



## Agenda punt 5b: Lausanne Action Plan

### Guiding principles and actions

- Thank you Mr. President. The Netherlands greatly appreciates the work you and your team put in the Lausanne Action Plan and we are looking forward to contribute further to this Action Plan that will be our guide for the coming five years.
- The Netherlands noted that the previous draft of the LAP contained an action on providing quality and regular information on progress and challenges in implementing the Convention (previous action #8). This action has been deleted from the current draft. We would appreciate if this action could be reincluded in the guiding principles as transparency reporting is one of the most effective ways for States Parties to monitor the implementation of obligations under the Convention.

### Transparency measures

- Greater transparency is an important aspect of the Convention and will contribute to achieving our shared goals.
- We therefore support the adaptation of reporting forms, which should help States Parties to complete their national reports more easily. We sincerely hope that this will be an extra encouragement for States Parties to submit their transparency reports.
- We would like to add to action #45 that the coordination committee will develop adapted reporting forms, while ensuring that States Parties can provide inputs and have the final say by its adoption at the Tenth Meeting of States Parties.
- Allow me in this regard, Mr. President, to repeat what we stated during the previous PrepCom: the Netherlands is open to consider ways in which we can improve both the quality and quantity of reporting. We would welcome any proposals to this end.

### National Implementation Measures

- The Netherlands is concerned about the lack of progress on national implementation measures.
- As one of the 13 States Parties that at this moment have legislation prohibiting investment in production of cluster munition, we would like to adapt action #47: “All States Parties should consider enacting national legislation prohibiting investments in all producers of cluster munitions **and its crucial components.**”

### **Agendapunt 5c Lausanne Political Declaration**

- The Netherlands aligns itself with the statement delivered by the EU and would like to make some additional remarks in its national capacity.
- The Political Declaration is not only to look back to what has been accomplished since the Convention entered into force, but also to bolster our political commitment to achieve the goals set in the Lausanne Action Plan until the next Review Conference in 2025.
- For the coming years' we should focus on the effective implementation and universalisation of the Convention. The Netherlands is therefore keen on contributing to a strong and forward looking Political Declaration.
- For the interest of time, I will not go into detail but wish to highlight one critical element, which is paragraph 9. We believe that paragraph 6 of the Dubrovnik provides a good starting point and contains some critical elements for this paragraph. My delegation deeply regretted that that in the report of last years' meeting of states parties no explicit reference was made to cases of use and this must be avoided in the current political declaration and the States Parties to this convention must condemn the use of cluster munitions in unequivocal terms. We must speak out when the norms that lie at the heart of this convention are violated.

## **Agenda punt 5d: Implementation Support / Reflections and options regarding the Convention's machinery**

### **Programme of meetings**

- Regarding the programme of meetings, the Netherlands would be in favour of resuming intersessional meetings for the reasons you mention in option 2 of your document.
- It could gain time for discussions about important issues we will have to decide about in the upcoming MSP such as extension requests under Articles 3 and 4. Having been part of the Analysis Group for both article 3 and 4 extension requests over the past two years, the Netherlands is of the view that it would be useful to have an initial discussion with all States Parties before a decision is taken the MSP. Using the intersessionals to this end would further increase the transparency and inclusivity of these processes.
- Intersessional meetings are also a helpful tool in informal contacts, not only between States Parties but also with States not party to the CCM and other stakeholders.
- In closing, allow me to express the warm appreciation of my delegation to the GICHD for their willingness support the resumption of intersessional meetings.

### **Coordination Committee and Working Groups/Coordinators**

- As co-coordinator of the Working Group on Cooperation and Assistance and of the Analysis Group, the Netherlands supports the adaptations you propose in the document.
- Adjustment of the mandate of the Working Groups in light of the decision to be taken at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Conference will have a positive impact on the implementation of the Convention.
- The Netherlands sees transparency reporting is one of the essential tools that enables States Parties to monitor the general status of the Convention and note that the Lausanne Action Plan in its current form requires a better reporting discipline. We are therefore open to consider the idea of having to topic covered by two coordinators instead of one, when this positively impacts the reporting rate. Another option would be to merge the coordinator position on reporting with the coordinators on General Status and Operation, and create a 3 person working group.