

ARTICLE 5: REMOTELY DELIVERED MINES

ISSUE: The only substantive issue is one of definition. The chairman's rolling text and the technical annex call for all remotely deliverable mines to employ either SN or SD features (which should be capable of PSD), automatically applied within 90 days of delivery.

BACKGROUND:

Under the present terms of the CCW, remotely delivered landmines must be SN/SD. There is no substantive change to this article. The text includes the longevity of remotely delivered landmines to ensure that the danger of live mines is eliminated relatively quickly after the mines are laid rather than having them remain in situ for many years compounding the risk. A secondary issue which may arise is that of "programmable mines", mines which can have a set of lifespan, say 90 days, but which also incorporate a feature which allows them to be reprogrammed on the 89th day to have another 90 day life span at which time they will SN/SD unless reprogrammed again to survive for another 90 days.

CANADIAN POSITION:

Canada should continue to support the concept that all remotely delivered landmines be SN/SD. NGOs will argue for SD and Canada can accept this. There is no reason to take a stand against incorporation of PSD, except that it will increase costs. It must be reiterated though, that the case regarding failure rates for SN/SD landmines is overstated. Regarding programmable mines, because the ultimate humanitarian effect (SN/SD after the military utility of the mines is exhausted), Canada should support the admissibility of programmable mines within the SN/SD concept.

POSITIONS OF OTHER MAJOR PLAYERS/GROUPS:

The UK is proposing that remotely delivered dumb mines within a 500 meter perimeter be exempted from the prohibition. The USA is on record that all remotely delivered mines be equipped with SN/SD devices..

LIKELY AREAS OF COMPROMISE:

Compromises are possible on the issue of SN versus SD and whether PSD is in fact necessary. The longevity issue will probably include options ranging from relatively long (in the order of a year?) to the relatively short (90 days as in the current rolling text). Canada has no military reason to adopt a stance different from its NATO partners on this issue.