably generous in supporting mine survey and clearance while mine action agencies can also give invaluable technical advice to address particular challenges. The onus, however, is on the mine-affected State Party to identify its needs for international assistance and to facilitate the receipt of that assistance. In recent years, individualised country-specific approaches have enabled a focus on the concerns and challenges of a particular State Party, thereby benefitting all concerned.

National Coordination and Dialogue

Action #44 *States Parties will strengthen national coordination including by ensuring regular dialogue with national and international stakeholders on progress, challenges and support for implementation of their obligations under the Convention. They will consider, where relevant, establishing an appropriate national platform for regular dialogue among all stakeholders.*

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The number of States Parties that have an in-country platform for dialogue among all stakeholders that meets on a regular basis.

Commentary

In addition to the overall coordination function performed by the national mine action centre, a mine-affected State Party should seek to establish a national platform that enables open and regular dialogue among all relevant stakeholders. Allowing all mine action actors to share their ideas and concerns in an informal and collaborative setting can help improve coordination of Article 5 implementation and demonstrate strong national ownership and political commitment to completion.

There is considerable scope for national platforms to enable a focus on the concerns and challenges of a particular State Party, thereby benefitting all concerned. In several States Parties national authorities convene regular meetings with clearance operators, but these do not include other stakeholders, such as donors.

Oslo Action Plan Section IX: Measures to Ensure Compliance

The States Parties remain committed to ensuring compliance with the obligations of the Convention in order to reach its objectives.

Compliance in Reporting

Action #49 Any State Party implementing obligations in particular under Article 5¹¹ that has not submitted an Article 7 report detailing progress in implementing these obligations each year will provide in close cooperation with the ISU an annual update on the status of implementation in line with Article 7 and will provide information to all States Parties in the most expeditious, comprehensive and transparent manner possible. If no information on implementing the relevant obligations for two consecutive years is provided, the President will assist and engage with the States Parties concerned in close cooperation with the relevant Committee.

Action Plan Indicator

- **Indicator #1:** The percentage of States Parties that are implementing obligations under Article 5¹² and that have not submitted an Article 7 report detailing progress in implementing these obligations in the last two years, that provide updates to all States Parties in Article 7 reports and during meetings of the States Parties.

Commentary

Annual reports on contamination and progress in land release are obligatory for every mine-affected State Party to the Convention under its Article 7. The Oslo Action Plan justly sees the failure by a State Party to comply with this obligation as a serious challenge to implementation.

¹¹ Action #49 of the Oslo Action Plan also references Article 4 and retaining or transferring mines in line with Article 3, but for purposes of monitoring Mine Action Review has focused solely on Article 5.

¹² The indicator in the Oslo Action Plan also references Article 4 and retaining mines in line with Article 3.1, but for purposes of monitoring Mine Action Review has focused solely on Article 5.

Annex 1: 2022 Provisional Assessment by Mine Action Review of Implementation of Oslo Action Plan (OAP) Action Items Related to Survey and Clearance

Table 1 below details the 2022 provisional results of Mine Action Review's assessment of Oslo Action Plan (OAP) Action Items related to survey and clearance. The 2022 provisional results will then be finalised after the conclusion of the Twentieth Meeting of States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC, 20MSP), which is taking place on 21–25 November 2022 in Geneva. Mine Action Review welcomes feedback from States Parties and other stakeholders on the results of the assessment. Please send an email with any feedback or additional information for Mine Action Review's consideration to MineActionReview@npaid.org.

States Parties Assessed: For the purposes of Mine Action Review's assessment for Oslo Action Plan (OAP) indicators related to survey and clearance, Mine Action Review has generally assessed 30 of the 34 affected States Parties, namely: Afghanistan,* Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH),* Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo), Ecuador, Eritrea,* Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria,* Oman,* Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia,* South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye (formerly known as Turkey), Ukraine,* Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

States Parties Not Assessed: Cyprus and Palestine* have not been assessed (except with respect to the indicator under Action Item #20 (indicator #2) on fulfilment of Article 5 obligations, as they do not have control over remaining mined areas under their Article 5 obligations. States Parties Cameroon* and Mali,* both of which have new mined areas as a result of new use of anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, but which have no new Article 5 deadline yet in place, have also not been assessed. This is the case except with respect to indicators under: Action Item #20 (indicator #2), on fulfilment of Article 5 obligations; Action Item #21 (indicator #1) on applying the provisions of the Convention to anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature; and Action Item #26 (indicator #3) on discovery of previously unknown mined areas.

States Parties marked with an * are those which had still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022 (covering 2021) as at 1 November 2022.

Table 1: Provisional Results of the 2022 Assessment of implementation of OAP Action Items related to Survey and Clearance of Anti-Personnel Mines

| Thematic Issue | Action Item | Indicator | Results (2022) | States Parties that have met the indicator | States Parties that have not met the indicator | States Parties for which it is unclear or unknown if the indicator has been met | Additional Comments and Information |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Oslo Action Plan Section II: Best Practices for Implementing the Convention | | | | | | | |
| National Ownership | Action #1: Demonstrate high levels of national | Indicator #2: The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report making national financial | 83% [25 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola BiH* Cambodia Chad Colombia | Ethiopia Eritrea* Niger | Afghanistan* Yemen | For the purposes of this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have made a national financial contribution |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| | ownership, ¹³ including by integrating Convention implementation activities into national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, humanitarian response plans and national strategies for the inclusion of persons with disabilities as appropriate, and by making financial and other commitments to implementation. | commitments to the implementation of their [Article 5] obligations under the Convention. | | Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania Nigeria* Oman* Peru Senegal Serbia Somalia* South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Ukraine* Zimbabwe | | <p>to their own Article 5 implementation in 2021 or 2022.</p> <p>In some States Parties, such as Chad, DR Congo, Guinea Bissau, and Senegal, national funding is provided towards the costs of the national mine action centre, but not towards anti-personnel survey or clearance operations.</p> <p>In Mauritania, the National Humanitarian Demining Programme for Development (PNDHD) is funded nationally. Despite its limited resources the PNDHD also contributes to small-scale survey and clearance of mined areas.</p> <p>The Government of Somalia does not provide any national funding for survey or clearance. However, the Ministry of Defence in Somaliland provides a financial allocation to two manual clearance teams totalling 18 personnel.</p> |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|

¹³ The States Parties have defined national ownership as entailing the following: “maintaining interest at a high level in fulfilling Convention obligations; empowering and providing relevant State entities with the human, financial and material capacity to carry out their obligations under the Convention; articulating the measures its State entities will undertake to implement relevant aspects of Convention in the most inclusive, efficient and expedient manner possible and plans to overcome any challenges that need to be addressed; and making a regular significant national financial commitment to the State’s programmes to implement the Convention”.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>The Government of South Sudan should fund the costs of NMAA staff salaries and its sub offices. However, South Sudan's most recent Article 7 report indicated that funding for salaries was inadequate and that salaries had not been paid for six months. The NMAA did not provide any funding for survey or clearance.</p> <p>It was unclear whether or not the government of Yemen provides any national funding to YEMAC.</p> |
| National Strategies and Work Plans | Action #2: <i>Develop evidence-based, costed and time-bound national strategies and work plans to fulfil and implement Convention obligations as soon as possible.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report having evidence-based, costed, and time-bound national strategies and work plans in place.</i> | 60% [18 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola BiH* Cambodia Colombia Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Iraq Oman* Serbia South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand | Chad Ethiopia Eritrea* Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Senegal Somalia* Ukraine* | Afghanistan* Peru Yemen | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have <u>either</u> a work plan <u>or</u> a strategy that is evidence-based, costed, and time-bound.</p> <p>Ecuador presented an updated work plan in February 2021 and in its 2022 Article 5 deadline extension request.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | Türkiye Zimbabwe | | | <p>Ethiopia had yet to present an updated work plan as at 1 November 2022.</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau presented a two year costed work plan in its 2022 deadline Extension Request. The work plan aims to complete national technical and non-technical survey.</p> <p>Mauritania has a work plan to clear identified hazardous areas in its jurisdiction or control. The work plan, however, has not been updated to reflect the most recent clearance or newly discovered areas. Part of the resources being sought by Mauritania are intended to update its work plan and put a strategy in place.</p> <p>While Peru has a work plan, it is based on the number of mined areas and not on the extent of contamination.</p> <p>Somalia's National Mine Action Strategic Plan 2018–2020 was extended until end of 2021, but at time of writing, SEMA had not</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | reported on whether a new strategy had been developed. |
| Gender and Diversity | Action #3: <i>Ensure that the different needs and perspectives of women, girls, boys and men are considered and inform all areas of Convention implementation and mine action programmes, in order to deliver an inclusive approach. Strive to remove barriers to full, equal and gender balanced participation in mine action and in Convention meetings.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties whose national work plans and strategies integrate gender and take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account.</i> | 47% [14 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola Cambodia Colombia DR Congo Guinea-Bissau Iraq Senegal Serbia South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Zimbabwe | BiH* Chad Ecuador Eritrea* Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Oman* Peru Somalia* Türkiye Ukraine* Yemen | Afghanistan* Croatia Ethiopia | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties have <u>either</u> a work plan <u>or</u> a strategy that integrates gender and takes into account diverse needs.</p> <p>Afghanistan's Taliban led government has not stopped women working in mine action but controls imposed on the participation of women and girls in public life create uncertainty over implementation of gender and inclusion goals set by mine action authorities before the change of government.</p> <p>Colombia's new NMAS and their annexes contain new provisions and affirmative action to mainstream gender and diversity.</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau committed in its 2022 Article 5 deadline Extension Request to promote gender and diversity inclusivity at all stages of the mine action programme. It</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>also promised that CAAMI will build its own gender and diversity policy and require operators to do follow suit. The extension request, however, did not contain clear and measurable targets.</p> <p>Somalia's National Mine Action Strategic Plan 2018–2020, which was extended until the end of 2021, did integrate gender and diversity considerations. However, at time of writing, SEMA had not reported on whether a new strategy had been developed.</p> |
| National Standards Reflecting IMAS | Action #5: <i>Keep national mine action standards up to date in accordance with the latest International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), adapt them to new challenges and employ best practices to ensure efficient and effective implementation.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that have updated their national standards to address new challenges and ensure the employment of best practices, taking into consideration the latest IMAS.</i> | 43% [13 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Afghanistan* Angola BiH* Cambodia Colombia Croatia Iraq South Sudan Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Zimbabwe | Ecuador Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Nigeria* Peru Senegal Serbia Somalia* Sri Lanka Ukraine* | Chad DR Congo Mauritania Niger Oman* Yemen | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has focused our assessment on whether or not States Parties have updated national standards to allow for evidence-based land release through both survey and clearance.</p> <p>Afghanistan has comprehensive NMAS in place that were subject to regular review and updating.</p> <p>Angola updated its NMAS in 2021. The NMAS are</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>considered to be adequate and address the main land release topics. Ten chapters of NMAS were completed and approved, and another three were drafted and awaiting approval as at time of writing.</p> <p>For Chad, FSD completed a review of 21 standards in 2021 and said it updated 17 of them but MAG said it was unaware of any changes.</p> <p>In 2021, Colombia formally issued 17 new NMAS (known as national technical norms (NTC)).</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau does not have NMAS in place, but has sought funding to establish its national standards in accordance with the IMAS.</p> <p>Ecuador does not have NMAS. Its national manuals on demining should be converted to NMAS and SOPs, and reflect the latest IMAS.</p> <p>Iraq has been reviewing national standards that were drafted nearly 20 years ago and has updated standards for non-technical and</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>technical survey and mine clearance, explosive ordnance disposal (EOD), marking, personal protective equipment, and operational accreditation.</p> <p>Mauritania last revised its NMAS in 2010, with the help of the GICHD and operators. Mauritania recognises that an update to its NMAS is due, while also reporting in 2021 that it had revised and adapted the NMAS to the “new ways of working”. What is meant by this is unclear.</p> <p>The standards to which Oman conducts land release are not known.</p> <p>Peru has 16 national NMAS which form part of the Humanitarian Demining Procedures Manual. However, it has yet to develop new policies for land release, as per its updated National Plan for Demining for 2018–24.</p> <p>A review of Somalia’s National Technical Standards and Guidelines took place in 2019 but was still awaiting</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>ministerial approval as of writing.</p> <p>In May 2021, NMAC reported that a review of Sudan's NMAS had been completed and the revised standards had been endorsed.</p> <p>In Ukraine, a technical working group comprised of the main mine action actors in country, submitted recommendations for improvements to NMAS to the Ministry of Defence for its consideration in July 2021. International operators do not consider that the current NMAS in Ukraine are fit for purpose for the mine action sector.</p> <p>As at writing, Yemen had revised its national mine action standards but had yet to receive final approval from the government.</p> |
| Information Management | Action #9: <i>Establish and maintain a national information management system containing accurate and up-to-date data at the national level on the</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of mine-affected States Parties that report having a sustainable national information</i> | 63% [19 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola BiH* Cambodia Colombia Croatia Ecuador Ethiopia | Eritrea* Guinea-Bissau Niger Nigeria* Senegal | Afghanistan* Chad DR Congo Iraq Mauritania Yemen | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties currently have a functioning mine action database. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| | <p><i>status of implementation. The design and implementation of information management systems will ensure that they are nationally owned, sustainable and take into account the need for data that can be accessed, managed and analysed post-completion.</i></p> | <p><i>management system in place.</i></p> | | <p>Peru Oman* Serbia Somalia* South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Ukraine* Zimbabwe</p> | | <p>Several States Parties, such as Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Sri Lanka, have functional information management systems in place, but are still in the process of resolving historical data issues and/or strengthening or upgrading the systems.</p> <p>Afghanistan has an IMSMA database that it intended to upgrade to the latest version (Core) but management has been disrupted by the change of government and DMAC's loss of trained IT staff. DMAC and UNMAS have agreed that UNMAS would run the IMSMA database in the Liaison Office, providing a duplicate data set to DMAC.</p> <p>BiH is in the progress of migrating from its own information management system to IMSMA Core.</p> <p>Chad's IMSMA database underwent a major clean-up with the support of FSD as part of the EU-funded PRODECO project but that ended in 2021 and the shortage of IM-trained staff</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>casts doubt on the sustainability of the database.</p> <p>Iraq's information management is dependent on iMMAP, which is funded by the US and is not autonomous or self-sustaining.</p> <p>Mauritania migrated to IMSMA Version 6 in 2017. In 2021–22, the PNDHD created an interactive platform that provides updated data on contamination, survey, and clearance.</p> <p>Since April 2022, Ukraine's IMSMA database has been backed up on a secure cloud based system, and was incorporated into Ukraine's emergency response platform, with the support of the GICHD. The MoD and SESU have access to and control over their own data systems on IMSMA.</p> <p>Yemen has upgraded its information management system to IMSMA Core, but coverage only currently extends to government-controlled areas and</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | contamination data are out of date. |
| Oslo Action Plan Section V: Survey and Clearance of Mined Areas | | | | | | | |
| An Accurate Baseline of Contamination | Action #18: <i>States Parties that have not yet done so will identify the precise perimeter of mined areas, to the extent possible, and establish evidence-based, accurate baselines of contamination based on information collected from all relevant sources no later than by the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2021.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties that have established an accurate and evidence-based contamination baseline no later than the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2021 (and by each year thereafter if not all affected States Parties have done so by 19MSP).</i> | 10% [3 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola Oman* Zimbabwe | Afghanistan* BiH* Cambodia Chad Colombia Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Peru Senegal Serbia Somalia* South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Ukraine* Yemen | | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has made an assessment on whether or not States Parties have established an accurate and evidence-based contamination baseline as at October 2022. A full assessment of this indicator will only be possible following 20MSP.</p> <p>While many States Parties have established a baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination, in many instances the baseline is assessed not to be accurate or evidence-based and therefore does not meet the OAP indicator.</p> <p>Some States Parties, such as BiH, Cambodia, Croatia, Serbia, South Sudan, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Türkiye have a reasonable idea of their baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination, but still</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>require further survey to more accurately delineate some mined areas.</p> <p>Sri Lanka had almost completed its non-technical survey to more accurately determine the baseline of mined area.</p> <p>To a varying extent, insecurity can sometimes prevent or hinder conflict-affected affected States Parties from accessing some mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. This was currently the case for: Chad, Colombia, DR Congo, Iraq, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen. It also concerns Cameroon and Mali, which, as at 1 November 2022, had still to request a new Article 5 deadline to address new contamination.</p> |
| | | <p>Indicator #2: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties that report having established their baseline through inclusive consultations with women, girls, boys, and men.</i></p> | <p>47% [14 of 30 affected States Parties assessed]</p> | <p>Afghanistan* Angola BiH* Cambodia Croatia Colombia DR Congo Iraq</p> | <p>Ecuador Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Niger Nigeria* Peru Senegal</p> | <p>Chad Mauritania Oman* Serbia</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| | | | | South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Zimbabwe | Somalia* Türkiye Ukraine* Yemen | | |
| A Plan for Completion | Action #19: <i>Develop evidence-based and costed national work plans, including projections of the number of areas and the amount of mined area to be addressed annually to achieve completion as soon as possible, and no later than their Article 5 deadline, to be presented at the Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties in 2020.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties presenting work plans for the implementation of Article 5 by the Eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties (and MSPs thereafter and by each year thereafter if not all affected States Parties have done so by 18MSP).</i> | 63% [19 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Afghanistan* Angola BiH* Cambodia Colombia Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Oman* Peru Senegal Serbia South Sudan Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Zimbabwe | Chad Eritrea* Ethiopia Iraq Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Somalia* Sri Lanka Ukraine* Yemen | | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed whether or not States Parties had an annual or multi-year work plan in place as at 1 November 2022. As at 1 November 2022, Ethiopia had yet to submit an updated work plan. Guinea-Bissau presented a two year costed work plan in its latest Article 5 deadline Extension Request submitted in June 2022. |
| Updating of Work Plans | Action #20: <i>Annually update their national work plans based on new evidence and report on adjusted milestones in their Article 7 reports by 30 April each year, including information on the number of areas and</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties that have reported annual updates and adjusted milestones to their national work plans in their 30 April transparency reports.</i> | 67% [20 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola Cambodia Chad Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania | BiH* Colombia Eritrea* Ethiopia Nigeria* Oman* Somalia* Sri Lanka Ukraine* | Afghanistan* | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment also takes into consideration new work plans submitted in 2022, including in Article 5 extension requests. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p><i>amount of mined area to be addressed annually and on how priorities have been established.</i></p> | | | <p>Niger Peru Senegal Serbia South Sudan Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Yemen Zimbabwe</p> | | <p>Chad presented a three-year work plan at the APMBC Intersessional meetings in June 2022.</p> <p>Croatia adopted a revised work plan for 2022–26 in April 2022. It did not, however, include information on updated targets in its Article 7 report (covering 2021).</p> <p>Ecuador submitted an updated work plan in its Article 5 deadline extension request.</p> <p>*As at 1 November 2022, of the 30 States Parties assessed, Afghanistan, BiH, Eritrea, Nigeria, Oman, Somalia, and Ukraine had still to submit an Article 7 report covering calendar year 2021. In addition, Cameroon and Mali had also still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan has consistently submitted annual Article 7 reports but the disruption of the mine action sector management following the change of government in 2021 also disrupted national reporting and as at 1</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | November 2022 it had not submitted an Article 7 report for 2021. |
| | | Indicator #2: <i>The number of States Parties that have fulfilled their obligations under Article 5.</i> | 0 State Party ¹⁴ fulfilled its Article 5 obligations between the start of the 20MSP presidency in November 2021 and 1 November 2022 [of 34 affected States Parties] | | Afghanistan* Angola BiH* Cambodia Cameroon* Chad Colombia Croatia Cyprus DR Congo Ecuador Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mali* Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Oman* Palestine* Peru Senegal Serbia | | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on the number of States Parties that have fulfilled their obligations under Article 5 since the start of the 20MSP presidency in November 2021. |

¹⁴ While no State Party has fulfilled its treaty obligations since the conclusion of 18MSP in November 2021, to date, a total of 32 States Parties have completed survey and clearance: Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Djibouti, France, The Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Jordan, Malawi, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Palau, Rwanda, Suriname, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom, Venezuela, and Zambia. States Parties underlined are not listed on the AMPBC Implementation Support Unit (ISU)'s list, "States Parties That Have Completed Article 5", at: <http://bit.ly/30xgu9r>, presumably because they did not officially report having mined areas under the APMBC and/or have not made a formal declaration of fulfilment of their clearance obligations under the Convention. Guinea-Bissau was removed from the list in 2021 as it reported in June of that year that it had discovered previously unrecorded mined areas on its territory and had formally requested a new Article 5 deadline to be considered at 19MSP.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | Somalia* South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Ukraine* Yemen Zimbabwe | | |
| Anti-Personnel Mines of an Improvised Nature | Action #21: <i>States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature will ensure that they apply all provisions and obligations under the Convention to such contamination as they do for all other types of anti-personnel mines, including during survey and clearance in fulfilment of Article 5 and disaggregate by types of mines when reporting in fulfilment of Article 7 obligations.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The number of [affected] States Parties that apply the provisions of the Convention to anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature (for the purpose of this indicator: survey, clear and report).</i> | 3 States Parties [of 14 affected States Parties assessed, including Cameroon, and Mali] | Afghanistan* Colombia Sri Lanka | Cameroon* Mali* Nigeria* Yemen | Chad Iraq Niger Somalia* Tajikistan Türkiye Ukraine* | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review has assessed the following 14 States Parties it believes have contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature: Afghanistan, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Iraq, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Ukraine, and Yemen.</p> <p>In Iraq, there has been a significant improvement in Article 7 reporting, but the authorities still use the catch-all term “IEDs” in their reporting, rather than using anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature (which refers to victim-activated IEDs that meet the definition of a mine).</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>While Nigeria now has an Article 5 deadline in place to address contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, it has not submitted an Article 7 transparency report since 2012.</p> <p>In Somalia, SEMA planned to start collecting data on contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature in 2020 but it is not clear what progress, if any, has been made on this.</p> |
| Reporting Consistent with IMAS | Action #22: <i>Report in a manner consistent with IMAS by providing information on the remaining challenges, disaggregating by “suspected hazardous areas” and “confirmed hazardous areas” and their relative size, as well as by the type of contamination. Report on progress in accordance with the land release methodology employed (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties reporting on the remaining challenge and progress made in accordance with IMAS.</i> | 18% [60 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Afghanistan* BiH* Colombia Croatia Ecuador Ethiopia Iraq Mauritania Peru Senegal Serbia South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Zimbabwe | Angola Cambodia DR Congo Eritrea* Oman* Niger Nigeria* Somalia* Ukraine* | Chad Guinea-Bissau Yemen | <p>Unlike in recent years, Angola’s Article 7 report covering 2021 did not classify hazardous areas into confirmed and suspected hazardous areas (CHAs/SHAs) in accordance with IMAS.</p> <p>For the first time, BiH reported to Mine Action Review mined released through clearance, technical survey, and non-technical survey, as well as the amount of SHA and CHA. However, as at 1 November 2022, BiH had yet to submit its Article 7 report covering 2021.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | <p><i>technical survey, or cleared through clearance).</i></p> | | | | | | <p>Cambodia disaggregated land release by methodology employed, but did not disaggregate mined areas into SHA and CHA.</p> <p>Croatia reported disaggregated data to Mine Action Review on mined area cancelled through non-technical survey and mined area reduced through technical survey in 2021, but only reported total combined mined area released through survey in its Article 7 transparency report.</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau has reported both suspected and confirmed hazardous areas in its latest Article 7 report, but acknowledged that it did not use survey techniques recognised by IMAS and will need to resurvey the areas, including the 9 CHAs.</p> <p>In Somalia, the authorities have not provided an updated estimate of remaining anti-personnel mine contamination since the end of 2019. Operators have</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>reported on progress in land release.</p> <p>The baseline survey conducted in areas of Yemen controlled by the internationally-recognised government has started reporting CHAs and SHAs but so far has only covered a small area and is not being conducted in areas controlled by the de facto authorities in the north.</p> |
| | | <p>Indicator #2: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties providing survey and clearance data in Article 5 extension requests and Article 7 reports that disaggregates by type of contamination.</i></p> | <p>70% [21 of 30 affected States Parties assessed]</p> | <p>Angola Cambodia Chad Colombia Croatia Ecuador Ethiopia Iraq Mauritania Niger Oman* Peru Senegal Serbia South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Zimbabwe</p> | <p>BiH* Eritrea* Guinea-Bissau Nigeria* Somalia* Ukraine* Yemen</p> | <p>Afghanistan* DR Congo</p> | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on Article 7 reports and Article 5 deadline extension requests submitted in 2022.</p> <p>*As at 1 November 2022, of the 30 States Parties assessed, Afghanistan, BiH, Eritrea, Nigeria, Oman, Somalia, and Ukraine had still to submit an Article 7 report covering calendar year 2021. In addition, Cameroon and Mali had also still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan has consistently submitted annual Article 7</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>reports but the disruption of the mine action sector management following the change of government in 2021 also disrupted national reporting and as at 1 November 2022 it had not submitted an Article 7 report for 2021.</p> <p>It is unclear from DR Congo's reporting if anti-personnel mines are disaggregated from anti-vehicle mines.</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau's latest Article 7 report and Article 5 deadline Extension Request do not disaggregate by type of contamination, but Guinea Bissau believes that the majority of contamination is from UXO.</p> <p>Iraq disaggregates in its reporting by type of contamination, but reports anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature as "IEDs" and does not confirm that this data only includes victim activated IEDs that meet the definition of an anti-personnel mine.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Accurate and Timely Extension Requests | <p>Action #23: <i>States Parties submitting requests for extensions will ensure that these requests contain detailed, costed and multi-year work plans for the extension period and are developed through an inclusive process, in line with the decisions of the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties¹⁵ and the recommendations endorsed by the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties in the paper «Reflections on the Article 5 Extensions Process».¹⁶</i></p> | <p>Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of extension requests that include detailed, costed, and multi-year work plans for the extension period.</i></p> | <p>57% [4 of 7 (excluding Argentina) affected States Parties assessed whose Article 5 deadline extension requests were submitted and considered in 2022. Eritrea has still to request to extend its deadline and is in serious violation of Article 5. Cameroon and Mali had also yet to request a deadline extension to address new anti-personnel mine contamination of an improvised nature.</p> | <p>Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Serbia Sudan Thailand</p> | <p>Afghanistan* Yemen</p> | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on Article 5 deadline extension requests submitted in 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, and Yemen submitted extension requests that were being considered at 20MSP. As at 1 November 2022, Eritrea had yet to submit an extension request for consideration at 20MSP and remains in serious violation of Article 5. Cameroon and Mali had also not yet requested a new Article 5 deadline for consideration at 20MSP to address new contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature.</p> <p>Although Argentina also submitted an extension request in 2022, it has not been assessed for the purposes of this indicator. The United Kingdom completed anti-personnel mine clearance</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|

¹⁵ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.7/2006/L.3, at: bit.ly/3d7HbGg.

¹⁶ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.12/2012/4, at: bit.ly/3jzi7KK.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | on the Falkland islands/Malvinas in 2020, therefore, Mine Action Review does not consider Argentina to be mine-affected. |
| | | Indicator #2: <i>The percentage of extension requests that are submitted in accordance with the process established by the States Parties.</i> | 40% [4 of 10 affected States Parties assessed whose Article 5 deadline extension request were due to be submitted and considered in 2022. This includes Eritrea , which has still to request to extend its deadline and which is in serious violation of Article 5; and Cameroon and Mali which have also still to submit respective deadline | Ecuador Serbia Thailand Yemen | Afghanistan* Cameroon* Eritrea* Guinea-Bissau Mali* Sudan | | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on whether or not States Parties seeking Article 5 extensions in 2022 submitted their request by 31 March 2022.</p> <p>Ecuador, Serbia, Thailand, and Yemen submitted the first drafts of their respective Article 5 deadline extension requests in March 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan submitted an Article 5 deadline extension request in July 2022; Guinea Bissau submitted a first draft of its Article 5 deadline extension request in April 2022; Sudan submitted a first draft of its Article 5 deadline extension request in April 2022; all later than 31 March 2022.</p> <p>As at 1 November 2022, Eritrea had yet to submit a</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | extension requests]. | | | | request to extend its deadline and remains in serious violation of Article 5. Cameroon and Mali had also not yet requested a new Article 5 deadline for consideration at 20MSP to address new contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature. |
| Declarations of Completion | Action #25: States Parties who complete their clearance obligations will continue the best practice of submitting voluntary declarations of completion and give due consideration to the paper “Reflections and understandings on the implementation and completion of Article 5 mine clearance obligations” ¹⁷ in that regard. | Indicator #1: The percentage of States Parties that have completed their Article 5 obligations and that submit voluntary declarations of completion. | 0% [0 of 0 affected States Parties that fulfilled their Article 5 obligations between the start of the 20MSP presidency and 1 November 2022] | | | | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review’s assessment is based on those States Parties that have fulfilled their Article 5 obligations between the start of the 20MSP presidency in November 2021 and 1 November 2022. |
| Residual Demining Capacity | Action #26: Ensure that national strategies and work plans for completion make provisions for a sustainable national capacity to address | Indicator #1: The percentage of affected States Parties that include provisions for addressing previously unknown mined areas in | 33% [10 of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Afghanistan* Angola Cambodia Croatia Oman* South Sudan Sri Lanka | BiH* Chad Colombia DR Congo Eritrea* Ethiopia Mauritania | Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Iraq Peru Tajikistan Türkiye Yemen | While several States Parties, such as BiH , Iraq , Türkiye , and Ukraine , have varying degrees of national clearance capacity (for example in the Armed Forces or Civil Defence), they have not stated publicly in |

¹⁷ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.17/2018/10, at: <https://bit.ly/2tdtmDM>.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| | <p><i>previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas discovered following completion. In addressing these areas, they will consider the commitments made at the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties as contained in the paper “Proposed rational response to States Parties discovering previously unknown mined areas after deadlines have passed”.¹⁸</i></p> | <p><i>their national strategies and/or completion plans.</i></p> | | <p>Sudan Thailand Zimbabwe</p> | <p>Niger Nigeria* Senegal Serbia Somalia* Ukraine*</p> | | <p>their national strategies or completion plans how previously unknown mined areas (i.e. residual contamination) will be addressed.</p> <p>In 2022, Tajikistan appointed an adviser for residual risk management, with a view to incorporating a plan for this into the 2021–2025 National Mine Action Strategy.</p> |
| | | <p>Indicator #2: <i>The percentage of affected States Parties that report having put in place sustainable national capacities to address the discovery of previously unknown mined areas.</i></p> | <p>20% [6 of 30 affected States Parties assessed]</p> | <p>Afghanistan* Oman* Peru Sri Lanka Thailand Zimbabwe</p> | <p>Angola BiH* Cambodia Chad Colombia Croatia DR Congo Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Senegal</p> | <p>Ecuador Iraq South Sudan Sudan Yemen</p> | <p>As noted above, while many States Parties have national capacity capable of addressing anti-personnel mines (for example Armed Forces, Civil Protection, or Police), this on its own is insufficient to meet this indicator.</p> <p>There should be an agreed plan in place specifying which national entity is responsible for addressing residual</p> |

¹⁸ Convention doc. APLC/MSP.12/2012/7, at: <https://bit.ly/34NE9U7>.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | Serbia Somalia* Tajikistan Türkiye Ukraine* | | <p>contamination, under which circumstances, and which ensures provision is made for long-term access to the national information management database.</p> <p>BiH's National Mine Action Strategy for 2018–2025 requires the development of a strategy for the management of residual contamination by 2022. As at 1 August 2022, the strategy had still to be developed.</p> <p>Iraq does not have a strategy in place for sustainable capacity to manage residual contamination but its new National Mine Action Strategy for 2022–28 commits to developing one.</p> <p>In South Sudan, UNMAS has been working with the NMAA to develop plans for a national capacity that will be responsible for clearing residual contamination. A pilot project to form and mentor an EOD mobile team within the national authority between August 2021 and March 2022 was successfully launched.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>Sudan has a plan to deal with residual risk and liability post completion. NMAC has continued to deal with any residual contamination in the Eastern states through deploying teams with government funding. However, it is planned that in the long term Sudan will establish a sustainable national capacity within the military or police.</p> <p>In 2021, Tajikistan expanded capacity to deal with any residual contamination after completion, but has yet to further increase capacity and to elaborate a plan.</p> |
| | | <p>Indicator #3: <i>The percentage of States Parties that discover previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas, that apply the decision of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.</i></p> | <p>40% [2 of 5 affected States Parties assessed]</p> | <p>Mauritania Guinea-Bissau*</p> | <p>Cameroon* Mali*</p> | <p>Nigeria*</p> | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment concerns States Parties that discover newly mined areas after fulfilment of their respective Article 5 obligations.</p> <p>Nigeria was granted an extension to its Article 5 deadline, to address mined areas discovered after fulfilment of its Article 5</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>obligations. However, as at 1 November 2022, it had yet to submit a transparency report in 2021 or 2022 and therefore did not fulfil their respective Article 7 obligations to report the location of all mined areas and the status of programmes for their destruction.</p> <p>In addition, Burkina Faso, the Philippines, and Venezuela, may also have anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature on areas under their jurisdiction or control.</p> |
| Innovation and Efficiency | Action #27: <i>Take appropriate steps to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of survey and clearance, including by promoting the research, application and sharing of innovative technological means to this effect.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The number of States Parties that report promoting research, application, and sharing of innovative technological means.</i> | 3 States Parties [of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Afghanistan* Croatia Türkiye | Angola BiH* Cambodia Chad Colombia DR Congo Ecuador Eritrea* Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania Niger Nigeria* Oman* Peru Senegal Serbia Somalia* | | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on information relating to the period between the start of the 20MSP presidency in November 2021 and 1 November 2022, based on available information. States Parties may have promoted the research, application, and sharing of innovative methodologies without reporting publicly on them.</p> <p>Prior to the change of regime in Afghanistan in August 2021, DMAC worked closely</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | South Sudan Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Ukraine* Yemen Zimbabwe | | <p>with the HALO Trust in developing survey, clearance, and national standards for tackling mines of an improvised nature. Since the change of government, de facto authorities have cooperated in research and information sharing on improvised mine types.</p> <p>Croatia hosts an international symposium annually, during which new detection and clearance technologies are shared. In other research initiatives, the Croatian Mine Action Centre's Centre for Testing, Development and Training (HCR-CTRO) provides two testing sites for various clearance methods on different soil types. HCR-CTRO is also the coordinator of the NATO SPS Project entitled "Biological Method (Bees) for Explosive Detection", working in collaboration with the universities of Zagreb, St. Andrews, and Banja Luka.</p> <p>Türkiye's defence industries developed the Mechanical Mine Clearing Equipment (MEMATT). This is a light medium, unmanned demining</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--------------|--|
| | | | | | | | machine with a tiller attachment, particularly suitable for demining on the flat terrain along the Syrian border. Delivery of machines was planned for 2020-21, but as yet it is not clear if/how many have been deployed. |
| Oslo Action Plan Section VIII: International Cooperation and Assistance | | | | | | | |
| Seeking Assistance | Action #43: <i>States Parties seeking assistance will develop resource mobilisation plans and use all mechanisms within the Convention to disseminate information on challenges and requirements for assistance, including through their annual Article 7 transparency reports and by taking advantage of the individualised approach. States Parties will share the outcomes of the individualised approach with the wider mine action community in order to maximise its impact.</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The number of States Parties requiring support that provide information on progress, challenges and requirements for assistance in Article 7 reports and Convention meetings.</i> | 16 States Parties [of 29 affected States Parties assessed that require financial support] | Angola Chad Colombia Ecuador Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania Peru Sri Lanka Sudan Tajikistan Thailand Türkiye Yemen Zimbabwe | BiH* Cambodia Croatia DR Congo Eritrea* Niger Nigeria* Senegal Serbia Somalia* South Sudan Ukraine* | Afghanistan* | <p>For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on 29 affected States Parties assessed, which require financial support, and excludes Oman which is entirely nationally funded.</p> <p>*As at 1 November 2022, Afghanistan, BiH, Eritrea, Nigeria, Oman, Somalia, and Ukraine had still to submit an Article 7 report covering calendar year 2021. In addition, Cameroon and Mali had also still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan has consistently submitted annual Article 7 reports but the disruption of the mine action sector management following the change of government in</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>2021 also disrupted national reporting and as at 1 November 2022 it had not submitted an Article 7 report for 2021.</p> <p>While Ecuador did not include information on the requirements for assistance in its Article 7 report, it did in its 2022 Article 5 deadline extension request. It also presented its requirements during the APMBC “Regional Dialogue on Humanitarian Demining in the Americas” meeting in February 2021.</p> <p>While Serbia and South Sudan provided information on progress (and in Serbia’s case on challenges too), in their respective Article 7 reports, they did not provide details of their requirements for assistance.</p> |
| | | <p>Indicator #2: <i>The number of States Parties that have taken advantage of the individualised approach and that report having received follow-up and/or increased support</i></p> | <p>1 State Party [of 16 affected States Parties assessed, that have taken advantage of the individualised approach]</p> | Sudan | | <p>Angola BiH* Cambodia Chad Croatia DR Congo Ecuador Guinea-Bissau Mauritania</p> | <p>As at 1 November 2022, the following 16 States Parties had taken advantage of the individualised approach to-date: Angola (2018) BiH (2020) Cambodia (2019 and 2022) Chad (2022)</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | <i>to meet the needs identified.</i> | | | | Niger Serbia Somalia* Sri Lanka Tajikistan Zimbabwe | Croatia (2016) DR Congo (2020) Ecuador (2019) Guinea-Bissau (2022) Mauritania (2020) Niger (2020) Serbia (2018) Somalia (2018) Sri Lanka (2018) Sudan (2018) Tajikistan (2019) Zimbabwe (2017 and 2018) Mine Action Review is not aware which of these States have received follow-up and/or increased support to meet the needs identified, following their individualised approach meetings. |
| National Coordination and Dialogue | Action #44: <i>States Parties will strengthen national coordination including by ensuring regular dialogue with national and international stakeholders on progress, challenges and support for implementation of their obligations under the Convention. They will consider, where relevant, establishing an</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The number of States Parties that have an in-country platform for dialogue among all stakeholders that meets on a regular basis.</i> | 7 States Parties [of 30 affected States Parties assessed] | Angola BiH* Cambodia South Sudan Sudan Tajikistan Zimbabwe | Afghanistan* Chad Colombia DR Congo Ethiopia Guinea-Bissau Iraq Mauritania Nigeria* Senegal Serbia Somalia* Sri Lanka Thailand | Croatia Ecuador Eritrea* Niger Oman* Peru Türkiye Ukraine* Yemen | While mine action sub-clusters exist in some affected States Parties, these are UN led and are not necessarily considered in and of themselves to have met this criterion. In several States Parties, such as Iraq and Somalia , national authorities convene regular meetings with clearance operators, but these do not include other stakeholders, such as donors. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | <p><i>appropriate national platform for regular dialogue among all stakeholders.</i></p> | | | | | | <p>In BiH, a Country Coalition was established between BiH and Germany in 2020, but regrettably did not meet in 2021.</p> <p>In Croatia, there is an in-country platform for dialogue which meets on a regular basis, consisting of representatives from the MoI and the association of private companies in demining. It is not, however, known if the platform includes donors, such as the EU.</p> <p>Mauritania appealed to the international community to form an in-country platform for dialogue/Country Coalition in several fora. This, however, has not yet materialised.</p> <p>In Sri Lanka, several meetings have been held with all stakeholders over the last year, as part of elaboration of the completion process.</p> <p>In Sudan, NMAC ordinarily holds a Country Coordination Forum with all stakeholders twice a year, though only one took place in 2021 due to the</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>political and security situation. UNMAS and NMAC lead mine action sub-cluster meetings to coordinate progress, tackle challenges, and support Article 5 implementation in Sudan.</p> <p>In Ukraine, while there is no national platform to bring together all stakeholders, implementing partners meet on regular basis and form several technical and coordination working groups with participation from the Ukrainian authorities, represented by the MoD and the State Emergency Security Services (SESU).</p> <p>In Ecuador, Eritrea, Niger, Oman, and Peru only national government entities are engaged in Article 5 implementation.</p> |
| Oslo Action Plan Section IX: Measures to ensure compliance | | | | | | | |
| Compliance in Reporting | Action #49: <i>Any State Party implementing obligations in particular <u>under Article 5</u>¹⁹ that has not submitted an Article</i> | Indicator #1: <i>The percentage of States Parties that are implementing obligations <u>under Article</u></i> | 50% [2 of 4 affected States Parties that had not submitted | DR Congo Niger | Eritrea* Nigeria* | | For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, Mine Action Review's assessment is based on those States Parties that have not |

¹⁹ Action #49 of the Oslo Action Plan also references Article 4 and retaining or transferring mines in line with Article 3, but for purposes of monitoring Mine Action Review has focused solely on Article 5.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | <p><i>7 report detailing progress in implementing these obligations each year will provide in close cooperation with the ISU an annual update on the status of implementation in line with Article 7 and will provide information to all States Parties in the most expeditious, comprehensive and transparent manner possible. If no information on implementing the relevant obligations for two consecutive years is provided, the President will assist and engage with the States Parties concerned in close cooperation with the relevant Committee.</i></p> | <p><i>5²⁰ and that have not submitted an Article 7 report detailing progress in implementing these obligations in the last two years, that provide updates to all States Parties in Article 7 reports and during meetings of the States Parties.</i></p> | <p>previously submitted Article 7 reports in 2021 and 2022. In addition, Cameroon and Mali had not submitted Article 7 reports in 2020, 2021, or 2022 (as at 1 November 2022]</p> | | | | <p>submitted Article 7 reports in 2020 and 2021.</p> <p>DR Congo and Niger had not submitted an Article 7 transparency report in 2020 or 2021, but did then submit a report in 2022.</p> <p>*As at 1 November 2022, of the 30 States Parties assessed, Afghanistan, BiH, Eritrea, Nigeria, Oman, Somalia, and Ukraine had still to submit an Article 7 report covering calendar year 2021. In addition, Cameroon and Mali, which had still to request a new Article 5 deadline to address new contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, did not submit Article 7 reports in 2020 and 2021, and as at 1 November 2022 had still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022.</p> <p>Afghanistan has consistently submitted annual Article 7 reports but the disruption of the mine action sector management following the</p> |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|

²⁰ The indicator in the Oslo Action Plan also references Article 4 and retaining mines in line with Article 3.1, but for purposes of monitoring Mine Action Review has focused solely on Article 5.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | change of government in 2021 also disrupted national reporting and as at 1 November 2022 it had not submitted an Article 7 report for 2021. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

States Parties marked with an * are those which had still to submit an Article 7 report in 2022 (covering 2021) as at 1 November 2022.