

Article 1 which simply refers to the scope provision in the Protocol ("The Protocol on Prohibitions and Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) shall further apply in the situations referred to in Article 1 of the said Protocol"). The French have suggested adding additional wording at the beginning of the scope provision ("Except where otherwise specified in any of its annexed Protocols"). At the Western Group meeting in July, this latter suggestion appeared to have wide support because of its simplicity and effectiveness.

**CANADIAN POSITION:**

We would support a change to the Convention to expand the scope provision for all the protocols to include situations of non-international armed conflict.

If the scope provision of Protocol II only is to be expanded in this manner, the easiest way to do this is to amend P II Art.1, with a consequential change to Conv Art.1. Either the Danish or French proposal for this amendment would be effective though the French proposal seems to be the simplest manner in which to do this.

**POSITIONS OF OTHER MAJOR PLAYERS/GROUPS ON THE ISSUE:**

The Dutch have argued that the scope of the entire Convention should be amended so that it applies to non-international armed conflicts but they would be willing to agree to such an amendment for Protocol II only. The positions of other States, except Russia (who hold the view expressed below) with respect to expanding the scope provision for all of the protocols is unknown.

**LIKELY AREAS OF COMPROMISE:**

Unknown.