



Geneva

2022-08-

Status of the implementation of Article 4 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions

Mr President, Excellencies, dear Colleagues,

It is an honour for me to take the floor as one of the two thematic coordinators of **Article 4 on clearance and destruction of cluster munitions remnants and risk education.**

Let me first of all on behalf of **Guyana** and my own country **Sweden**, express our sincerest gratitude for the excellent cooperation with *the Implementation Support Unit* in the preparation of this meeting of States Parties and also with the Presidency throughout the work in the CCM Coordination Committee

As stated in the *Lausanne Action Plan* in its chapter on survey and clearance, significant progress has been made over the last year in addressing cluster munition contaminated areas, especially with regards to improved efficiency through survey. Nevertheless, there is still some more work to be done.

Since entry into force of the Convention in 2010, a total of 17 States Parties have reported to have had obligations under Article 4.

Seven States Parties have since declared completion of the clearance of cluster munition contaminated land, two of which reported to have done so before entry into force of the Convention.

There remain **ten** States Parties with obligations under Article 4 - Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and Somalia. Eight of these states (excluding Iraq and Somalia) have since submitted a request to extend their original deadlines.

In our role as Coordinators for Clearance and Risk Education, we undertook a number of activities during the period under review, including several bilateral meetings with Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Iraq, Lebanon and Somalia aimed at facilitating their work with the objective of avoiding extension requests, where possible. The meetings also served to identify and facilitate the establishment of country coalitions for States Parties that may need assistance to comply with Article 4 obligations.

As Coordinators Guyana and Sweden also chaired **the ad hoc Analysis Group**– with Germany and Montenegro - and considered three Article 4 extension requests (Afghanistan, Chile, and Mauritania) in 2021 (that were considered at the 2nd Review Conference Part 2) and in

2022 we analysed further three extension requests (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad and Chile) which Guyana yesterday presented to the meeting (State Parties).

We also, together with *the Implementation Support Unit*, held separate meetings with the States Parties with the objective of facilitating extension requests of a high quality in addition to their being submitted and considered in a timely manner.

We will now give you **a short summary** of some *key updates* under Article 4 of the Convention:

Nine out of the ten States Parties (Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania and Somalia) have submitted their **annual transparency report** (Article 7) **for 2021** with updated information on their implementation of Article 4.

Only Afghanistan has *not* submitted a report, for the first time. It has in the past always been one of the states to submit its article 7 Report on time

Two out of ten States Parties (Germany and Lebanon) report to be on track in meeting their current Article 4 deadlines.

One State party (Iraq) has informed that it would not be able to meet its Article 4 obligation deadline and would submit an extension request by 1 December 2022 to be considered at the 11MSP.

Seven States Parties (Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania and Somalia) have *requested international cooperation and assistance* to implement their Article 4 obligations through their 2021 annual transparency report. An additional State Party (Chile) indicated that they needed international assistance in its extension request.

In their 2021 annual transparency report, four States Parties (Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR and Lebanon) provided particularly detailed information on their risk education efforts, including disaggregated data.

Finally, we would like to take the opportunity to highlight Action 20 of the *Lausanne Action Plan*, which reminds States Parties with obligations under Article 4 **to submit the extension request on time**, which is not later than nine months before the MSP during which the request should be considered.

The reason we bring this up here is *not* to point fingers, but ultimately to strengthen the convention, which in the end is in the interest of all States Parties.

The applicable deadline is set with the objective that all involved parties will have the necessary time to consider the request and give it the attention it deserves, in order to give substantial and appropriate feedback.

Thank you for your kind attention. ./.