

"No more" Landmines Youth Symposium BACKGROUND

*"Landmines cannot tell the difference between the footsteps of a soldier
or those of a child, or between war and peace"*



Thank you for your participation!

WELCOME!!

December 3, 2007 will mark the 10th anniversary of the Ottawa Treaty, the international treaty to ban the production and use of landmines. Canada and Canadians played a lead role in this momentous and global effort to save lives and help make the world safer and more humane. Thanks to this treaty, thousands of lives have been saved and millions of mines have been removed. Moreover the “Ottawa Process” has served as a catalyst for rethinking the nature of security and the means by which we may structure responses to other international crisis.

This backgrounder has been put together to help prepare you for the Youth Forum celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the Ottawa Treaty. We are excited to have you participate and continue the effort to rid the world of these dreadful killers. In this backgrounder you will find information about the history and the current scope of the landmine problem throughout the world. You will also find the question that will be discussed and debated at the Youth Forum. Along with the questions we have provided crucial background information for you to ensure that you are informed. Please read through the backgrounder, explore the internet and enjoy becoming an expert on the landmine issue. With your voice we can finally achieve a world free of landmines!!!



Table of Contents

Landmine Background	4
Current Situation	6
Question 1	8
Question 2	10
For More Information	12
Appendix 1	13
Appendix 2	16
Participating Organizations	19

Landmine Background

The global landmine crisis is one of the most pervasive problems facing the world today. It is estimated that there are between 45 and 60 million landmines in the ground in over 70 countries. Landmines reportedly maim or kill 10,000 to 20,000 civilians every year. Those victims that survive endure a lifetime of physical, psychological, and economic hardship.

What is an anti-personnel mine?

According to the 1997 Convention to Ban Anti-Personnel Mines (a.k.a. Ottawa Convention, Mine Ban Treaty), an anti-personnel mine is "a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons".



Why are anti-personnel mines illegal under international humanitarian law?

1. They are indiscriminate. They cannot tell the difference between the footsteps of a child and those of a soldier. There are an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 new landmine casualties a year, 86% of which are civilians.
2. They last long after wars are over.
3. The harm caused by anti-personnel mines is disproportionate to their military value.

"Once peace is declared the landmine does not recognize that peace," says Jody Williams, coordinator of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and Nobel Peace Prize laureate. "The landmine is eternally prepared to take victims."



Landmine victims suffer debilitating physical and emotional injuries. Victims' families and communities are plagued by psychological and economic burdens, and the environmental impact of landmines on their surroundings is significant. Landmines also impede long-term reconstruction of war-torn societies, the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their homes, and political reconciliation and peace. The element of tragedy that befalls mine victims and their families and communities is a powerful deterrent to any individual who might otherwise use land for productive purposes or basic everyday activities. Unfortunately, fundamental human instincts and the need for food all too often compel adults and children alike to enter mined areas.

What is the Scope of the Problem?

Fifty-four countries have produced more than 340 models of antipersonnel landmines. They cost as little as \$3 to produce and are relatively easy to deploy. They can be laid anywhere, including roads, paths, fields, buildings, waterways, bridges, forests, and deserts. By contrast, it costs between \$300 and \$1,000 to locate and destroy a single mine, typically a very complex and time-consuming task.

Traditionally, antipersonnel landmines were used for military defence purposes, but increasingly they are used as offensive weapons. They are designed to target civilian populations, disrupt people's lives, and displace entire communities from their homes and agricultural bases. Their purpose is to inflict maximum harm on victims and to create a state of military, political, social, and economic imbalance in war-torn societies. Unexploded ordnance (UXO) also adds significantly to the plight of these communities. They are typically strewn across large areas of land and respond like landmines when stepped on or picked up off the ground.

What are the most severely mine-affected countries?

Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia, Croatia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Somalia and Sudan are all heavily mined. From country to country, there is a huge difference in the levels of contamination and in how mines affect development.

What has been done to STOP the landmine crisis?

In recent years, the international community has made significant progress in addressing the global landmine crisis. An international treaty to ban landmines, known as the Ottawa Treaty, entered into force on March 1, 1999, faster than any international treaty in history. International and nongovernmental organizations are working with mine-affected countries to establish effective mine awareness campaigns and victim assistance programs. The United Nations is coordinating a global effort to survey the state of landmine contamination in mine-affected countries, and private and public groups are undertaking mine clearance efforts in more countries than ever before. Yet, with all these accomplishments to its credit, the international community continues to face many overwhelming challenges.

Landmine Crisis NOT Over

The landmine crisis is far from over. Millions of anti-personnel mines continue to threaten populations around the world, claiming thousands of new victims each year, and impoverishing communities. Vast tracts of valuable land remain unusable due to the presence of anti -personnel mines.

Universalization

Forty countries have yet to join Ottawa Treaty to Ban Landmines. Some of these countries include the US, China, Russia, most of middle East (US & Cuba only two in Americas). It also includes many producers: India, Pakistan, US, China. Many non-state armed groups continue to use landmines. Universalization of the treaty and the norm against landmines is biggest challenge to ban supporters.

Current Situation

Source: Landmine Monitor Report 2006

THE GOOD

- Increased international rejection of antipersonnel mines

As of 1 October 2007, 155 countries were States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty, constituting well over three-quarters of the world's nations.

- Increased support for the goal of eliminating antipersonnel mines

UN General Assembly Resolution 60/80, calling for universalization of the Mine Ban Treaty, was adopted on 8 December 2005.

- No use of antipersonnel mines by States Parties or signatories

There is no evidence-or even serious allegation-of use of antipersonnel mines by Mine Ban Treaty States Parties or signatories. This is notable because many were users in the recent past before becoming States Parties or signatories.



- Non-State Armed Groups ban landmine use

35 NSAs have banned AP mines. Of these, 31 had signed Geneva Call's Deed of Commitment, and at least an

additional 14 had allegedly introduced some type of limitations to their mine use.

- De facto global ban on trade in antipersonnel mines

For the past decade, global trade in antipersonnel mines has consisted solely of a low-level of illicit and unacknowledged transfers.

- Millions of stockpiled antipersonnel mines destroyed

States Parties collectively have destroyed more than 39.5 million antipersonnel mines.

- Significant international mine action funding in 2005

International funding of mine action funding totalled US\$376 million in 2005, the second highest funding to date and \$37 million more than two years ago.

THE BAD

- Three governments using antipersonnel mines

In 2005 – 2006, at least three governments continued using antipersonnel mines- Myanmar (Burma), Nepal and Russia-with the most extensive use in Myanmar.

- Non-State Armed Groups using antipersonnel mines

Non-state armed groups are using antipersonnel mines in more countries than government forces.

- Decrease in international funding of mine action

The 2005 total of \$376 million was down \$23 million, almost six percent, from 2004. This is the first time that global mine action funding has decreased meaningfully since 1992. Canada provided less mine action funding in 2005.

- Decreased funding to many mine-affected countries

Drastic reductions in mine action funding occurred in Iraq (down \$30.9 million, 53 percent), Afghanistan (\$25 million, 27 percent) and Cambodia (\$17.7 million, 43 percent). Other countries with substantial decreases in 2005 included Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Jordan, Mozambique, Sri Lanka and Tajikistan.

- Some major mine action programs hit by funding shortfalls

Mine action programs in at least five mine-affected countries were limited by major funding shortfalls: Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Mauritania, and Tajikistan.

- Inadequate funding of mine victim assistance

Several survivor assistance programs had serious funding shortfalls in 2005, preventing the delivery of essential services to mine survivors, their families and communities.



Question 1

The Ottawa Process was a ‘fast-track’ diplomatic effort. In only 14 months countries negotiated the Ottawa Treaty. By international standards the Ottawa Process was extraordinarily fast and effective. For the first time, a global partnership of governments, international institutions and non-governmental groups came together – with remarkable speed and spirit – to draft an international Treaty.

- Why do you think it succeeded with such speed, efficiency, and goodwill?
- Given the current environment, could the Ottawa Process be replicated for other international humanitarian / human rights issues (challenges, problems, crisis)? For which ones? How might that be done (potential impediments and challenges to overcome)?

Background: Ottawa Process

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the front-line international aid organisations, Handicap International and the International Committee of the Red Cross began to be concerned about the high number of civilian landmine casualties and began to lobby governments to do something about it. They said that landmines were a weapon unlike any other - and that this weapon should be removed from the world arsenal. Mine action advocacy



groups were created in a number of countries. Later a number of these NGOs, or non-government organisations, joined together to form the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

The most powerful cries for action came from the victims of landmines - from the rice fields of Cambodia, to the suburbs of Kabul; from the mountainsides of Sarajevo to the plains of Mozambique. A chorus of millions of voices pleading with the world demanded the elimination of landmines.

Those who are familiar with international law will know that the development process is long and frustrating and that law is formulated over a prolonged period of time. This was the way the landmine discussion was flowing: then, at the end of a conference in Ottawa in October 1996, Lloyd Axworthy, Canada's then Foreign Minister, changed the way international law was formulated. He challenged those present to return to Ottawa in December of 1997, some 14 months off, and sign a comprehensive treaty banning landmines. The NGOs were delighted but the countries, even those that supported a mine ban were shocked: this was not the way international treaties were negotiated. Then Mr. Axworthy went one step further, he said that Canada would sign such a treaty even if it was the only signature on the page. What followed was a rapid fire series of meetings

around the globe that led to Ottawa in December of 1997. This approach is known as the Ottawa Process.

The timeline set by Mr. Axworthy was achieved. When the parties met in Ottawa on December 3rd 1997, they had developed a comprehensive agreement to ban the production, use and transfer of antipersonnel landmines and on the destruction of existing stockpiles. Canada was not the only signature on the page - in fact 122 countries signed the document on that day.



For the first time, the majority of the nations of the world agreed to ban a weapon which was in military use by almost every country in the world. For the first time, a global partnership of governments, international institutions and non-governmental groups came together – with remarkable speed and spirit – to draft an international Treaty. For the first time, those who walked their fields in fear, those who could not till their lands, those who could not go to school – all because of landmines – began to hope.

The lessons of the Ottawa Process:

The success of the Ottawa Process has meant that it has been the focus of a great deal of discussion and analysis since 1997.

It's three key features were:

- The unique partnership between civil society and governments sharing a common objective;
- The leading role played by small and middle powers like Canada, Belgium, Norway, Mexico and South Africa;
- The unprecedented speed with which the process unfolded.

Arguments for and against the Ottawa Process can be read at:

Against - <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458466.html>

For - <http://www.redcross.ca/article.asp?id=024621&tid=001>

Question 2

2007 marks the tenth anniversary of the signing of the **Ottawa Treaty** on December 3, 1997. The Ottawa Treaty or the Mine Ban Treaty, bans completely all anti-personnel landmines (AP-mines). For the first time, the majority of the nations of the world worked with civil society to ban a weapon which was in military use by most of the countries of the world. Knowing about the current situation regarding landmines and the international effort rid the world of their scourge (include background material),

- a. What might Canada and Canadians do to continue its support of countries in their demining efforts? How might we increase funding for survivors?
- b. How can landmine organizations engage young people?

Background – Canada's Contribution to Mine Action



In December 1997 the Government of Canada established the Canadian Landmine Fund, a **\$100 million contribution over 5 years**, for the universalization of the Treaty and to achieve its objectives. The Fund was renewed in 2002 for \$75 million dollars until 2007.

Use of the Canadian Landmine Fund 2000-01 (sample):
Bosnia \$1 787 000; Croatia \$50 000; Mozambique \$ 3 197 000 (biggest receiver); Central America \$2 094 377

CANADA'S ROLE AND LEADERSHIP IN IMPLEMENTING OTTAWA CONVENTION

- CIDA: lead on mine action – development programme and humanitarian assistance
- DFAIT – lead on universalization and policy
- DND and Industry Canada – CCMAT, mine detection, neutralization, victim assistance, protective gear.
- In demining: ie. Bosnia – CIDC; Cambodia - Geospatial Engineering Int'l funding to do Level 1 Survey; Honduras – Canada gave money to OAS to help Honduras to reach goal; Mozambique – CAW programme Cooperation Canada Mozambique for mine clearance.
- In survivor assistance: Canada is the co-chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance (with Honduras). Afghanistan – orthopaedic institution in Kandahar in cooperation with Royal Ottawa Hospital; Bosnia – Queen's University peer counselling and landmine survivor training; El Salvador – Sierra Club BC training of landmine survivors in environmentally friendly technologies; ICRC in 14 countries
- In efforts to implement convention: helps states make it to meetings and contributes to the running of meetings in mine affected countries

- In stockpile destruction: Canada has never turned away a country that has asked us for assistance in SD (except Chad – very dangerous specifics of their programme and lack of their providing details). We have supported Albania, Central Am, Ecuador, Moldova, Peru, Romania, Yemen, Ukraine (either complete or in progress). We also launched the Managua Challenge.

The Canadian Landmine Fund has now lapsed and Canada contributed to mine action is disbursed throughout the government. The Government of Canada's contribution toward mine action increased in 2006-2007 by 32% and totalled \$32 million. Although the contributions are significant there are concerns that since the special funding is now over that there might be decreases in mine action funding by the Government of Canada in the coming years. Many are concerned that there have been no long-term funding commitments made by the government and could lead to a decrease over the near and long-term.

For More Information

Internet sites:

Canadian Landmine Foundation

www.clm.org

International Campaign to Ban Landmines

www.icbl.org

Landmine Monitor Report

www.icbl.org/lm

Handicap International

www.handicap-international.ca

Government of Canada

www.mines.gc.ca

Canadian International Demining Corp

www.cidc.ws

Canadian Red Cross

www.redcross.ca

Mines Action Canada

www.minesactioncanada.org

Books & Articles:

To Walk without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines

by Maxwell A. Cameron (Editor), Brian W. Tomlin (Editor), Robert J. Lawson (Editor)

Navigating a New World: Canada's Global Future

by Lloyd Axworthy

Landmines and Human Security: International Politics and War's Hidden Legacy

by Richard Anthony Matthew, Bryan McDonald, Ken Rutherford

Landmines and Unexploded Ordnance: A Resource Book

by Rae McGrath

The Politics of International Law

by Christian Reus-Smit

- Appendix 1-

AREAS OF MINE ACTION

SURVIVOR ASSISTANCE

SOURCE: Landmine Monitor 2001

- 2004- 2005: new landmines/UXO victims in 58 countries; about 8000 new casualties (not including the unreported or those countries that do not provide accurate info like Burma and Vietnam)
- Now between 15 000 – 20 000 new victims per year (vs. previous estimates of 26 000) – in terms of survivor assistance however, remember that victims from previous years still need care.
- Prosthetics last from 3-5 yrs but children need it more often: “clients are clients for life” (source: Jackie Wright on Tajikistan)
- Prosthetics: remember in different countries, different types of prosthesis would be required (ie. Cambodia – need to walk in water, Tajikistan – up mountains) (source: Jackie Wright on Tajikistan)
- Most cases of new victims are after conflict has ended
- Casualty rate is going up in some countries because of new conflict of refugee/IDP movement. ie. Columbia, Chechnya, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Namibia, and Tajikistan.
- Subsistence agriculturists are the most common victim of landmines (source: To Walk Without Fear)
- Survivor assistance includes: pre-hospital care, hospital care, rehabilitation (physio, prosthetic, psychological support), social and economic reintegration, disability policy and practice, health and social welfare surveillance and research capacities.
- Observation: usually better care for military casualties than mine-affected civilians
- Mine clearance has an end in sight whereas survivor assistance is long-term

VICTIM - directly affected individual and their families and mine-affected communities

SURVIVOR – only those directly affected individuals

MINE RISK EDUCATION

- Programmes that seek to reduce deaths and injuries from APMs and UXO through information, education, and dialogue with communities at risk.
- UNICEF = UN focal point for mine awareness; in charge of developing guidelines
- Mine awareness in emergencies (inform vs. educate), mine awareness in transitional context (peace bldg, educate defined target groups, participatory training), mine awareness in development context (usually know about mines – address APMS and wider dev’t issues)

MINE CLEARANCE

- Military field breaching: clear a lane several meters wide ASAP during combat (with steel rollers, flails, mines pushed aside with armoured ploughs).
- Works for flat open terrain.
- Speed over thoroughness

- Expect some casualties still
- Humanitarian Demining: safe return of land and other resources to civilian use
- Challenge of varied terrain
- Thoroughness
- Done through:
 - Area reduction (reduce from what you think is mined to what you know is mined)
 - Marking
 - Clearance (mostly by hand, lane by lane)
- Verification, certification and handover to community/civil authority (standards 99.6% clear, certification by national mine action centre). Have been some anecdotal reports of incidents in verified and certified fields (source: John MacBride)
- **DANGEROUS: it is estimated that a deminer is killed or maimed for every 1000-2000 mines cleared.**
- **Manual demining is the only method sufficiently reliable to make land safe.**
- Use metal detectors and when they identify metal, they get down on hands and knees and prod the ground at a 30degree angle every 2 cm until they find the mine. Then they uncover it. They usually leave it where it is and then run a line of explosive to it to blow it up in place (it is more dangerous to try to move it). (source: Sergeant Gariépie, Croatia)
- **Canine Demining is another reliable way to detect mines.** Dogs are trained to smell mines and to walk up and down marked lanes. They sit beside the location at which they smell a mine. Two dogs have to work the same lanes. Once the mine is identified, a manual deminer comes in and takes over. No dog has ever been maimed or killed on the job. (source: CIDC Croatia)
- **Why can't you just roll over the fields with a big machine? Terrain, need 99.6% certainty. Would you go into a field cleared that way? "We think we got them, but..." (source: John MacBride). Also, you might be imagining a field as the minefield, but what if it is mountainous like Afghanistan, or if the mines are in a city, in houses and schoolyards like in Sarajevo Bosnia – you can't just send a big machine in.**
- Actors in mine clearance: armed forces, commercial firms, UN agencies, NGOs (ie: HALO, MAG, NPA), multilateral and bilateral donors
- Technology for clearing mines hasn't kept pace with technology for deploying them.
- Mines can be deployed: hand, mechanical, remote deployment (free fall from air, vehicles, etc.), scatterable (usually by air over wide area)

STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION

- A niche for Canada – we are one of the only nations providing assistance (under Article 6) in this area.
- **S.D. is up to 1000 times cheaper than clearing mines (\$300 - \$1000 to demine a mine vs. about \$1 to blow it up before its in the ground).**
- Danger of holding stockpiles: they can be stolen or sold to other countries and groups (happened in many African countries, Albania, Chad, etc.)
- Some methods of stockpile destruction:
 - Open burning/detonation: most common and least technically challenging (dig a hole and blow them up). Some countries don't allow this because of environmental harm – but studies show it isn't harmful if done right.
 - Disassembly (NB: butterfly mines cannot be defused – most others are defusable – most don't have AHD - but safest to be burned in ground)
 - Contained destruction (put them in some kind of sealed box and blow them up)
 - Freezing and crushing (in theory)

MINE AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGY

SOURCE: John MacBride presentation

- History: can be traced to non-explosive alternatives in Roman Times.
- 13th century Chinese use of explosive mines in Mongolia.
- US Civil War – Confederate use
- WW1 – ltd use
- WW2 – massive use (North Africa, Eastern front between Russians and Germans) – use of APMs and AVMs – first time mines used in a planned fashion (ie. Mine maps)
- Korean War – laid by both sides. Lots of casualties on side that laid mines.
- Vietnam War – extensive US use; many picked up by North Vietnamese soldiers and used as booby traps against US
- Arab-Israeli wars – mechanized wars, not many APMs because not too many foot soldiers, but were used in some places to slow the enemy.
- First Gulf War

- Appendix 2 -

THE OTTAWA TREATY

- Immediately end use, development and production, and transfer (physically and by titled) of APMs and not assist or encourage others to use, produce, or transfer them. (one caveat: can transfer mines for their destruction)
 - Destroy existing stockpiles of APMs within 4 yrs of Convention entering into force (caveat: can retain small number for training)
 - Clear mined land within 10 years of entry into force for that country. This includes landmines in that country and in land under its control. Obligation to mark all risky places. (caveat: can get an extension if it is impossible).
 - Provide assistance for care and rehabilitation of mine victims and awareness campaigns until all mines are destroyed.
 - Assist other states in meeting their Convention obligations (states that need assistance can seek it, and states in a position to provide assistance must do so).
 - Cooperate to ensure compliance
 - Provide yearly transparency reports (Including stockpiles, training piles, destruction, mine locations, technological character of past mines produced). First report is within 180 days of treaty coming into force.
 - Annual meeting of state parties until Review Conference (every 5 yrs after entry into force) – countries participating have to pay for the conference, based on ability to pay.
 - Disputes brought to meeting of States parties
 - “Requests for clarifications” if doubts about reports, also fact-finding missions
 - ICBL: “Total Ban on Landmines. No Exceptions. No Reservations. No Loopholes.”
 - can withdraw from treaty with 6 months notice (or at the end of armed conflict if it is longer)
-
- a norm has been established. 75% of world’s countries say the weapon is illegal. US has not used in 10 yrs, not produced in 5, is the largest donor to landmine issue, has destroyed some stockpiles. Stigmatization of those who haven’t signed and those that don’t live up to their obligations (but currently no formal penalties in the treaty for not living up to obligations).
 - Convention: signed December 3, 1997
 - need 40 ratifications for Convention to become law.
 - Entry into force: March 1, 1999
 - Fastest treaty ever to enter into force.
 - 155 state parties (states for which convention has entered into force –6 months after ratification/accession)
 - 155 ratifications/accessions (agree to be bound by Convention including domestic measures to adhere to the law)

- 2 signatures (intend to formally adhere to Convention at later date but in meantime not to undermine purpose of convention. Once entry into force, can be no more signatures)

UNIVERSALIZATION

- 40 countries yet to join Ottawa Treaty to Ban Landmines
- includes: US, China, Russia, most of middle East (US & Cuba only two in Americas)
- also includes many producers: India, Pakistan, US, China
- universalization is biggest challenge to ban supporters

GLOBAL USE OF APMS

- by parties: No evidence
- by signatories: no evidence
- non-signatories use: Sri Lanka, Nepal, Burma and Georgia and
- 60 armed non-state actors
- about 15 000 to 20 000 victims per year (it used to be 26 000 which was 1 victim/20 minutes; now we are about 1 victim in 30 minutes)
- not now being used on massive scale in any conflict.

PRODUCTION

- Used to be 54 producers in 1997. In 2005 13 known producers
- Those that stopped production include 8 of the biggest producers in 70s –90s (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Italy, Hungary, and UK)
- Current producers include the US (which hasn't produced in years and only other producer in Americas is Cuba).

TRADE

- No trade from one nation to another in 3 years
- Used to be 34 exporters, all have stated that they no longer export

STOCKPILES

- About 27 million APMs recently destroyed (21 million by signatories)
- 28 parties completed destruction, 19 are in process, 17 yet to start
- can keep up to 2000 for training purposes

CONCERNS WITH THE CONVENTION

- Anti-vehicle mines with anti-handling devices (which act like APMs) – but not included in convention
- Joint operations (Canada's rule is that Cdns can't use, can't ask others to use, and there is to be no use when a Cdn is the commanding force in charge of the op)
- Claymore mines (can work be victim operated or remote detonated – not allowed when victim operated but allowed detonated – problem of uncommon practice for them)
- Transparency reporting (63% submission rate)
- Need for national implementation measures (43% of state parties have yet to start this)

BASICS OF THE CONVENTION

Article 1 : “never under any circumstances” use, produce, transfer, or develop or assist others to do so

- Some debate as to what ‘assists’ means

Article 2: definition of 5 key terms: APMs, mines, anti-handling devices, transfer and mined-area

Article 3: No exceptions except can keep some for training and can transfer for destruction

- Can says that will retain max. 2000

Article 4: Destruction of stockpiles – 4 yrs to do so from day become state party

- Can destroyed all stockpiles even before signing Convention in 1997
- Canada is a world leader in assisting with stockpile destruction (ie. Some countries worried that can't meet obligations because lack of money)

Article 5: Destruction of Mines in mined areas – 10 yrs to take mines out of ground

- Estimated that only a few countries will need extension

Article 6: International Spirit: Cooperation and Assistance. Those countries not in a position to go at it alone shouldn't have to – state parties can ask for help with mine clearance, awareness, stockpile destruction, care & rehab & social and economic reintegration of landmine survivors.

- Canada – 1997 established \$100 million dollar Canadian Landmine Fund.

Article 7: Transparency measures

Participating Organizations

CANADIAN LANDMINE FOUNDATION

The Canadian Landmine Foundation was launched in April 1999, with the support of the Government of Canada, to provide Canadian leadership in mine action by



Canadian Landmine Foundation
La Fondation des Mines Terrestres du Canada

generating and channelling public interest and funding. Throughout its brief history, the Foundation has informed tens of thousands of people about Canada's recognized international leadership in the anti-personnel landmine issue by using websites, brochures, speeches, letters, and a growing network of partners. This awareness level has then been elevated to a call to action, which has resulted in significant funds being raised for humanitarian demining.

As a partner in the global Adopt-A-Minefield Campaign, the Foundation undertakes most of its operations through the United Nations. In addition to utilizing the network of Mine Action Centres in the various mine affected countries, the Foundation supports the UN belief in building capacity in the mine affected countries. Not only does this result in skills training, it also provides employment in the area.

GLOBAL COLLEGE @ UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

Global College, the vehicle for The University of Winnipeg's international initiatives, is dedicated to the development of global citizenship in our students and in our Winnipeg community. The Global College provides students, faculty, visiting scholars,



THE UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG
Global College
A Place for Research, Dialogue & Action

dignitaries, and the community with a place to interact to share their diverse perspectives about issues of global citizenship, human rights, and issues affecting the planet. International students that brings students and community members into contact with local faculty, visiting scholars and notable speakers from around the world and engages them to discover their role within the local and global community, our responsibility to protect and our responsibility to act.

For more information on Global College events email us at global.college@uwinnipeg.ca.