

Convention on Cluster Munitions

10 July 2017

Original: English

Seventh Meeting of States Parties

Geneva, 4–6 September 2017

Item 8 of the provisional agenda

**Review of the status and operation of the
Convention and other matters important
for achieving the aims of the Convention**

Convention on Cluster Munitions 7MSP Progress Report — monitoring progress in implementing the Dubrovnik Action Plan

Submitted by the President of the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

I. Introduction

1. This report presents an aggregate analysis of trends and figures in the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) as operationalized in the Dubrovnik Action Plan (DAP) which will guide the work of the CCM from the First Review Conference (IRC) in 2015 to the Second Review Conference scheduled for 2020. This report specifically focuses on the progress made from 1 July 2016 until 30 June 2017.

2. The report has been structured to provide a document that is as practical and useful as possible on the global implementation of the CCM. It is further intended to guide discussions at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties (7MSP) by monitoring progress and identifying key issues and/or challenges to be addressed. The key elements under each thematic area have been summarized to provide an overall status of implementation of the Convention at a glance. It does not in any way replace the requirement for formal reporting nor does it seek to provide a complete overview of all the progress made in implementing the 32 Action Points contained in the DAP. The information contained in this report is based on publicly available information, including from official statements and States Parties' initial and annual transparency reports due annually on 30 April.

II. Report Summary

Universalization:

- (a) One new State Party brings total to 101;
- (b) Twenty nine more States Parties needed to meet the 2020 target of 130 States Parties set in the DAP.

Stockpile Destruction:

- (a) One State Party became compliant with Article 3 while 10 remain with obligations;

GE.17-11498(E)



* 1 7 1 1 4 9 8 *

Please recycle 



(b) Eight out of ten States Parties provided information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction;

(c) Fifteen States Parties have previously declared having retained cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention though in 2016 only 6 provided updates on the actual use of these retained submunitions in accordance Article 3.8;

(d) Three States Parties specifically declared that they would not retain any cluster munitions after completion deadline.

Clearance and Risk Reduction Education:

(a) One State Party completed clearance ahead of its treaty deadline;

(b) Eight out of ten States Parties provided information concerning the size and/or location of contaminated areas in their 2016 Article 7 Reports;

(c) Seven States Parties reported on the status and progress of clearance programmes;

(d) Two States Parties reported to have released land through methods other than clearance.

Victim Assistance:

(a) Six out of 11 States Parties with Article 5 obligations reported on the designation or existence of a national focal point;

(b) One State reported on the existence of a temporary national focal point;

(c) Seven out of 11 States Parties with Article 5 obligations provided information on a national disability action plan or a national action plan on victim assistance;

(d) Six States Parties reported to have integrated their victim assistance efforts into the broader disability sector;

(e) Seven States Parties reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes.

International Cooperation and Assistance:

(a) Eleven States Parties requested international cooperation and assistance through their 2016 Article 7 report;

(b) Sixteen States Parties reported through their 2016 Article 7 report that they provided assistance to affected States;

(c) Two informal meetings were hosted by the Coordinators between affected States, other States Parties with pressing obligations under the Convention and donor States Parties, to facilitate communication on needs, challenges and capacities to assist and to encourage the formation of partnerships;

(d) One partnership was formed as a result of the informal meetings hosted by the Coordinators.

Transparency Measures

(a) Eighty States Parties submitted their initial transparency reports;

(b) Twenty States Parties still to submit overdue initial transparency report;

(c) Five States Parties submitted their initial transparency reports;

(d) Forty eight States submitted their 2016 Annual Report;

(e) Twenty eight States yet to submit their 2016 Annual Report;

(f) One new State Party deposited its instrument of ratification.

National Implementation Measures

(a) One State Party reported in its initial transparency report as having sufficient existing legislation in place;

(b) Six States Parties reported to have legislation under consideration or in the process of being adopted;

(c) Six States Parties reported that they have adopted legal, administrative and/or other measures to implement the Convention.

III. CCM 7MSP Progress Report Covering the Period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017

A. Universalization

Table 1

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan. Actions 1.1 to 1.3</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
An increased number of States Parties to the Convention (130 at least)	Increase adherence with the Convention	One new State Party Current total of 101 States Parties
A decreased number of reported alleged and confirmed instances of use		Eighteen Signatory States Twenty nine still to go to reach the DAP 2020 objective of 130 States Parties Seventy eight States still to join the CCM Continued slowdown in universalization rate
	Promote the universalization	Numerous bilateral meetings with representatives of Signatory States and States not Party Letters sent to encourage States to ratify/accede to the Convention One regional seminar for Signatory States on ratification and implementation of National Implementation Measures
	Reinforce the norms being established by the Convention	Three regional workshops held

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

(a) How can stakeholders of the Convention make use of identified internal and external factors to motivate States to join?

(b) What level of certainty regarding available evidence on use of cluster munitions would States require in order to speak out against all use, production and/or transfer of cluster munitions?

(c) How can regional and international cooperation and assistance be used and promoted to increase the membership of the CCM?

2. Progress Report on Universalization: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

3. The number of States Parties to the CCM continued to grow during the reporting period. Since the last report, one State, Madagascar, became Party to the CCM on 20 May 2017 and the Convention will enter into force for it on 1 November 2017. As of 30 June 2017, a total of 119 States have joined the CCM by signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention. Of these, 101 are States Parties whilst 18 are Signatory States.

4. After initial rapid ratifications/accessions in the early years of the CCM, the universalization rate continued to slow-down with only one new State Party during the period under review.

5. Action 1.1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan requires that another 29 States join the CCM by the Second Review Conference in 2020, thereby reaching the objective of 130 States Parties. Even though 74 Member States of the United Nations are neither Signatories nor Parties to the Convention, in December 2016, 141 Member States of the United Nations voted in favour of UNGA resolution 71/45 "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

6. Since last reported, only one Signatory State, Madagascar, ratified the CCM; meaning that from the time the Convention entered into force over six years ago, 18 Signatory States are still yet to ratify it. These States are: Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Sao Tomé and Príncipe, Tanzania and Uganda.

7. Action 1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan aims to increase adherence with the Convention, promote its universalization and reinforce the norms being established by the Convention. In this regard, the Coordinators elaborated an action plan with activities and strategies for further universalization of the CCM. Some of these activities built on the efforts of previous Presidencies and Coordinators with regards to States not Party which could potentially accede to the Convention. This strategy included the development of a dialogue with specific States not Party which have had reservations concerning the Convention. Particular focus was given to major producers in collaboration with national and international civil society.

8. The Coordinators on universalization met with representatives of Signatory States and States not Party in the margins of various non-CCM meetings including the Intersessional meetings of the Ottawa Convention in Geneva to implement the strategy outlined in their Action plan.

9. Universalization and outreach activities included bilateral meetings with Signatory States to encourage them to ratify the Convention. In that regard, Coordinators sent out letters to the then 19 Signatory States requesting an update on efforts made to ratify. In response to the letters, one Signatory State stated that it was unable to ratify the Convention at this time as its closest neighbour had shown no indication of joining the Convention. These meetings also requested additional information on the obstacles and challenges faced by States in the process of ratification. The meetings allowed Coordinators to reiterate their availability to provide support to Signatory States in the ratification process.

10. Furthermore, the Coordinators sent letters and demarches to States not Party in addition to bilateral meetings held to promote the universalization of the Convention. One such State was Sri Lanka.

11. In collaboration with the Coordinator on National Implementation Measures, the Coordinators on universalization co-organized the CCM Ratification Seminar targeting African Signatory States with the aim to provide an opportunity for them to discuss challenges and possible solutions to their joining the Convention. The seminar was co-hosted by the Government of Uganda and held in Kampala, Uganda on 29 – 30 May 2017. The seminar brought together nine African Signatory States: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, Uganda and Madagascar as a new State Party. Signatory States attending the event provided an update on their current positions and plans regarding the ratification of the Convention. A specific interactive session was conducted to exchange how best to overcome the identified obstacles and challenges to the ratification of the CCM.

12. At the seminar, the African Union (AU) reminded that at its 584th meeting held on 29 March 2016 the Peace and Security Council of the AU adopted a communiqué under the theme "disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation" in which it called upon Member States that have not yet done so to ratify or accede to the CCM and appealed to States Parties to spare no effort in meeting their respective obligations. A short outline was also provided on two initiatives: the AU Commission Mine Action and Explosive Remnants of War Strategic Framework for the period 2014 to 2017 and the AU Mine Action Survey aimed at facilitating inter-African cooperation in the field of mine action, launched in April 2014 and in February 2017 respectively.

13. As the rate of ratification/accession has continued to slow down, accession especially by States that produce and/or stockpile cluster munitions, is a particular challenge that needs to be addressed. To address this challenge, the Coordinators will remain fully involved in pursuing dialogue with the main producers and possessors of cluster munitions to urge them to join the Convention. The Presidency also addressed this issue by engaging in a structured dialogue with 17 possessor/producer states which strategy needs to be followed up by future Presidencies and Coordinators.

14. To promote the implementation of the Convention, three workshops were held during the period under review. The 7MSP President hosted the Bangkok workshop with a focus on South East Asia in March 2017 and another at RACVIAC in Ratikje, Croatia in June 2017 with a focus on South East Europe. The Coordinators on Universalization and National Implementation Measures collaborated on a ratification seminar in Kampala, Uganda in May 2017.

Challenges identified regarding CCM ratification/accession

15. During the period under review, the Coordinators identified the following challenges faced by Signatory States and States not Party to the ratification/accession of the CCM.

- (a) Limited awareness of the Convention by key decision makers;
- (b) Competing national priorities;
- (c) Lack of interest in the CCM — in particular by non-affected States;
- (d) Internal bureaucracy;
- (e) Regional security concerns;
- (f) Poor coordination between various national stakeholders;
- (g) High turnover of government employees working on the matter and limited information sharing;
- (h) Limited human resources;
- (i) Inadequate national budgets.

B. Stockpile destruction and retention

Table 2

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 2.1 to 2.5</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
An increased number of States Parties that finished stockpile destruction	Develop a resourced plan	Seven States Parties reported having a destruction plan in place or being developed
Increased levels of reporting on matters pertaining to Article 3 implementation, including information on the amount and planned use of sub-munitions retained		Six States Parties reported applying standards related to safety and environment Two States Parties requested assistance to comply with Article 3
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency		Eight States Parties provided information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction Two States Parties reported to be developing a plan for the destruction of stockpiles
	Increase exchanges of promising practices	No reports in this regard
	Apply an appropriate approach to retention	Eleven States Parties reported still retaining cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention Six States Parties provided updates on the use of submunitions retained in accordance with provisions granted under Art 3 Three States Parties declared that they would not retain any cluster munitions after completion deadline
	Announce declaration of compliance on stockpile destruction	One State Party became compliant with Art 3 ahead of deadline
	Act upon unexpected developments	One State Party reported of newly declared stockpiles by a commercial company

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

- (a) How can States Parties most efficiently support destruction of small or limited stockpiles of cluster munitions?

(b) How can States Parties support other Parties and also States not Party with more significant stockpile destruction challenges?

(c) How can international cooperation and assistance between States with stockpiles and States with destruction capacities be optimised?

(d) How can the dissemination of information on innovative and cost-effective technologies to destroy stockpiles be ensured more effectively?

(e) How can States Parties ensure that the amount of explosive sub-munitions retained does not exceed the minimum number absolutely necessary for the purposes permitted under the CCM?

2. Progress Report on Stockpile Destruction: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

16. Since entry into force of the CCM, a total of 39 States Parties reported to have obligations under Article 3, of which 29 have since declared completion of their stockpile destruction or indicated the destruction of stocks before ratification of the CCM.

17. During the period under review, one State Party, France, announced compliance with its obligations under Article 3, more than two years ahead of its 2018 mandatory deadline for stockpile destruction.

18. According to information provided through 2016 Article 7 reports and other official statements by States Parties, there are ten States Parties with obligations under Article 3: Botswana, Bulgaria, Cuba, Croatia, Guinea Bissau, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain and Switzerland.

19. As at 30 June 2017, of the States Parties with Article 3 obligations, only eight had submitted their 2016 annual report with information on Article 3 implementation. Two States Parties with Article 3 obligations, Guinea Bissau and South Africa, have not submitted their initial transparency reports which were due on 28 October 2011 and 29 April 2016 respectively.

20. Seven States Parties: Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cuba, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland, provided updated information on the expected completion date of destruction and should therefore be in compliance with Article 3 obligations before their respective deadline.

21. In line with Action 2.1 of the DAP, among States Parties with remaining stockpile destruction obligations, five States Parties: Croatia, Cuba, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland, have reported that a destruction plan is in place and/or that progress has been made in the destruction process.

22. Two State Parties, Bulgaria and Peru, informed in their 2016 Article 7 reports that it was developing a plan for the destruction of cluster munitions.

23. Another State Party, Botswana, reported that it had requested technical assistance to assess needs and develop a destruction plan.

24. Six States Parties: Botswana, Croatia, Cuba, Peru, Spain and Switzerland, reported that they will ensure that destruction techniques are in compliance with national and international standards in terms of safety and protection of the environment.

25. Three States Parties with Article 3 obligations: Croatia, Cuba and Slovakia; specifically declared that they would not retain any cluster munitions after completion deadline.

26. In their 2016 reports, 11 States Parties: Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland, reported that they retain or have retained cluster munitions and explosive sub-munitions for training purposes and/or for the development of countermeasures in accordance with provisions granted under Article 3 (6). Out of these, five States Parties: France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland, reported on the use of retained cluster munitions retained leading to an overall decrease in numbers while increasing the level of reporting

compared to the previous period. Only one State Party, Belgium, reported that the number of retained cluster munitions had not decreased in 2016 as there had been no EOD training conducted on the retained type of munitions.

27. During the reporting period, the Coordinators on Stockpile Destruction and Retention held bilateral meetings with a number of States Parties, in which these States were reminded of their obligations under Article 3 of the Convention and were encouraged to provide an update on the progress towards the implementation of their commitments. Additionally, the Coordinators sent a letter to each of the three States Parties with overdue submissions of initial or annual transparency reports, inviting them to inform on the status of the implementation of their obligations under Article 3.

C. Clearance and Risk Reduction Education

Table 3

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 3.1 to 3.8</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
A decreased number of new victims, with the aim of zero	Assess the extent of the problem	Eight States Parties reported on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition contamination
Increased amounts of suspected land released for subsistence, cultural, social and commercial purposes	(a) Affected States Parties subject to obligations under Article 4 will endeavour to make every effort to promote clarity on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition remnants in areas under its jurisdiction or control, drawing on survey approaches (technical and non-technical) as appropriate and needed.	Three States Parties reported on newly contaminated areas
Better targeting of scarce clearance resources		
Larger freedom and safer movement	Protect people from harm	Seven States Parties with Art. 4 obligations reported to have provided risk reduction education and/or marked/fenced hazardous areas
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Develop a resourced plan	Five States Parties with Art. 4 obligations reported to have allocated national resources to clearance
	(a) Affected States Parties will endeavour to develop and start the implementation of Article 4 compliant national clearance strategies and plans based on survey results and clearance rates, taking into account best practices, international and national standards and methods	Seven States Parties reported on the status and progress of clearance programmes
	Be inclusive when developing the response	No State provided specific information on the inclusion of communities in the development of clearance plans

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 3.1 to 3.8</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
	Manage information for analysis, decision-making and reporting	Two States Parties reported on land release through methods other than clearance
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	One workshop held in an affected State to support Art. 4 implementation
	Apply practice development	Discussions held with clearance operators
	Promote and expand cooperation	One workshop held in one affected State Clearance Coordinators participated in 2 closed side events organized by Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

(a) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States' efforts to develop and implement cost-efficient survey and land-release plans for affected areas?

(b) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States' efforts to develop and implement risk reduction education programmes?

2. Progress report on Clearance and Risk Reduction Education: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

28. Ten States Parties have reported to be contaminated by cluster munition remnants and therefore have obligations under Article 4 in the reporting period: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

29. During the period under review, one State Party, Mozambique, declared fulfilment of its obligations under Article 4 pertaining to clearance and destruction of cluster munitions ahead of its 2021 deadline.

30. As at 30 June, only eight out of ten States Parties with Article 4 obligations had submitted their 2016 annual report: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

31. Eight States Parties have reported on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition contamination in their 2016 annual report: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

32. Seven States Parties: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Iraq, have reported on the status and progress of programmes for the clearance for cluster munitions remnants on their national territory.

33. During the reporting period, two States Parties, Iraq and Lebanon, reported to have provided information on the release of land previously suspected to contain cluster munition remnants by methods other than clearance.

34. Three States reported to have discovered additional contaminated areas: Croatia, Lebanon and Montenegro.

35. Additionally, seven States Parties: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, with Article 4 obligations reported to have taken measures to provide risk reduction education and/or to prevent civilian access to areas contaminated by cluster munitions remnants through marking and fencing.

36. Five States Parties: Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Article 4 obligations reported to have allocated national resources to clearance.

37. Six States Parties reported on their challenges and international assistance and cooperation needed to fulfil obligations under Article 4 through their Article 7 report: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

38. To meet one of the DAP's key goals of increasing exchange of information on good and cost effective clearance practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency, Norway and the Netherlands, in their capacity as Coordinators for Clearance and Risk Reduction Education, undertook a number of activities during the period under review.

39. In relation to Action 3.7 on applying practice development, the Coordinators held through the fall of 2016 and spring of 2017 discussions with key operators on challenges faced in methods and technologies, and ways in which States can support their work to reach the goals set out by the Convention. These discussions focused on the importance of adequate survey practices and standards, as good survey practices remained a precondition for effective implementation of Article 4. Despite progress made in the application of appropriate techniques, there still remain examples of overestimations of suspected hazardous areas, resulting in a waste of expensive clearance resources.

40. In early autumn 2016 the Coordinators elaborated an action plan which was followed up during the course of the year. In this context, the Coordinators organized a workshop within a concrete country setting to discuss experiences, opportunities and remaining challenges in close proximity to the field. This technical workshop, held on 17 November 2016 in Beirut, Lebanon and facilitated by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), brought together the Lebanese Mine Action Centre (LMAC)/Regional Mine Action Centre (RMAC), national and international clearance operators, donors and UNDP representatives. During the workshop, survey and clearance methods were discussed and a possible follow up to the workshop took place in the margins of the 20th International Meeting of National Mine Action Programme Directors and United Nations Advisers (NDM-UN) held from 7 to 10 February 2017.

41. Furthermore, on 7 June 2017, the Presidency in collaboration with the Presidency of the APMBC co-hosted with the technical support of the GICHD a workshop on Universalizing Land Release. The objective of the workshop was to provide an overview of land release principles as promoted by both the Conventions and the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), take stock of the relevant existing frameworks and tools that endorse land release and encourage participant exchanges on good practices and challenges in the implementation of land release activities which are essential for States to meet their respective completion targets.

42. With regard to Action 3.8, on promoting and expanding cooperation, the Coordinators are considering holding another workshop targeting one or more specific country situations. The Coordinators have also participated in cross-cutting activities with the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance in order to enhance cooperation between affected and donor States.

D. Victim Assistance

Table 4

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 4.1 to 4.4</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
An improvement in the quality and quantity of assistance provided to persons with disabilities	Strengthen national capacity	(a) the end of 2016
Strengthened respect for human rights to all persons	(a) Designating a focal point within the government to coordinate victim assistance	Six States Parties reported the designation or existence of a national focal point
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective practices	(b) Develop a national disability action plan or develop a national action plan on victim assistance	One State reported on a temporary national focal point
Increased involvement of victims in consultations and policy-making and decisions making processes on issues that concern them		(b) the end of 2018
Increased cooperation assistance for victim assistance programmes, through traditional mechanisms, and south-south, regional and triangular cooperation and in linking national focal points and centres		Seven States Parties provided information on a national disability action plan /national action plan
Increased demonstration of results achieved and/or expected results in Article 7 transparency reports		Two States Parties highlighted challenges related to victim assistance and/or disability law implementation mechanisms
		One State Party reported on improvements in regulations for cluster munitions victims
		Six States Parties reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector
	Increase the involvement of victims	Seven States Parties reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes
	Share information	Eight States Parties with Article 5 obligations submitted their Article 7 transparency report.
		Two States Parties provided detailed feedback on key challenges and priorities in art. 5 implementation
		One joint side event across Conventions to

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 4.1 to 4.4</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	<p>launch the <i>Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance</i> and the <i>Guidance on Victim Assistance Reporting</i></p> <p>Seven States Parties requested international assistance and cooperation for victim assistance</p> <p>Thirteen States Parties provided cooperation and assistance in the area of victim assistance</p>

1. Questions for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

(a) What obstacles prevent states from designating national focal points on victim assistance?

(b) What obstacles prevent states from developing national disability action plans and national action plans on victim assistance?

(c) How could the Coordinators improve the draft Guidance for states on an integrated approach to victim assistance?

(d) What mechanisms help increase involvement of victims in policy and decision making processes on issues that concern them?

(e) What mechanisms or fora should be used to enhance sharing of information on approaches to victim assistance?

(f) What good practices can ensure the sustainability and effective targeting of cooperation and assistance on victim assistance?

2. Progress report on Victim Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

43. To date, 11 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Guinea Bissau, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Sierra Leone, have reported to have cluster munition victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control, giving rise to obligations under Article 5 of the Convention.

44. Of the 11 States Parties with victim assistance obligations, eight: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro, submitted their Article 7 transparency reports. Two States Parties with victim assistance obligations, Chad and Sierra Leone, missed the due date for submission of their respective 2016 annual report. One State Party, Guinea Bissau, is overdue in the submission of its initial transparency report since 2011.

45. Five States Parties: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, reported on accidents giving rise to new cluster munition victims.

46. Six States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, and Lebanon, reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector.

47. Seven States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, reported involving victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes on victim assistance.
48. Seven States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro, requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance.
49. Thirteen States Parties: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reported having provided international cooperation and assistance in the area of victim assistance.
50. Five States Parties: Albania, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, reported on their efforts to collect all necessary data and assess the needs and priorities of victims on an ongoing basis. One State Party, Bosnia and Herzegovina, reported having specific challenges with regards to data collection.
51. During the review period, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance focused on the implementation of Action 4.1 of the DAP outlining two specific, time-bound commitments aimed at strengthening national capacity of States Parties with obligations under Article 5 of the Convention.
52. In accordance with DAP Action 4.1, para 32(a), six out of 11 States Parties with obligations under Article 5: Afghanistan, Albania, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, reported on the designation and/or existence of a victim assistance national focal point. One State Party, Bosnia and Herzegovina, reported that until the full establishment of the Working Group for Mine Victims assistance and the CCM in 2017, the Mine Action Centre would be the entity documenting information about the CCM.
53. With the assistance of the ISU, the Coordinators identified two States Parties with obligations under Article 5, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone, yet to inform of the designation of a victim assistance focal point. In January 2017, the Coordinators wrote to these States Parties reminding them of their commitment under the DAP to designate a victim assistance focal point by the end of 2016, and requesting an update on progress towards its implementation. The Coordinators did not receive a response from either of these States.
54. In accordance with DAP Action 4.1, para 32(c), in 2016, seven States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, provided information on a national disability action plan or national action plan on victim assistance; three States Parties, Afghanistan, Croatia and Lebanon, highlighted challenges related to victim assistance and/or disability law implementation mechanisms; one State Party, Bosnia and Herzegovina, reported on improvements in regulations for cluster munitions victims.
55. With the assistance of the ISU, the Coordinators identified five States Parties with obligations under Article 5 yet to inform of the development of a national disability action plan or national action plan on victim assistance: Afghanistan, Guinea Bissau, Iraq, Montenegro and Sierra Leone. In early 2017, the Coordinators wrote to these States Parties reminding them of their commitment under the DAP and requesting an update on progress towards its implementation. In reply to this request, Montenegro, informed of the ongoing development of an adequate legislative framework to implement Article 5 obligations, including the adoption of a national plan of action. Montenegro also reported on the need for international, including expert assistance, in its efforts to strengthen relevant legislative, administrative and technical capacities.
56. The Coordinators also focused on facilitating increased information exchange among States Parties on the implementation of Article 5 obligations, with the goal of identifying good practices as possible useful resources for other States parties, and providing a platform to share information on challenges and convey assistance needs. In early 2017, they wrote to Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Iraq and Lebanon inviting them to share information on challenges and key priorities in implementing Article 5

obligations. By 30 June 2017, two of these States Parties, Albania and Croatia, as well as Montenegro, had provided detailed feedback.

Good practices and challenges in implementing Article 5

National legal and regulatory framework

57. National action plans formulated in accordance with relevant international instruments (APMBC, CCM and Protocol V of the CCW) and highly developed legal and regulatory systems have been put in place. These provide a comprehensive framework to address victims' needs relating to emergency and continuing medical care, physical rehabilitation, psychosocial support, socio-economic reintegration and data collection. Where these frameworks are being developed, international assistance is being actively sought.

Data collection

58. Data disaggregation by type of injury not always possible Data collection on mine/other UXO incidents and victims uses different platforms (e.g. the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)) and diversified sources (e.g. the UN, health care institutions, media). The information is constantly updated and verified, particularly to prevent cases of double entries, and disaggregated by age and gender. Some difficulties have been encountered in disaggregating data by type of casualty.

National Coordination

59. The record of cooperation among the different stakeholders is mixed. Cooperation among government agencies has met with some challenges, particularly in the absence of an entity with the clear authority to promote coordination. Good experience, instead, has been reported in the broader relationship among governmental and non-governmental bodies — national and international — local authorities, health structures, survivors' and other Persons with Disabilities' organizations. Such cooperation translates also into a sustained flow of information enabling joint progress assessment and planning. The need for greater cooperation with the disability sector has also been highlighted.

Effective provision of services

60. Service provision is based on the evaluation of specific needs, not discriminating between mine/other UXO victims and other Persons with Disabilities. Needs assessments programmes have also helped to identify victims' needs and elaborate relevant recommendations. The migration of capacities to urban areas has affected the service provision in rural and remote ones. Lack of coordination among the institutions responsible for providing different services has also hindered effective service provision. In these cases, engagement with other institutions or NGOs has proven useful to identify and address specific gaps and problems. Other challenges to the effective service provision include: competing priorities within the health sector; insufficient numbers of professionals, particularly in physical rehabilitation; low perception of the importance of physical rehabilitation.

Socio-economic reintegration

61. General economic issues and high unemployment rates have been an obstacle to the socio-economic reinsertion of victims, like other PwDs, even for those having benefited from vocational training programmes. High unemployment or the lack of job opportunities allowing for adequate sources of income have also resulted in inappropriate living conditions for many persons with disabilities, including mine/other UXO survivors.

62. In building on previous efforts, the Coordinators also continued to work to improve coordination on issues of victim assistance with other disarmament conventions including commitments on victim assistance, namely the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

63. On 29 November 2016, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and the Victim Assistance Committee of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention hosted a

joint side event during the 15th Meeting of the States Parties of the APMBC, in Santiago, Chile. During the event, two Guidance documents were launched in an effort to contribute to the development of common approaches to victim assistance issues across Conventions: the Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance (developed in the framework of the CCM) and the Guidance on Victim Assistance Reporting (developed in the framework of the APMBC).

E. International Cooperation and Assistance

Table 5

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik action plan actions 5.1 to 5.7</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
A decrease in the number of new victims and a better quality of life for victims	Strengthen partnerships at all levels	Two informal meetings between affected States Parties/ States Parties with pressing obligations and donor States Parties
An increased number of States Parties that finish stockpile destruction in advance of their eight-year deadlines		<i>Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance</i> finalised and launched
A better targeting of scarce resources		
Increased technical and material assistance, transfer of skills and good practices	Communicate challenges and seek assistance	Eleven States Parties requested assistance in 2016 annual report
Increased and improved reporting on challenges and needs for assistance		Sixteen States Parties reported on provision of assistance to affected States
An increase of multi-year partnerships for cooperation including multi-year funding arrangements		Ten affected States Parties reported assistance received from other States Parties and stakeholders
An increase in the exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance and stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Evidence based needs for better results	Six States Parties submitted requests for assistance based on surveys, needs assessments and analysis
An increase in cooperation and assistance for victim assistance programming, with the aim to ensure that victims can participate in all aspects of life on an equal basis	Take ownership	Fourteen States Parties reported allocating national resources to implement the CCM
	Respond constructively to request for assistance	Two States Parties have assistance arrangements with an operator in response to their requests No States Parties reported provision of assistance to

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik action plan actions 5.1 to 5.7</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
		affected States based on specific requests
	Make use of existing tools, cost efficiency and effectiveness	Twenty seven States reported in their 2016 Reports either requesting or providing assistance
	Support implementation support	Sixteen States Parties reported on the provision of assistance to affected States
		Thirty three States Parties paid contributions to the ISU in 2016

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

(a) What are the key obstacles to securing assistance from States Parties and organisations with the capacity to provide it?

(b) How can States Parties make use of available channels of information within the Convention to make their needs more clearly known, and are there new ways of conveying information which should be explored?

(c) What is the potential of targeted initiatives such as "country coalitions" to enhance international cooperation and assistance?

(d) What can the Coordinators do better to enhance international cooperation and assistance among States Parties?

2. Progress Report on International Cooperation and Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

64. There are 11 States Parties which have requested international cooperation and assistance through their 2016 report: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Colombia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Niger and Peru, an increase from 9 in 2015.

65. According to information provided through Article 7 reports and official statements, 10 States Parties have obligations under Article 3: Botswana, Bulgaria, Cuba, Croatia, Guinea Bissau, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain and Switzerland. Of these, two States Parties, Botswana and Peru, specifically requested assistance through their Article 7 report to fulfil their obligations; an increase from only one reported in 2015.

66. Ten States Parties have reported having Article 4 obligations: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro. Out of these, six States Parties, Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro, have requested assistance to fulfil obligations under clearance through their Article 7 report (a decrease from nine in 2015). In addition, four States Parties: Afghanistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro, have asked for assistance in risk reduction education; a decrease from five reported in 2015.

67. To date, 11 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Guinea Bissau, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Sierra Leone, have reported to have cluster munition victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control, giving rise to obligations under Article 5 of the Convention. Out of these, six States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lebanon, Montenegro and Iraq, have specifically requested assistance to fulfil obligations under victim assistance through their 2016 annual transparency report, the same number as in 2015.

68. One State Party, Niger, specifically requested, in its initial Article 7 report, assistance in the development of specific national legislation on the implementation of the CCM.

69. Five States Parties: Botswana, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Iraq and Peru, also requested assistance in other areas such as data collection and technical training to deal with obligations under articles 3 and 4.

70. One State Party, Colombia, reported that it is still in the process of gathering data in order to determine whether it has cluster munition contamination or not and requested international assistance to set up its operational capacity to deal with possible cluster munition remnants contamination.

71. Sixteen States Parties reported that they provided assistance to affected States: Australia, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. All 16 donor States reported that they had provided support for clearance activities while only 13 of them had given support to victim assistance and only 12 to risk reduction education and capacity building.

72. Ten States Parties provided information on international cooperation and assistance received from other States Parties and/or stakeholder organisations: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Iraq, Montenegro and Peru, and increase from only four in 2015.

73. Six States Parties: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Peru, submitted their Article 7 requests for international cooperation and assistance based on surveys, needs assessments and analysis, including at times a focus on capacity-building at national and local level.

74. Fourteen States Parties: Albania, Botswana, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Peru, France, Germany, New Zealand, Slovakia and Switzerland, reported having allocated national resources to fulfil obligations under the Convention, an increase from 12 in 2015.

75. The Coordinators encourage all affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations to provide their Article 7 reports in a timely manner and to report in as much detail as possible on their needs and challenges with regard to fulfilment of their obligations. Article 7 reports continue to be a critical resource used by the Coordinators to bring States Parties with needs together with potential State Party and civil society partners who may be able to help meet those needs.

76. During the period reported on, consistent with the Dubrovnik Action Plan, the Coordinators focused on enhancing communication between States Parties on their challenges and needs and their capacity to provide assistance to address these (Action 5.2), and facilitating the formation of partnerships between States Parties to meet pressing obligations under the Convention (Action 5.1), including through the Country Coalitions initiative of the Presidency of the Seventh Meeting of States Parties.

77. The Coordinators launched a new initiative to support these priorities — holding closed meetings directly between affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations and donor States Parties. Two such meetings were held, on 8 February in the margins of the 20th International Meeting of National Mine Action Programme Directors and United Nations Advisers (NDM-UN) in Geneva, and on 9 June in the margins of the Intersessional Meetings of the Anti-Personnel Landmine Convention.

78. In total, 45 representatives participated in these meetings, from the following States: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, France, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

79. The primary objectives of the meetings were:

(a) to serve as a new, additional channel through which unmet needs and challenges could be directly raised by affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations, with States Parties with capacity to assist in addressing such needs and overcoming such challenges;

(b) to help affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations understand how they could access assistance more effectively, by hearing directly from donor states about their priorities and procedures for provision of assistance;

(c) to help donor states understand what difficulties affected states faced in accessing assistance;

(d) provide the foundations for the establishment of enhanced partnerships between affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations which would facilitate timely and effective implementation of obligations, including Country Coalitions; and

(e) to provide an opportunity for the Coordinators to hear directly from States Parties how to improve their support to States Parties.

80. The key points raised by States in these meetings as issues to be considered in the formation of partnerships to assist affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations included that:

(a) lack of funding, technical expertise and resources (including technology and equipment) were major obstacles to meeting deadlines for clearance and stockpile destruction, and also to meeting the needs of victims;

(b) an absence of national ownership and will to prioritise implementation of Convention obligations above other competing national priorities was a key barrier to moving forward on clearance, stockpile destruction and victim assistance;

(c) provision of funding, expertise and resources were key areas in which donors might assist affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations to meet their obligations, but also important was engaging with and building the capacity of local NGOs and national mine action authorities to deal with Convention obligations;

(d) a key to success in securing assistance from donors was the provision in a request for assistance (including in Article 7 transparency reports) of as much detailed information as possible about the status of progress in implementing Convention obligations, the nature of the obstacles to implementation and the specific type of assistance necessary to fulfil their obligations;

(e) preferred channels for requesting assistance varied between donor States Parties, but typically included Article 7 transparency reports, direct bilateral contact through diplomatic or development assistance offices or in the margins of multilateral meetings, or through the donor's preferred civil society partners;

(f) there was a need for better coordination amongst donors to ensure that assistance was distributed to all states in need, and not concentrated on a limited number of states in a duplicative manner;

(g) the Coordinators could further enhance informal meetings on cooperation and assistance by holding closed meetings limited to affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations, and separately, closed meetings limited to donor states, to enable more frank exchanges, before holding joint meetings; and

(h) an individualised approach to assistance, as proposed in the Country Coalitions concept, offered significant potential for accelerating progress on implementing deadlines under the Convention, and should be made a focus of the next Action Plan in 2020.

81. Therefore, the informal meetings proved an effective platform, both because they enabled the valuable exchanges on these points, but also because they led to the establishment of at least one new partnership between a State Party with pressing

obligations under Article 3 and an operator with capacity to assist in the fulfilment of those obligations. The Coordinators recommend continuation of the practice of holding such meetings, including meeting separately with affected States Parties/States Parties with pressing obligations and donor States before holding joint meetings, in the next reporting period.

82. Additionally, during the period under review, the Coordinators worked with the Coordinators on Victim Assistance to finalise Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance, a publication which highlights a range of good practices and national examples of effective implementation of an integrated approach to victim assistance by both donor states and affected states. The publication was launched on Tuesday 29 November 2016, at a side event during the Fifteen Meeting of States Parties of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention in Santiago.

F. Transparency Measures

Table 6

<i>2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
	<i>6.1 to 6.2</i>	
An increase in the rate of submissions of transparency reports provided under Article 7	Report in time, initially and annually	Three States Parties submitted their initial transparency report ahead of deadline
Improved quality in reporting		Two States Parties submitted their respective overdue initial transparency report
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective reporting practices		
Increased use of the reporting guide that reflects the actual need for qualitative information and represents a useful tool for States Parties to submit initial reports and annual updates	Make practical use of reporting	Three States Parties for the first time used Article 7 reports to communicate their needs for assistance

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

(a) What are the factors preventing higher submission rates of both initial and annual transparency reports?

(b) What best practices on reporting could be shared to enhance quality of reports and increase submission rate?

2. Progress Report on Transparency Measures: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

83. All States Parties to the CCM are required to report, initially, within 180 days of entry into force of the CCM for the State Party, and then annually with updates by 30 April. According to the information available on the UNODA Article 7 database, by 30 June 2017, a total of 80 States Parties out of 100 had submitted their initial Article 7 transparency report as required by Article 7 of the Convention, representing 80% of States Parties for which the obligation applied at that time.

84. There are, therefore, to date 20 States Parties still with overdue initial transparency reports: Belize, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Dominic Republic, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Nauru, Palau, Rwanda, Somalia, South Africa, State of Palestine, Togo and Tunisia.

85. In the period under review, five State Parties: Colombia, Cuba, Honduras, Mauritius and Niger, submitted their initial transparency reports, with three of them being submitted ahead of the stipulated deadlines: Colombia, Cuba and Mauritius.

86. During this period, four States Parties: Iceland, Rwanda, Somalia and Palau, missed the deadline for the submission of their respective initial transparency reports.

87. The Convention will enter into force for one new State Party, Madagascar on 1 November 2017 and the deadline for its initial transparency report is 30 April 2018.

88. As at 30 June 2017, 48 States Parties had submitted their 2016 Annual Report, leaving 28 States Parties with overdue 2016 Annual Report. Therefore, out of 100 States Parties that should have submitted an initial and/or annual Article 7 transparency report by 30 April 2017, only 52 had complied with this obligation with 48 still to submit either an initial or annual report.

89. During the reporting period, in performing its mandate, the Coordinator on matters pertaining to Transparency Reporting sent 21 letters to States Parties that had overdue submissions of initial transparency or 2016 annual reports. Two out of 22 States Parties that had overdue initial reports submitted their reports, Honduras and Niger, whilst another one out of 18 States Parties that had overdue 2015 annual reports complied with the obligation; Senegal.

90. The Coordinator with the support of the Implementation Support Unit had bilateral meetings with a number of States with overdue reports to explore possible solutions to the challenge of non-submission of transparency reports. This effort resulted in two States Parties submitting their overdue report.

Key challenges identified to reporting during the period under review

91. Some of the challenges identified as contributing to the low rate of reporting were:

- (a) staff rotation;
- (b) limited staff dedicated to disarmament matters;
- (c) numerous reports all due at the same time;
- (d) misconceptions regarding the complexity of the reporting template;
- (e) perception that the information provided in the reports is never actually used in facilitating international cooperation and assistance;
- (f) some States Parties saw no point in submitting the report when there was nothing new to report since the previous report.

92. In addition, some States Parties without Articles 3, 4 and 5 obligations indicated that they saw no added value in submitting annual reports when they never had anything new to report.

G. National Implementation Measures

Table 7

<i>CCM 2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan - Actions 7.1 to 7.3</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
All States Parties being in compliance with Article 9 and have reported on national implementation in formal meetings of the Convention and through Article 7 transparency reports	Enact national legislation to implement the CCM	Six States reported that they have adopted new/additional legal, administrative and/or other measures aimed at the implementation of the CCM

<i>CCM 2nd Review Conference Goals</i>	<i>Actions to be taken</i>	<i>Progress made</i>
	<i>Dubrovnik Action Plan - Actions 7.1 to 7.3</i>	<i>During reporting period</i>
All relevant national actors, including armed forces being informed of obligations under the Convention and of National Implementation Measures including as a result of their reflection, where necessary in military doctrine, policies and training	Highlight challenges and request assistance	One State indicated in its initial report that its existing legislation was sufficient Four States informed that they are still in the process of developing legislation One State specifically requested assistance for Article 9 implementation May 2017 workshop in Kampala, Uganda on ratification of the CCM to provide African Signatory States a forum to share challenges
	Raise awareness of National Implementation Measures	Specific session on NIM during May 2017 workshop in Kampala, Uganda Promotion of model legislation at March 2017 CCM implementation seminar in Bangkok, Thailand Bilateral and regional outreach

1. Questions/Challenges for discussion at the Seventh Meeting of States Parties

- (a) What would encourage those States Parties that have yet to do so to review their national legislation and report on it?
- (b) How can uptake of existing implementation tools, including model legislation, be improved?
- (c) How can we encourage States Parties and Signatory States to identify specific assistance that may be needed to implement the CCM?
- (d) Beyond the introduction of national legislation, in what ways can States Parties address the issue of investment in cluster munitions?
- (e) How can States Parties be further encouraged to share best practices with respect to the dissemination to relevant national stakeholders of national obligations under the CCM?

2. Progress Report on National Implementation Measures: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

93. Over the course of the period under review, work on National Implementation Measures has strived to make progress towards the achievement of the two relevant goals agreed in the Dubrovnik Action Plan, namely; "*all States Parties being in compliance with Article 9 and have reported on national implementation in formal meetings of the Convention and through Article 7 transparency reports; and all relevant national actors,*

including armed forces being informed of obligations under the Convention and of National Implementation Measures including as a result of their reflection, where necessary in military doctrine, policies and training".

94. In the absence of inter-sessional meetings, States Parties have been encouraged to submit written updates on their National Implementation Measures, particularly through the timely submission of Article 7 transparency reports. The Coordinator for National Implementation Measures, New Zealand, wrote to and sought meetings with a number of States Parties that had previously reported being in the process of developing new legislation: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, El Salvador, Ghana, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mauritania and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Of these States Parties, two Lebanon and Mauritania have both advised that no new legal developments have taken place over the course of the reporting period.

95. The Coordinator for National Implementation Measures also contributed to a letter sent by the Coordinator for Transparency Measures to a number of States Parties that have not previously provided any information on their national implementing legislation: Belize, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Honduras, Iceland, Mauritius, Niger, Rwanda, Somalia, South Africa and Togo. Mauritius has since reported that it is implementing and enforcing new legislation specifically aimed at implementation of the CCM (Anti-Personnel Mines and Cluster Munitions Act dated 25 June 2016).

96. In addition, a number of other States Parties have reported on National Implementation Measures in their Article 7 initial and/or annual reports:

(a) One State Party, Cuba, reported in its initial transparency report as having sufficient existing legislation in place, bringing to a total of 18 the number of States Parties with existing law deemed sufficient;

(b) One State Party, Niger, specifically requested in its initial transparency report assistance in the development of specific national legislation on the implementation of the CCM;

(c) Out of the 48 States Parties that have provided Article 7 reports for calendar year 2016, four States Parties: Afghanistan, Botswana, Swaziland and Zambia, informed that they are still in the process of developing legislation relating to the Convention's implementation. There are therefore to date, 17 States Parties with legislation under consideration or in the process of being adopted;

(d) Out of 48 States Parties that have submitted their 2016 annual reports, six States Parties: Bulgaria, Colombia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, New Zealand and Switzerland, reported that they have adopted new legal, administrative and/or other measures to implement the Convention.

(i) Bulgaria reported having amended its penal code to establish penal sanctions for violating the prohibitions contained under the Convention;

(ii) Colombia reported having made efforts to ensure that obligations of the Convention and its National Implementation Measures are disseminated to its Air Force and reflected in military trainings;

(iii) Lao People's Democratic Republic reported on the adoption of a series of legal and strategic measures aimed at implementation the Convention's goals;

(iv) Lebanon reported not having any new developments on the legal front. Administratively, however, it informed that it had updated some of its National Mine Action Standards and that it was striving to clear all cluster munition remnants within the 10 year timeframe;

(v) New Zealand reported on the entry into force of a new disclosure regime to help ensure that investments made by funds are not used for the development or production of cluster munitions, as required by section 10 (2) of the Cluster Munition Prohibition Act 2009;

(vi) Switzerland reported on the adaptation of the Swiss Criminal Code and Military Criminal Code that criminalize the use of prohibited weapons as a war crime.

97. The Coordinator for National Implementation Measures, New Zealand, has continued to promote existing tools for implementation, including model legislation, and has continued its engagement with bilateral and regional partners to better understand the range of challenges that are affecting progress towards implementation in States Parties and Signatory States. A briefing sheet and outreach chart has been developed to facilitate outreach to relevant States on the tools available to assist with implementation of obligations under the CCM.

98. In its role as Coordinator for National Implementation Measures New Zealand participated in the seminar "Cooperating to implement the Convention on Cluster Munitions: the country coalition concept" organised by Germany as the President of the 7th Meeting of States Parties in March 2017 in Thailand. The Coordinator promoted the simplified model of legislation that New Zealand had developed to assist ratification of the CCM by States neither possessing cluster munitions nor contaminated by them.

99. Alongside the Coordinators for Universalisation, France and Zambia, New Zealand as Coordinator for National Implementation Measures also supported and participated in an African regional seminar held in Kampala and co-hosted by Uganda from 29 to 30 May 2017. Participants included the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, Gambia and Uganda as well as representatives from the Implementation Support Unit, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines — Cluster Munitions Coalition (ICBL-CMC) and the International Committee of the Red Cross. The seminar included a dedicated session on CCM Article 9 obligations and on the ratification and domestication tools available to States Parties and Signatories.
