

The Convention on Cluster Munitions Lusaka Progress Report

Monitoring progress in implementing the Vientiane Action Plan up until the Fourth Meeting of States Parties

This report presents an aggregate analysis of trends and figures in the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), operationalized in the Vientiane Action Plan (VAP), from entry into force of the Convention on 1 August 2010 up to the Fourth Meeting of States Parties (4MSP) in Lusaka, Zambia, in September 2013. A special emphasis is placed on progress made since the Third Meeting of States Parties (3MSP) held in Oslo, Norway, in September 2012.

This document is intended to facilitate discussions at the 4MSP by monitoring progress and identifying key questions to be addressed. It does not replace any formal reporting. Nor does it provide a complete overview of all progress made in implementing the VAP's 66 Action Points. The list of challenges and questions to be discussed is not meant to be exhaustive. The content of the report is based upon publicly available information, including States Parties' initial and annual transparency reports, statements made during the Intersessional Meetings in April 2013, and other open sources such as information provided by civil society. The Lusaka Progress Report (LPR) is submitted to the 4MSP by Norway as President of the 3MSP. All thematic Coordinators have been invited to provide additional information based on their own consultations and analysis. A draft version was made available to all States and other stakeholders for review and factual corrections.

When referring to States Parties, signatories or States not Party, these terms are used explicitly; otherwise the term "states" is used for referring to States Parties, signatories and States not Party in general. The CCM has not yet entered into force for some of the states mentioned that have ratified the Convention, but they are still referred to as States Parties in this document. In general the report does not distinguish between the information from statements given during the Intersessional Meetings, Meetings of States Parties, or the initial and annual transparency reports.

This report was finalised on **28 June 2013**. Changes that have occurred after that date are not reflected in this report.

1. General trends

Universalization

The number of States Parties to the CCM continues to grow. By 28 June 2013, there are 83 States parties and 29 signatories to the CCM. This means that more than half of the United Nations (UN) member states have joined the ban on all use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster munitions. Eight States have ratified or acceded since the 3MSP. Universalization and outreach actions in line with the VAP by states, the UN, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) and other organizations, have resulted in continued interest by States not Party in formally joining the CCM through ratification or accession.

The norm against the use of cluster munitions has been strengthened since entry into force of the CCM. There have, however, been a few instances of confirmed use of cluster munitions by States not Party to the CCM since entry into force. A large number of States Parties and States not Parties have condemned or otherwise expressed concern with the use of cluster munitions in Syria in 2012 and 2013.

Stockpile destruction

Since the entry into force of the CCM, 32 of the 34 States Parties with reported stockpiles of cluster munitions have either completed their stockpile destruction obligations, started the destruction process, or started developing plans for such destruction. 15 States Parties have completed their stockpile destruction obligations, one since the 3MSP. It seems likely that all will complete destruction well within the initial eight-year deadline. According to the Cluster Munition Monitor 2012, five signatories have stockpiles that will have to be destroyed in accordance with Article 3 when they become States Parties.

13 States Parties have reported that they retain or have retained cluster munitions and explosive submunitions for permitted purposes in accordance with Article 3 (6).

Clearance

Almost all of the 13 States Parties and the one Signatory with reported contamination from cluster munitions have taken steps to address the contamination, in line with relevant actions in the VAP. Three States Parties have completed their clearance obligations, including two States Parties that cleared all contaminated areas under its jurisdiction or control prior to the entry into force.

Victim assistance

The majority of the 11 States Parties and the two signatories reported to have victim assistance obligations have implemented some or all relevant actions in the VAP. States with such obligations report that limited resources remains the main obstacle to developing or maintaining capacities for effective life-saving first-response aid, and to establishing the enabling environment necessary to ensure that victims of cluster munitions may enjoy their full rights.

International cooperation and assistance

13 States Parties have explicitly reported that they are currently in need of international cooperation and assistance. 22 States Parties and two signatories have reported that they have provided funding for implementation of the CCM.

Transparency

26 States Parties have not yet submitted their initial transparency reports, including ten that have not yet reached their deadlines.

A number of States Parties have moreover been late in the submission of subsequent annual reports. The reports that have been submitted have been of varying quality and sometimes hard to extract relevant information from.

19 States Parties have not yet submitted their annual transparency report for 2013. This represents an increase from 2012 when nine States Parties failed to submit their annual transparency report.

National Implementation Measures

3 States Parties have adopted national implementation measures since the 3MSP. A growing number of States Parties have reported on efforts being undertaken to develop national legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the CCM, or to ensure that existing legislation is sufficient.

2. Partnerships

Since entry into force, States, UN agencies, the ICRC, civil society, including the CMC, survivors and their representative organisations, and other relevant stakeholders, have cooperated formally and informally at the national, regional and international level on a broad range of implementation issues. These partnerships have facilitated rapid universalization, progress on operative provisions and the strengthening of the norm against use.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

- How can these partnerships further evolve to promote the universalization and full and effective implementation of the CCM?

3. Universalization

Scope

75 States were Parties to the CCM at the time of the 3MSP. Since then seven¹ signatories have ratified and one² state has acceded to the CCM. 83 States are Parties to the CCM as of 28 June 2013.

¹ Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Iraq, Liechtenstein, Nauru and Peru

² Andorra

Progress

Three years after entry into force, 29 signatories³ have yet to ratify the CCM.

17 States Parties⁴ have reported on actions taken to promote adherence to the CCM and to encourage states to join the Convention in several forums, including the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Commonwealth, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), the Arab League and relevant UN forums. Universalization workshops have been hosted in Ghana and Croatia, and most recently in Togo.

A number of States Parties have also reported on how they have encouraged States not Party to accede to the CCM through political demarches, in bilateral and multilateral meetings, workshops, issuance of a political declaration, and by encouraging States not Party to participate as observers in the formal and informal meetings of the Convention. The Coordinators on Universalization have addressed a joint letter to the Permanent Missions of States not Party to the CCM, encouraging them to consider accession. Since the 3MSP, the President of the 3MSP has visited Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia and Serbia for universalization purposes.

Outreach activities in line with **Action #7** have resulted in sustained high participation in Meetings of States Parties and Intersessional Meetings since the entry into force. 61 States not party participated at the 3MSP, including 30 signatories. 42 States not party participated at the 2013 Intersessional Meeting, including 16 signatories. 4 States Parties⁵ provided funding for the sponsorship programme for the 3MSP, whereas one State Party⁶ provided funding for the sponsorship programme for the 2013 Intersessional Meeting. This enabled the participation of delegates from 33 States not party⁷ at the 3MSP and 19 States not party⁸

³ Angola, Benin, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cyprus, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Palau, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania

⁴ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, France, Ghana, Grenada, Ireland, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zambia

⁵ Germany, Ireland, Norway and Switzerland

⁶ Norway

⁷ Armenia, Benin, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, DRC, Djibouti, Eritrea, Gabon, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Tajikistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe

⁸ Armenia, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Palau, Philippines, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Suriname, Thailand, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Somalia

at the 2013 Intersessional Meeting respectively (as well as 31 States Parties⁹ at the 3MSP and 28 States Parties¹⁰ at the 2013 Intersessional Meeting).

11 States Parties¹¹ have reported that they have provided funding for advocacy purposes to civil society. UN agencies, the ICRC and the CMC have reported numerous and diverse actions to promote the universalization of the CCM, including through legal advice and advocacy efforts.

Discussions at formal and informal meetings, as well as consultations with States not Parties, have revealed that regional security concerns, as well as concerns related to perceived costs of implementing the provisions of the CCM prevent some signatories from ratifying and other states from acceding. Another concern is that some signatories or other states lack legal and bureaucratic capacity to tackle the formal processes of ratification or accession.

Since the entry into force of the CCM, the use of cluster munitions by three States not Party¹² has been confirmed, and one state is alleged to have used cluster munitions without this being independently verified¹³. A number of states have reported actions in response to the use of cluster munitions since entry into force.

Reactions have been particularly vocal with regard to the sustained use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic, in line with **Action #6**. The President of the 3MSP has on several occasions condemned the use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic. In May 2013, 107 UN member States voted in favour of General Assembly Resolution 67/262, strongly condemning the use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic. In addition, 22 States Parties¹⁴ and one Signatory¹⁵, as well as at least three¹⁶ other States have, on various occasions, condemned or otherwise expressed concern with the use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic. At the Togo Regional Seminar on Universalization in May 2013, 36 African States expressed grave concern over the recent and on-going use of cluster munitions.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

It is a challenge for States Parties to reinforce the norm against all use and end the use of cluster munitions by States not Party.

⁹ Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Niger, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Senegal, Swaziland, FYR Macedonia, Togo, Uruguay and Zambia

¹⁰ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea Bissau, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, Montenegro, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Seychelles, Swaziland, The FYR of Macedonia and Zambia

¹¹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Spain

¹² Thailand, Libya and the Syrian Arab Republic

¹³ Sudan

¹⁴ Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Ireland, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zambia

¹⁵ South Africa

¹⁶ Cambodia, Qatar and the United States of America

A second challenge is to promote ratification or accession to the CCM, especially by States contaminated by cluster munitions; in possession of stockpiles of cluster munitions; and/or with responsibility for many survivors.

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- How can regional approaches be utilised to increase the rate of accession and ratification of the CCM?
- How can international cooperation and assistance be used to increase the membership of the CCM?
- How can States Parties to the CCM, individually, as a community and represented by the President, best respond to allegations of use by States not Party to the CCM?

4. Stockpile Destruction

Scope

A total of 34¹⁷ States Parties have reported that they have or have had obligations under Article 3 of the CCM. 15¹⁸ have declared completion of their stockpile destruction obligations, one¹⁹ of them since the 3MSP. There are thus 19 States Parties²⁰ with current obligations under Article 3.

In addition, one signatory²¹ has in voluntary reports confirmed the possession of cluster munitions and has provided information on the number of stocks. The Cluster Munition Monitor has reported that three signatories²² previously possessed stockpiles of cluster munitions and that six signatories²³ have existing stockpiles.

Progress

Among the States Parties with remaining stockpile destruction obligations, nine²⁴ have begun physical destruction and eight²⁵ have reported that a destruction plan is in place or that a process of developing concrete implementation plans is underway, in line with **Action #8**. Most of the 19 States Parties that have declared to have stockpile destruction

¹⁷ Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

¹⁸ Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Mauritania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova and Slovenia

¹⁹ Côte d'Ivoire

²⁰ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

²¹ Canada

²² Angola, Central African Republic and Colombia

²³ Canada, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, Indonesia, Nigeria and South Africa

²⁴ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

²⁵ Botswana, Bulgaria, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland

obligations have submitted Article 7 reports that provide information on the number and type of cluster munitions stockpiled.

According to the 2012 Cluster Munition Monitor, a total of 85.8 million submunitions had been destroyed by States Parties by July 2012 as a result of efforts to implement the CCM. This constituted 68% of the stockpiles declared by States Parties. Most States Parties with obligations to destroy stockpiles have indicated that they will finish the destruction of all stockpiles well in advance of their deadline. Moreover, stockpile destruction has proved to be cheaper and less complicated than was previously anticipated.

13 States Parties²⁶ have reported that they retain or have retained cluster munitions and explosive submunitions for training purposes and for the development of countermeasures in accordance with Article 3 (6), while two²⁷ have reported that they intend to do so. All States Parties having reported on retained cluster munitions and/or explosive submunitions have provided information about types and quantities of the retained stocks. All States Parties reporting on present retention also report on planned use, for permitted purposes, except one²⁸ for which the initial report is not yet due, while five²⁹ of them have so far reported on actual use, for permitted purposes, of the retained cluster munitions. Since the 3MSP, one State Party³⁰ formerly retaining cluster munitions has reported that all of its retained stocks have been destroyed.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

One challenge is to maintain the momentum for rapid destruction of stockpiles, and to utilise provisions for international cooperation and assistance to this end. Another is to ensure that the amount of submunitions retained does not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary to conduct the activities reported by States Parties with retained cluster munitions.

Questions to discuss at the 4MSP may include:

- How can States Parties most efficiently support destruction of small or limited stockpiles of cluster munitions?
- How can States Parties ensure that the possibility to retain cluster munitions does not result in de facto stockpiling?

5. Clearance

Scope

13 States Parties³¹ have reported to be contaminated by cluster munitions and therefore have obligations under Article 4. Of these, two³² are among the four countries³³ most heavily

²⁶ Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

²⁷ Peru and Switzerland

²⁸ Australia

²⁹ Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, France and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

³⁰ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

³¹ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Mozambique and Norway

affected in the world. In addition, one signatory³⁴ has reported to be contaminated by cluster munitions. Estimates presented in the 2012 Cluster Munition Monitor suggest that a total of 24 states and three territories are contaminated by cluster munition remnants³⁵.

Two States Parties³⁶ completed their obligations to clear all contaminated areas prior to the entry into force, and one State Party³⁷ has done so since the entry into force of the CCM.

Progress

14 states³⁸ have provided information on the size and location of contaminated areas and/or reported to have conducted or planned some sort of survey in line with **Action #12**. Four States Parties³⁹ and one State not Party⁴⁰ reported on efforts undertaken to develop and implement a national clearance plan in line with **Action #13**.

Two States Parties⁴¹ have reported on how they have included and informed affected communities in their development of national clearance plans and planning of clearance activities and land release.

Ten States Parties⁴² and one State not Party⁴³ have reported on methods applied for survey and/or clearance in contaminated areas. Since the 3MSP, five States Parties⁴⁴ have provided updated information on the size and location of contaminated areas that have been released, and four⁴⁵ have disaggregated this information by release methods, in accordance with **Action #16**.

Seven States Parties⁴⁶ and one Signatory⁴⁷ have reported on efforts undertaken to develop and provide risk reduction programmes to their population.

The Working Paper “Application of all available methods for the efficient implementation of Article 4”, prepared by the Friend of the President on Clearance, was welcomed by the

³² Iraq and Lao People’s Democratic Republic

³³ Cambodia and Vietnam in addition to Iraq and Lao People’s Democratic Republic

³⁴ Democratic Republic of the Congo

³⁵ Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Montenegro, Norway, Russia, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Vietnam, and the territories Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara

³⁶ Albania and Zambia

³⁷ Grenada

³⁸ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Mozambique, Norway and Serbia

³⁹ Chad, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mauritania

⁴⁰ Cambodia

⁴¹ Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁴² Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania and Norway

⁴³ Cambodia

⁴⁴ Afghanistan, Croatia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mauritania

⁴⁵ Afghanistan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mauritania

⁴⁶ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁴⁷ Democratic Republic of Congo

2MSP⁴⁸. The CMC has issued a paper emphasizing the need for efficient land release, titled “CMC Guiding Principles for Implementing Article 4 of the Convention in Cluster Munitions”. The President of the 3MSP has drafted a Working Paper on compliance with Article 4, the purpose of which is to provide greater clarity about what completion of Article 4 obligations entails. A draft was discussed at the 2013 Intersessional Meeting, and a revised version will be submitted to the Fourth Meeting of States Parties.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

A challenge for many States Parties with Article 4 obligations is to develop and implement national strategic plans that apply context-relevant and up-to-date survey and land release methods. A second challenge is to identify and mobilise resources for Article 4 implementation that some States Parties have reported to be an obstacle.

Questions to discuss at the 4MSP may include:

- How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support efforts to develop and implement cost-efficient survey and land-release plans, for each affected country and area?
- What does compliance with Article 4 entail, and how can greater clarity about the “end-state” help States Parties prioritise, coordinate and plan survey, clearance and land release operations?

6. Victim Assistance

Scope

11 States Parties⁴⁹ and two Signatories⁵⁰ have reported to have obligations under Article 5 (1). Estimates presented in the 2012 Cluster Mmunition Monitor suggest that 30 States and three territories⁵¹ have had cluster munition casualties and thus have responsibility for cluster munition victims. Of these, four States Parties⁵² and two States not Party⁵³ are considered to have the largest number of cluster munition survivors.

Progress

Seven States Parties⁵⁴ and three States not Party⁵⁵ have reported the establishment of a coordinating mechanism for victim assistance varying from single individual focal points to coordinating inter-ministerial committees in line with **Action #21**. Six States Parties⁵⁶, and

⁴⁸ CCM/MSP/2011/WP.4

⁴⁹ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique and Sierra Leone

⁵⁰ Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda

⁵¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Mozambique, Russia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Uganda, Vietnam and the territories Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara

⁵² Afghanistan, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁵³ Cambodia and Vietnam

⁵⁴ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique

⁵⁵ Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda

⁵⁶ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Lebanon

two States not Party⁵⁷ have reported that they have started or undertaken data collection in line with **Action #22**. Five States Parties⁵⁸ have reported that their casualty data recording has improved since such data collection was initiated. Nine States Parties⁵⁹ and one State not Party⁶⁰ have reported that their victim assistance efforts are integrated with existing disability-coordination mechanisms in line with **Action #23**, and six States Parties⁶¹ report that they have reviewed their national laws and policies in line with **Action #26** since entry into force of the CCM.

Seven States Parties⁶² and three States not Party⁶³ have reported to have developed and/or adapted plans and/or budgets in line with **Action #24**.

Six States parties⁶⁴ and two States not party⁶⁵ have reported to have undertaken, or to have planned, actions to enhance the accessibility of victim assistance services in line with **Action #25**, such as improvements in prosthetics services, healthcare/rehabilitation services in previously contaminated areas, and free medical care and distribution of disability cards to survivors. Five States parties⁶⁶ reported to have conducted outreach activities to raise awareness among cluster munition survivors about their rights and available services in line with **Action #27**.

With regard to **Action #28**, Four States parties⁶⁷ and one signatory⁶⁸ have reported on steps undertaken to enhance the social and economic inclusion of cluster munition victims in the form of training and income-generating projects.

Three States Parties⁶⁹ have reported on steps taken to mobilize national and international resources in line with **Action #29**. Six States parties⁷⁰ and one signatory⁷¹ have reported that funding of victim assistance measures remains a challenge.

Eight States Parties⁷² have reported that cluster munition survivors and their representative organisations participated in national implementation efforts, as laid down in **Action #30**.

⁵⁷ Cambodia and Democratic Republic of the Congo

⁵⁸ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁵⁹ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Mozambique

⁶⁰ Cambodia

⁶¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Mozambique

⁶² Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique

⁶³ Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda

⁶⁴ Albania, Chad, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro

⁶⁵ Cambodia, Uganda

⁶⁶ Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁶⁷ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁶⁸ Uganda

⁶⁹ Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon

⁷⁰ Afghanistan, Albania, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique

⁷¹ Uganda

⁷² Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique

Three States Parties⁷³ and one signatory⁷⁴ have so far included victims as experts in their delegations to meetings within the CCM framework, as envisaged in **Action #31**.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

One challenge is to ensure that victim assistance activities are based on the needs and priorities of those affected, and that resources are made available and used efficiently.

A second challenge is to create sustainable services and programs, and to ensure that the lifelong needs of victims are met.

A third challenge is to fully integrate Victim Assistance efforts with the wider agenda on development, disability and human rights, and to make best use of opportunities that allow for a holistic approach that encompasses all victims of explosive remnants of war.

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- How can States Parties link victim assistance efforts under the CCM to activities promoting the rights of victims under other relevant instruments of international law, as well as in development cooperation?
- How can States Parties better include survivors in the planning, priorities and implementation of victim assistance?
- How can States Parties best operationalize their obligations towards victims of cluster munitions, whilst observing their obligation to not discriminate on the basis of what caused the injury/disability?

7. International cooperation and assistance

Scope

15 States Parties⁷⁵ have reported assistance needs since entry into force, of which two⁷⁶ have since fulfilled the obligations for which international assistance was required. Since the 3MSP, eight States Parties⁷⁷ have reported on such needs.

Since entry into force, five States Parties⁷⁸ and one signatory⁷⁹ have reported assistance needs for Stockpile Destruction, nine States Parties⁸⁰ have reported assistance needs for

⁷³ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia

⁷⁴ Uganda

⁷⁵ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Peru, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Zambia

⁷⁶ Grenada and Côte d'Ivoire

⁷⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Mozambique

⁷⁸ Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Peru

⁷⁹ Nigeria

⁸⁰ Afghanistan, Chad, Croatia, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Clearance and/or Risk Reduction and seven States Parties⁸¹ and one⁸² signatory have reported assistance needs for Victim Assistance.

Nine States Parties⁸³ have reported to have received dedicated CCM assistance, seven⁸⁴ since the 3MSP.

24 States⁸⁵ have reported that they have provided funding for international cooperation and assistance since entry into force of the Convention, 18⁸⁶ of them in reports or statements since the 3MSP.

Progress

Since entry into force, 23⁸⁷ States Parties have partly or fully implemented **Action #33**, developing or updating national plans for meeting their obligations under the Convention.

At the 3MSP, one State Party⁸⁸ declared compliance with Article 4 following cooperation with another State Party as well as an NGO. Most States Parties report to be cooperating with national and international NGOs and/or the UN in stockpile destruction, clearance and victim assistance activities, in line with **Action #44**.

Since entry into force, states and other actors have used the formal and informal meetings to exchange information and experiences and to promote technical cooperation, through panel discussions and presentations by technical experts, in line with **Actions #35 and 36**. The same framework has been utilized to discuss international cooperation and assistance issues in line with **Action #43 and 45**.

In 2012, the Coordinators of International Cooperation and Assistance published a catalogue of best practices on cooperation and assistance, in line with **Action #47**. This catalogue is available at the Convention's website.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

Some States Parties with obligations under Articles 3, 4 and/or 5 and with needs for international cooperation and assistance have not communicated their needs to other States

⁸¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and Zambia

⁸² Uganda

⁸³ Afghanistan, Albania, Côte d'Ivoire, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro and Republic of Moldova

⁸⁴ Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania and Montenegro,

⁸⁵ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, South Africa, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

⁸⁶ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

⁸⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

⁸⁸ Grenada

Parties. Some states also need to develop and/or update and improve national plans identifying accurate needs, extent of the problem, priorities and timelines.

Remaining challenges for states and other implementation actors include: how to increase regional cooperation; and how to increase technical cooperation and exchanges of experiences and best practices between affected states?

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- How can States Parties ensure that international assistance and cooperation efforts are linked to actual needs on the ground and broadened to include exchange of best practices, equipment, technology, skills and experience?
- How can States Parties and other actors providing assistance structure their support according to national plans and priorities, including through enabling long-term planning?
- How can the Convention community work together to overcome challenges related to building national capacity and strengthening national ownership?
- How can more States Parties be mobilised to support the implementation of the CCM through international cooperation and assistance measures?

8. Implementation Support

States, the United Nations, the ICRC, the CMC, civil society and several other entities have participated in and contributed to, the formal and informal meetings of the Convention since entry into force. The Presidencies⁸⁹, Friends, Coordinators and other States Parties have consulted broadly, including with other States and relevant organisations in accordance with **Actions #51 and #52**.

Since the adoption of the VAP at the 1MSP, an Intersessional Work Programme has been established, and since the 2MSP, a Coordination Committee has met regularly, succeeding the Group of Friends meetings held during the first Presidency. Moreover, the Coordinators have been progressively involved in the preparations for and the implementation of the Intersessional Meetings, and they have also contributed with substantive input at the Meetings of States Parties. UNDP, CMC and the ICRC have continued to play a vital role in the implementation structures of the Convention, including as panellists in various thematic sessions and workshops at meetings under the Convention. The Coordination Committee includes representatives from the CMC, the ICRC, UNDP, and UNODA.

The implementation of the Intersessional work programme, including the work of the Coordination Committee, has been substantially supported by the UNDP/BCPR in its role as Interim Implementation Support Unit (ISU). The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining provided logistical support in organizing the intersessional meeting.

At the 2MSP, States Parties decided to establish an ISU, and the President of the Meeting was mandated to negotiate a hosting agreement and a funding model for its establishment.

⁸⁹ Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Norway

The President of the 3MSP continued consultations on a funding model and the subsequent establishment of an ISU, building on the work conducted by the President of the 2MSP. This has included consultations with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) on a hosting agreement for a future ISU. The President of the 3MSP presented a draft decision on the establishment and funding of an ISU at the 2013 Intersessional Meeting. Consultations on the matter continue.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

One challenge that remains is to decide on a sustainable and predictable funding model for the ISU that ensures universal ownership and accountability towards all States Parties. A second challenge is to continue to adapt the Intersessional Work Programme to reflect the realities and needs in affected areas.

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- How can the formal and informal meetings be organised so that they best support the norms of the Convention and its effective implementation?

9. Transparency

Scope

76 States Parties had or have Article 7 reporting deadlines in the time period up until the 4MSP.

Progress

Since entry into force, 57 States Parties⁹⁰ have submitted their initial Article 7 reports (as of 28 June 2013) in accordance with Article 7 (1) and **Action #58**. Three initial reports⁹¹ have also been submitted on a voluntary basis. 26 States Parties⁹² have not yet submitted their initial transparency reports. Of these, 10 are not yet due. Since the publication of the Oslo Progress Report, an additional 15 States Parties⁹³ have submitted initial reports.

52 States Parties⁹⁴ were required to submit annual Article 7 reports by April 30 2013 in accordance with Article 7 (2) and **Action #59**. Of these, 35⁹⁵ reports were submitted as of 28 June 2013, and one⁹⁶ signatory submitted its updated Article 7 report on a voluntary basis. The number of States Parties that have not yet submitted their annual transparency reports for 2013 has increased in both absolute and relative terms since 2012. As of 28 June 2013, 17 States Parties have not yet submitted their annual transparency report for 2013, as compared to nine for 2012.

⁹⁰ See Annex 1

⁹¹ Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Palau

⁹² See Annex 1

⁹³ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Chile, Czech Republic, Grenada, Hungary, Italy, Mauritania, Mozambique, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Swaziland and Sweden

⁹⁴ See Annex 1

⁹⁵ See Annex 1

⁹⁶ Canada

The Coordinator on Reporting has reported that letters have been sent on a regular basis to remind States Parties of their obligations to report.

Since entry into force, Reporting formats have been prepared by the Coordinator to ensure coherent and comprehensive reporting. These and a draft “Guide to reporting”, also prepared by the Coordinator in line with **Action #62**, are available on the Convention’s website.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

One challenge is to improve the quality of the reports, which have ranged from highly detailed and comprehensive, to lacking required information or being difficult to read.

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- What steps should be taken to ensure that high quality information is provided in the transparency reports?
- How can the transparency reports be used as a tool for assisting and cooperating in implementation, particularly where States Parties have obligations under Articles 3, 4, and 5?

10. National Implementation Measures

22 States Parties⁹⁷ have reported having adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the CCM, three⁹⁸ having done so since the 3MSP. 14⁹⁹ have stated that they consider their existing legislation to be sufficient. 16 States Parties¹⁰⁰ and two signatories¹⁰¹ have reported that they are in the process of adopting legislation, while two States Parties¹⁰² report that they are undertaking reviews of the national legislation to ensure compliance with Article 9 of the CCM.

The ICRC has prepared a model legislation for common law states, and the Coordinator for National Implementation Measures has prepared a model legislation for small states without stockpiles or cluster munition contamination. These are both available on the Convention’s website.

Five States Parties¹⁰³ have reported on how they have informed other relevant state agencies about the prohibitions and the requirements of the Convention.

⁹⁷ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

⁹⁸ Hungary, Italy and Samoa

⁹⁹ Albania, Bulgaria, Denmark, the Holy See, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

¹⁰⁰ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Croatia, Ghana, Grenada, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Swaziland and Zambia

¹⁰¹ Canada and Democratic Republic of the Congo

¹⁰² Mozambique and Seychelles

¹⁰³ Croatia, Denmark, Ireland, Lebanon and Norway

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

The main challenge under national implementation measures is to ensure that all states swiftly develop and adopt any legislation deemed necessary for the effective and comprehensive implementation of the Convention.

Questions to discuss at the 4MSP may include:

- What are the factors preventing greater progress in national implementation?
- What further assistance might States need to facilitate their adoption of implementing legislation?

11. Compliance

No serious issues of non-compliance have yet been raised, but one may note that 18 States Parties are late in submitting their annual Article 7 transparency reports covering the year 2012, and that 16¹⁰⁴ States Parties are late in submitting their initial reports. The general impression is that States Parties and signatories are showing great determination to implement the Convention rapidly and thoroughly.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the 4MSP

A key challenge under compliance is how States Parties and the President should deal with future compliance concerns.

Questions to discuss at 4MSP may include:

- How should States Parties address the issue of non-compliance in the future?

¹⁰⁴ Cape Verde, Cook Islands, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Mali, Niger, Panama, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia

Annex 1:
Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas.

III. Universalization

83 States Parties (by region)¹⁰⁵	29 Signatories
Africa (23)	Africa (19)
Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon Cape Verde, <i>Chad</i> , Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia, Swaziland, Zambia	Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania
Americas (17)	Americas (5)
Antigua and Barbuda, <i>Bolivia</i> , Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, <i>Peru</i> , Trinidad and Tobago, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Uruguay	Canada, Colombia, Haiti, Jamaica, Paraguay,
Asia (3)	Asia (2)
Afghanistan, Japan, Lao PDR	Indonesia, Philippines
Europe (32)	Europe (2)
Albania, <i>Andorra</i> , Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, <i>Liechtenstein</i> Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Cyprus, Iceland
Middle East (2)	Middle East
<i>Iraq</i> , Lebanon	
Pacific (6)	Pacific (1)
<i>Australia</i> , Cook Islands, Fiji, <i>Nauru</i> , New Zealand, Samoa	Palau

IV. Stockpile Destruction

¹⁰⁵ New States Parties since the Third Meeting of States Parties in *italics*, in order of ratification or accession: Peru (26.09.2012), Australia (08.10.2012), Nauru (04.02.2013), Liechtenstein (04.03.2013), Chad (26.03.2013), Andorra (09.04.2013), Bolivia (30.04.2013), Iraq (14.05.2013)

States Parties with obligations under Art. 3	States Parties that have completed their Art. 3 obligations¹⁰⁶	States Parties retaining stockpiles for permitted purposes	States Parties that have provided information on retained stockpiles
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, <i>Côte d'Ivoire</i> , Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Mauritania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia,	Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland,	Belgium, Croatia, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

V. Clearance and Risk Reduction

States Parties with obligations under Art. 4	States Parties that have provided updates on the status and progress of their clearance programmes since the 3MSP	States Parties that provided information on the size and location of contaminated areas and on survey activities	States Parties that reported on efforts undertaken to develop and implement a national clearance plan	States Parties that have developed risk reduction programmes
Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Mozambique, Norway	Afghanistan, Croatia, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Mozambique, Norway	Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Norway	Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania,	Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon

¹⁰⁶ States Parties that have completed their obligation since the 3MSP in *italics*.

VI. Victim Assistance

States Parties with obligations under Art. 5	States Parties that have integrated victim assistance into national disability and health programs	States Parties that have developed a national plan on victim assistance
Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique, Sierra Leone	Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique	Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mozambique

VII. International cooperation and assistance

States Parties that have reported assistance needs	States Parties that have reported providing support
Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Peru, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Zambia	Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

VIII. Transparency

States Parties that have submitted their initial Article 7 reports	States Parties that have yet to submit initial reports¹⁰⁷ (as of 24 June 2013)	Signatories that have voluntarily submitted Art. 7 reports
Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, New Zealand, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Vincent and Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland,	Andorra, Australia, Bolivia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Cook Islands, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iraq, Liechtenstein, Mali, Nauru, Niger, Panama, Peru, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago and Tunisia	Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Palau

¹⁰⁷ For the following ten countries, the deadline for submission was not yet reached at the time of writing: Andorra, Australia, Bolivia, Cameroon, Chad, Iraq, Liechtenstein, Nauru, Peru, Switzerland

Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia		
---	--	--

States Parties required to submit annual reports by 30 April 2013	States parties that have submitted their annual Art. 7 report (as of 24 June 2013)	Signatories that have voluntarily updated Art. 7 reports
Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, New Zealand, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Vincent and Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zambia	Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay	Canada (2012 and 2013), Democratic Republic of the Congo (2012)

IX. National Implementation Measures

States Parties that have adopted legislation aimed at the implementation of the Convention	States Parties that are developing legislation relating to the Convention's implementation
Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Croatia, Ghana, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Saint Vincent and Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Zambia