

Convention on Cluster Munitions

24 July 2024

Original: English

Twelfth Meeting of States Parties**Geneva, 10-13 September 2024**

Item 10 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 12MSP Progress Report: Monitoring progress in implementing the Lausanne Action Plan^{*,1}

**Submitted by the President of the Twelfth 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) through the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP). The LAP, which was adopted at the Second Review Conference in September 2021, serves as a guiding framework for the work of the CCM up to the Third Review Conference scheduled for 2026. This report specifically covers the period from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024.

2. The report is intended as a practical overview of the global implementation of the CCM. It aims to facilitate discussions at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties (12MSP) by identifying key issues and challenges that need to be addressed. The elements under each thematic area have been summarized to provide a snapshot of the Convention's cumulative implementation status to date. It does not replace the formal reporting requirements by State Parties to the CCM, nor does it provide a complete account of activities outlined in the 50 Action Points of the LAP. The actions and indicators have been condensed for brevity.

3. The information contained in this report is based on publicly available sources, including from official statements of States Parties and their initial and annual transparency reports submitted between 1 July 2023 and 30 June 2024.

II. Report Summary

Guiding Principles

- 07 States Parties reported to have integrated Convention implementation activities into various national plans;

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.

¹ The present report was submitted to the conference services for processing after the deadline so as to include the most recent information.

- 16 enhanced national capacity or made resource commitments to implement the Convention;
- 08 adopted comprehensive national strategies;
- 07 States Parties updated national standards according to the IMAS.

Gender Mainstreaming

- 14 States Parties provided information on gender in their transparency reports;
- 05 States Parties collected and analyzed data on risk education or victims disaggregated by gender, age and disability;
- 06 States Parties included gender and the diversity of populations in their survey and clearance planning and prioritization.

Universalization

- 01 new State Party was welcomed during the period under review;
- 12 Signatory States remained to ratify the CCM;
- 02 cases of confirmed cluster munition use reported.

Stockpile Destruction

- 04 State Parties declared completion of their obligations;
- 01 State Party destroyed all its retained cluster munitions and explosive submunitions;
- 07 States Parties reported on the use of retained cluster munitions for training exercises, hence reducing their stocked quantities.

Survey and Clearance

- 01 State Party declared completion of its obligations;
- 03 extension requests submitted for consideration at the 12MSP;
- 08 affected State Parties reported detailed progress in implementing strategies and plans.

Risk Education

- 08 affected State Parties reported on tailor-made risk education activities in annual reports;
- 10 States Parties reported having provided risk reduction education.

Victim Assistance

- 04 States Parties confirmed to have new cluster munition victims;
- 12 States Parties made efforts to mobilize national and international resources for victim assistance;
- 10 States Parties allocated national resources to victim assistance.

International Cooperation and Assistance

- 35 States Parties provided or received assistance to implement the CCM;
- 06 States Parties provided multi-year funding to affected States Parties;
- 18 States Parties reported having allocated national resources to fulfill these obligations.

Transparency Measures

- 51 of 103 States Parties submitted their 2023 Article 7 annual reports;
- 02 initial Article 7 report received;
- 07 of 112 States Parties remain with overdue Article 7 initial reports;
- 24 States Parties used the revised Article 7 reporting form.

National Implementation Measures

- 65 States Parties report having adopted all national measures;
- 10 States Parties reported to have strengthened or amended their national implementation measures, or to be in the process of doing so;
- 03 States Parties requested support for national legislation enforcing the provisions of the Convention domestically.

Compliance

- 00 States Parties found to be non-complaint by the 11MSP;
- 00 extension request was submitted in a timely manner.

III. Monitoring progress in the implementation of the Lausanne Action Plan**A. Guiding Principles**

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 1	<p>07 States Parties (SPs) that report having included Convention implementation activities in humanitarian response plans, peace promotion plans, development plans and/or poverty reduction strategies and other pertinent documents.</p> <p>16 SPs that report having enhanced national capacity or made national financial and/or other material commitments to the implementation of their outstanding obligations under the Convention.</p>
Action 2	<p>08 Affected SPs that report having adopted a comprehensive national strategy to fulfil implementation of obligations under the Convention.</p> <p>04 Affected SPs that report having developed annual work plans to implement their national strategy.</p>
Action 3	<p>23 Donor SPs that report providing financial or other support to affected SPs, including as part of partnerships.</p> <p>06 Donor SPs that report providing multi-year funding to affected SPs.</p>
Action 5	<p>09 Affected SPs that report having developed their national strategies and work plans in an inclusive manner, in particular by involving victims, including survivors, and affected communities.</p> <p>00 SPs including victims or their representatives in their delegations taking part in the Convention meetings.</p>

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 6	07 Affected SPs that report having adapted or updated their national standards to address new challenges and ensure the employment of best practices, taking into account the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS).
Action 7	11 Affected SPs that report having a sustainable national information management system (for clearance) in place.
Action 8	00 SPs that report having coordinated their activities relating to the implementation of the Convention with actions undertaken in relation with mine action, international humanitarian law, human rights law and environmental protection instruments that they are party to, and with peacebuilding and sustainable development activities, as relevant.
Action 9	75 SPs that pay their assessed contributions no later than three months before the Meeting of States Parties or Review Conference. 45 SPs that contribute to the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) budget.

1. Guiding Principles: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

4. Guiding principles are meant as cross-cutting best practices and a critical tool for the successful implementation of the Convention. They inform the various sections of the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP) and serve to reinforce its overall coherence and impact. A key concept in this regard is the demonstration of *national ownership* in implementing the Convention's obligations. National ownership has been defined by State Parties as, inter alia, "maintaining interest at high level in fulfilling Convention obligations; empowering and providing relevant state entities with the human financial and material capacity to carry out their obligations under the Convention; articulating the measures that State entities will undertake to implement relevant aspects of the Convention in the most inclusive, efficient and expedient manner possible, including plans to overcome any challenges; and making a regular significant national financial commitment to the State's programmes to implement the Convention".

5. In the past three years there has been a general increase in the number of State Parties reporting integration of implementation activities under the Convention through, amongst others, enhanced national capacity building, resource commitments to implement the Convention, comprehensive national strategies and annual work plans, and updated national standards according to the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), etc. However, this increase is not as noticeable among State Parties affected by cluster munitions. Similarly, State Parties reporting victims, have shown limited progress regarding inclusion of victims, survivors and affected communities among representatives in delegations at Convention meetings.

6. As obligations under operative articles of the Convention, notably sub-articles under 4.2 and 5.2, these are critical to putting an end to the harm caused by cluster munitions, in particular to those victims and communities affected.

7. Notwithstanding the evident increased attention this warrants in affected states, it is also critical to analyse how each State Party, in fulfilling its obligations under the Convention, is taking into consideration the provisions of Article 6 to collectively ensure that critical dividends of cooperation and assistance accrue and benefit those most affected. Increasing the effectiveness of the means and methodologies utilized under Article 6 calls for a joint evidence-based review of the practices within international cooperation and assistance. This would be undertaken by State Parties seeking and receiving assistance and those in a position to provide technical, material and financial assistance ensuring that the well-established mine action sector strives for innovation, synergies and efficiency at all times.

8. To date, no State Party has reported coordinating their Convention implementation with actions related to mine action, international humanitarian law, human rights law, environmental protection instruments, or with peacebuilding and sustainable development activities, all of which may present unidentified and untapped synergies and cost savings.

9. Instruments adopted by State Parties such as the Lausanne Political Declaration often go unnoticed in State Parties' reports and have little resonance beyond the disarmament community in attendance. Moreover, reporting exclusively focused on indicators as opposed to the actions undertaken risk reducing the impact of the LAP, case in point is action 11 of the LAP which embodies paragraph 9 of the Lausanne Political Declaration.

10. While the number of donor State Parties providing financial or other support to affected State Parties has remained consistent, there has been a decrease in those reporting multi-year funding to affected States during the period under review. On a related note, there is a lack of clarity as to how much of the actual mine action funding is allocated specifically for supporting cluster munition affected State Parties.

11. Similarly, the number of State Parties contributing financially to the operations of the ISU has remained steady, but there has been a concerning decline in the *level* of contributions from several States. The ISU's 2023 Annual Report illustrates how a substantial proportion of its budget relies on these contributions. This trend therefore poses a significant threat to the sustainability of the ISU's operations and, by extension, the effective implementation of the Convention.

12. Concretely, the reduction in contributions is placing substantial constraints on the ISU's ability to provide effective support for the implementation of the Convention. Key activities, such as organizing informal meetings of the Convention—which require room rentals, catering, and interpretation services—are becoming increasingly difficult to manage. Additionally, the ISU's capacity to support states at country/capital level, in joining and implementing the Convention is non-existent. Furthermore, ISU communication activities including production and distribution of promotional materials and publications, and maintenance and development of web-based resources among others, essential for raising awareness and promoting the Convention's goals, are also impacted.

13. Overall, this State Party trend of reduced engagement, integration and outreach, including funding, weakens the Convention as a humanitarian disarmament tool.

14. For the Convention to remain effective and for the ISU to continue its vital support role and effectively deliver on its mandate, it is thus imperative that State Parties ensure:

- Interest at high level in fulfilling Convention obligations;
- Empower and provide relevant state entities with the human financial and material capacity to carry out their obligations under the Convention;
- Articulate the measures its State entities will undertake to implement relevant aspects of the Convention in the most inclusive, efficient and expedient manner possible and plans to overcome any challenges that need to be addressed; and
- Make a regular significant national financial commitment to the State's programs to implement the Convention.

15. Addressing the issue of demonstrating national ownership by all State Parties is critical to maintaining a robust and responsive mechanism for the implementation of the Convention's humanitarian objectives.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties

16. How can States Parties improve on inclusive participation and ensure continued support for cluster munition victims, including survivors and affected communities?

17. (How can States Parties improve their efforts to synergize and coordinate activities related to the Convention on Cluster Munitions with mine action, international humanitarian law, human rights law, environmental protection, peacebuilding, and sustainable development efforts?)

18. (How can States Parties ensure sustainability, predictability and ownership in funding the Convention and its Implementation Support Unit to maintain a financially sound Convention and effective machinery?)

B. Gender Mainstreaming

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 4	06 States Parties whose national work plans and strategies integrate gender and the diversity of populations.
	05 States Parties where women presided over Convention engagement.
	17 Women contributing to the Coordination Committee.
	85 Women in State Party delegations attending Convention meetings: 85 out of 258.
	18 State Party delegations headed by women: 18 out of 69.

1. Gender Mainstreaming: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions:

19. Nine States Parties (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Japan, Lebanon, New Zealand, South Sudan, and the United Kingdom) provided information using Form J of the amended CCM reporting template.

20. Five States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Iraq, Lao PDR, and Mauritania) provided information on gender using other forms of the reporting template.

21. Four States (Afghanistan, Iraq, Lao PDR, and Lebanon) provided disaggregated information, including gender, in relation to risk education.

22. Four States Parties (Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and Mauritania) reported new victims, providing disaggregated information including on gender.

23. At the Second Review Conference (2RC), States Parties decided that the Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention would also act as the Gender Focal Points to provide advice on gender mainstreaming and ensure the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities are considered in implementing the LAP, in cooperation with other thematic Coordinators.

24. During the period under review, Belgium and Germany, serving as Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention/Gender Focal Points, followed a three-track approach: (1) intensify coordination with thematic Coordinators, (2) strengthen cooperation on gender and diverse needs with other disarmament conventions, especially the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC), and (3) initiate research on CCM gender issues with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and prepare a side event on CCM gender at the 12MSP.

25. On track 1, Belgium and Germany regularly coordinated with the other CCM Coordinators to ensure gender and diverse needs are considered in the LAP's implementation. They supported the Coordinator on Transparency Measures in implementing the Article 7 reporting template, participated in a workshop on gender and diversity reporting under the CCM co-hosted by Australia, Belgium, Germany, UNIDIR, and the ISU. On this occasion, particular effort was made to promote the new Form J of the Article 7 reporting template, adopted by the 11MSP.

26. On track 2, the Gender Focal Points focused on increasing synergies with counterparts from other disarmament conventions, particularly the APMBC. Highlights include:

27. A joint meeting on 15 February 2024, where discussions on preparing for gender and diverse needs in the new APMBC "Siem Reap Angkor Action Plan" provided valuable insights.

28. A discussion on 28 May 2024, invited by Ambassador Thomas Göbel of Germany, on structural and implementation issues relevant to both the CCM and APMBC.

29. Participation in the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) Gender Focal Point briefing on 8 April 2024, which introduced the Gender & Diversity in Mine Action Working Group and discussed planning and support from the GICHD Working Group.

30. On track 3, the Gender Focal Points initiated a research cooperation with UNIDIR on CCM gender issues, funded by the Federal Government of Germany. This ongoing project aims to evaluate progress on gender and diversity mainstreaming in the CCM and explore ways to further enhance these issues. The results will be presented at a side event during the 12MSP.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties:

- (a) How can States Parties ensure greater and more meaningful participation of women in meetings of the Convention?
- (b) How can States Parties better report on the gender mainstreaming provisions of the LAP? Currently the emphasis is on quantitative not qualitative shifts, as per measurement “indicator results in numbers”.
- (c) How can State Parties ensure that the implementation of the CCM benefits women and girls in concrete, tangible ways?

C. Universalization

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 10	01 New State Party to the Convention. 12 States not party took part in the Meeting of States Parties. 00 States not party submitted a voluntary Article 7 report.
Action 11	02 Confirmed cases of cluster munition use. 36 States not party voted in favour of the CCM UNGA resolution. 00 States not party that report having adopted moratoria on the use, development, production, stockpiling and transfer of cluster munitions or that report having destroyed their stockpiles of cluster munitions. 03 Dedicated meetings with States not party to the Convention, and which possess cluster munitions stocks.

1. Universalization: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

31. As of 30 June 2024, a total of 124 States have committed to the CCM by signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention. Of these, 112 are States Parties whilst 12 are Signatory States.

32. During the period under review, one State not Party (South Sudan) acceded to the Convention and became the 112th State Party. In accordance with Article 17(2), the Convention entered into force for South Sudan on 1 February 2024.

33. Twelve Signatory States have yet to ratify Convention: Angola, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cyprus, Djibouti, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, United Republic of Tanzania, and Uganda.

34. Five Signatory States participated at the 12MSP (Angola, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, and United Republic of Tanzania).

35. Twelve States not Party participated at the 12MSP (Argentina, Armenia, Cambodia, Finland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Thailand, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates, and Zimbabwe).

36. The CCM Resolution was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) on 4 December 2023 with 148 States voting in favour, of which 36 were States not Party (Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, People's Republic of China, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Yemen). This represented a significant advance in terms of the overall level of support for the resolution; 144 States voted in favour of the resolution in 2022, including 32 States not Party.

37. States Parties to the Convention are reminded that universalization is a joint responsibility of all states under the leadership of the Presidency and the coordination of thematic Coordinators. In this regard, Malawi and Peru, serving as Coordinators, have been working closely with the Presidency to set strategic directions and organize several activities aimed at promoting universalization.

38. In February 2024, Malawi and Peru held a meeting with the Deputy Permanent Representative of Lithuania following reports of the country's intention to withdraw from the Convention. The Coordinators urged Lithuania to reconsider, emphasizing the humanitarian consequences of such a decision. They recommended strong calls from States Parties to dissuade Lithuania from this course of action, particularly from their European peers.

39. In April 2024, the Universalization Coordinators organized a virtual meeting of the African Group in Geneva on the CCM. During this meeting, Coordinators urged member states that were Signatories and States not Party to consider joining the Convention.

40. Recognizing the crucial role of Parliamentarians in the ratification and implementation of the Convention, the Universalization Coordinators and the ISU met with the Secretariat of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) in April 2024. The objective was to establish a working relationship with the IPU and strategize on integrating Convention issues into IPU discussions. The Coordinators, in collaboration with the IPU and with assistance from the ISU, are currently planning activities for 2025 to focus on these efforts.

41. In April 2024, the Coordinators, in partnership with the ISU, the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC), and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), organized a briefing session for Signatories and States not Party from East Africa. The meeting addressed challenges preventing these states from joining the Convention and assured them of available support for their ratification and implementation efforts. South Sudan shared its experience with the accession process, providing valuable insights.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties:

- (a) How can Convention stakeholders identify and build on synergies among internal and external factors and trends to motivate States to join?
- (b) How can international cooperation and assistance, at regional and global level, be used and promoted to increase the membership of the Convention?
- (c) How can Convention stakeholders better engage with national authorities in charge of ratifications/ accessions?

D. Stockpile Destruction and Retention

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 12	03 States Parties (SPs) with outstanding Article 3 obligations have developed a destruction plan.

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
	04 SPs with outstanding Article 3 obligations reported on progress made.
Action 13	04 SPs having completed Article 3 obligations made an official declaration of compliance.
Action 14	00 SPs discovered previously unknown stockpiles and reported such findings through established channels.
Action 15	00 Article 3 extension requests – with detailed, costed multi-year work plans for the extension period.
Action 16	03 SPs provided information on their experience of the stockpile destruction process.
Action 17	10 SPs reported retaining or acquiring cluster munitions and/or explosive sub-munitions, and the quantity of cluster munitions and explosive sub-munitions retained, under Article 3.6. These measures are understood within the context of Article 3.6 as solely for the “development of and training in, cluster munition and explosive submunition detection, clearance or destruction techniques, or for the development of cluster munition counter-measures”.
	At least 41 retained cluster munitions (CMs) and 4,034 explosive submunitions (SMs) were destroyed by States Parties.

1. Stockpile Destruction and Retention: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

42. All 41 States Parties with Article 3 obligations under the Convention have declared compliance as of 31 December 2024.

43. Four States Parties with obligations remaining under Article 3 (Bulgaria, Peru, Slovakia, and South Africa) declared compliance during the period under review. Of those, three submitted updated 2023 annual reports on Article 3 implementation (Bulgaria, Peru, and South Africa), while one (Slovakia) has not submitted its 2023 annual report.

44. Two States Parties (Bulgaria and Slovakia) presented their declaration of compliance to the 11MSP, while two other States Parties (Peru and South Africa) submitted their declarations after the 11MSP.

45. Three States Parties (Bulgaria, Peru, and Slovakia) reported having received international cooperation and assistance in the destruction process. All three States also reported that the destruction techniques used were in compliance with national and international standards of safety and environmental protection.

46. Two States Parties (Bulgaria and Slovakia) reported having transferred their cluster munition stockpiles to other States Parties’ facilities to be destroyed.

47. All States Parties that have retained cluster munitions in accordance with Article 3.6 have submitted their 2023 annual reports (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland), with the exception of Cameroon.

48. Of the 11 States Parties that reported retaining cluster munitions in accordance with Article 3.6, seven (Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland) reported using retained cluster munitions in 2023, therefore reducing their stocks. One State Party (Belgium) confirmed having destroyed all its retained cluster munitions and explosive submunitions.

49. Three States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and Spain) did not report any decrease in their retained stocks during the reporting period.

50. During the reporting period, the Stockpile Destruction Coordinators, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Zambia, engaged in discussions with UNIDIR and the CMC to draft a working document for the 12MSP regarding retained cluster munitions for training purposes. Progress has been noted as States Parties have steadily reduced and, in several cases, completely destroyed cluster munitions originally retained for training. However, it was observed that more extensive discussions are needed on this issue, particularly because the focus thus far has been primarily on States Parties obligated to destroy stockpiles under Article 3. There is a recognized benefit to the Convention in facilitating broader discussions on retained cluster munitions.

51. Following consultations, the Coordinators concluded that the most effective way to initiate and draw attention to the issue of retained cluster munitions for training purposes would be to include it as a discussion item during the 12MSP. Accordingly, discussions at the upcoming 12MSP will centre on the current status of retained cluster munitions and propose effective strategies for their elimination, where possible.

52. Additionally, during the reporting period, the Coordinators collaborated with the Universalization and Reporting Coordinators to organize a virtual meeting with the African Group. The purpose of this meeting was to address States Parties' obligations under Article 7 Reporting of the Convention.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties

- (a) What have been the lessons learned by States Parties with current or completed Article 3 obligations? How can these lessons and experiences be shared?
- (b) What are/were the main barriers to completing Article 3 stockpile destruction obligations? What- if any -were the challenges to reporting on this progress?
- (c) How could States with Article 3 stockpile destruction obligations benefit from enhanced international dialogue and/or assistance?
- (d) How can States with obligations ensure that adequate political will and national ownership is in place to ensure successful implementation of obligations? How can the community of States Parties support this?

E. Survey and Clearance

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 18	09 Affected States Parties (SPs) reported completing an evidence-based and inclusive baseline survey. 10 Affected SPs reported marking hazardous areas under their jurisdiction.
Action 19	09 Affected SPs reported developing evidence-based national strategies and work plans. 09 Affected SPs reported detailed progress in implementing strategies and plans.
Action 20	02 SPs submitted Article 4 extension requests with detailed, costed work plans for the extension period.
Action 21	03 Affected SPs reported promoting research, application and sharing of innovative methodologies. 09 Affected SPs reported progress in the effectiveness and efficiency of surveys and clearance.

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 22	06 Affected SPs reported national strategies and work plans providing for the establishment of sustainable national capacity to address residual contamination.
Action 23	02 Affected SPs reported including humanitarian and sustainable development considerations in survey and clearance planning and prioritization, in line with the SDGs. 06 Affected SPs reported including gender and the diversity of populations in survey and clearance planning and prioritization.
Action 24	09 Affected SPs reported providing disaggregated information on remaining cluster munition contaminated areas and on progress in survey and clearance efforts.
Action 25	01 SP reported completing Article 4 obligations and submitted its voluntary declaration of compliance.
Action 26	03 SPs reported sharing experiences and lessons learned.

F. Risk Education

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 27	10 Affected SPs reported integrating risk education into strategies and work plans on survey, clearance and victim assistance.
Action 28	08 Affected SPs reported on tailor-made risk education activities in annual reports.
Action 29	06 Affected SPs provided detailed, disaggregated reporting focused on most at risk groups. 05 Affected SPs reported on measures to better understand impact of risk education, including in terms of behavioral change.
Action 30	07 Affected SPs reported on national strategies and work plans that include capacity to address residual contamination with a risk education component.

1. Clearance and Risk Education: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

53. A total of 18 States Parties have reported having obligations under Article 4. Eight States Parties have declared completion of their clearance of cluster munition contaminated land (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Grenada, Montenegro, Mozambique, Norway), two (Albania and Zambia) of which reported having done so before entry into force of the Convention.

54. Currently 10 States Parties have obligations under Article 4: Afghanistan, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan. During the period under review, one State Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina) announced completion of its obligations under Article 4.

55. The newest State Party (South Sudan) submitted its initial report in 2024, detailing its cluster munition contamination and clearance operations.

56. Eight States Parties with Article 4 obligations (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Iraq, Germany, Lao PDR, and Lebanon) submitted their 2023 annual report with

updates on Article 4 implementation. One State Party (Somalia) submitted its 2022 annual report with updates on Article 4 implementation, during the period under review.

57. Eight States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) reported on progress in clearing contaminated areas and releasing land.

58. Three States Parties (Chad, Germany, and Lao PDR) with clearance deadlines in 2024 and 2025, submitted extension requests to be considered at the 12MSP.

59. Two States Parties (Lebanon and Somalia) have reported they would not be able to complete their Article 4 obligations by their respective deadlines, and would submit extension requests to be considered at the 13MSP.

60. One State Party (Afghanistan) reported having submitted a proposal to a donor country that had pledged to fund the clearance of cluster munition sites. With the provision of this support, Afghanistan reported it would be able to comply with its obligations within the extended deadline in place.

61. One State Party (Chile) reported that one of four contaminated areas, (Punta Zenteno) had been cleared. The efforts are focused on securing new equipment with a plan to complete clearance at the “Barrancas” Military Premises. Allocation of financial resources was reported as the primary clearance challenge.

62. Eleven States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Iraq, Germany, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) with Article 4 obligations reported having allocated national resources to clearance operations.

63. Eight States Parties (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported on challenges faced in Article 4 implementation and requested international cooperation and assistance.

64. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) reported having received international cooperation and assistance to address their Article 4 obligations.

65. One country coalition (Lebanon) is currently in place to support Article 4 implementation, while another country coalition concluded (Bosnia and Herzegovina) as the affected State Party completed its Article 4 obligations.

66. Ten States Parties with Article 4 obligations (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having provided risk reduction education services.

67. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) provided disaggregated information on risk education by gender and age.

68. One State Party (Lebanon) reported that media, NGOs, and educational institutions actively inform and educate the public about the Convention.

69. Italy and Norway, in their role as Clearance and Risk Education Coordinators, chaired the ad hoc Analysis Group tasked with reviewing three Article 4 extension requests. In collaboration with the ISU, the Coordinators sought additional details from the concerned States Parties and engaged with in-country organizations to ensure high-quality extension requests, as well as their timely submission and consideration. The Analysis Group's work adhered to the established Methodology for Requests of Deadline Extensions under Articles 3 and 4 of the Convention (CCM/MSP/2019/12), ensuring fair and balanced consideration of each request.

70. Recognizing the critical role of Risk Education in cluster munition clearance activities, the Coordinators also drafted a dedicated Working Paper, which will be presented at the 12MSP.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties

- (a) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States with legacy contamination to finish their Article 4 obligations by their respective deadlines?
- (b) How can States Parties and other implementation actors assist in mobilizing funds required for affected states to eliminate the threat from cluster munitions and meet Convention obligations?
- (c) How can States benefit from technical assistance, specifically in preparing a detailed work plan before submitting extension requests? Would it be useful to have a guiding template for detailed, costed annual work plans?

G. Victim Assistance

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 31	09 States Parties (SPs) reported collecting and analyzing data disaggregated by gender, age and disability.
Action 32	04 SPs reported addressing needs of cluster munition victims in national policies and legal frameworks aligned to the SDGs & CRPD.
Action 33	08 SPs reported having a measurable national action plan in place. 12 SPs reported designating a national focal point for VA coordination.
Action 34	10 SPs reported providing emergency and continuing medical care to victims. 08 SPs reported having well-functioning rehabilitation, psychological and psychosocial services, which are accessible, age and gender-sensitive.
Action 35	09 SPs reported efforts to improve the socio-economic inclusion of cluster munition victims.
Action 36	09 States reported national laws and policies addressing victim assistance and developed with the inclusion of cluster munition victims. 00 SPs reported including cluster munition victims in their delegations.
Action 37	08 SPs reported supporting the training of victim assistance professionals. 12 SPs reported provision of victim assistance by qualified personnel.

1. Victim Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions

71. Currently, 12 States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Somalia, and South Sudan) are considered to have cluster munition victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control.

72. Ten States Parties with Article 5 obligations (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) have submitted their 2023 annual or initial report with updates on the thematic area. One State Party (Somalia) submitted its 2022 annual report with updates on Article 5 implementation during the period under review.

73. Twelve States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported

having made efforts to mobilize national and international resources for victim assistance. Ten States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) allocated national resources to victim assistance.

74. Four States Parties (Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and Mauritania) reported on new cluster munition victims, while five States Parties (Albania, Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, and Croatia) reported no new cluster munition victims during the period under review.

75. Five States Parties (Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) provided disaggregated information on victims by gender, age and type of accident during the reporting period.

76. The newest State Party (South Sudan) submitted its initial report, which included disaggregated information on victims. Additionally, the report provided detailed information on the assistance provided to victims and outlined the assistance required.

77. One State Party (Somalia) reported facing difficulties in collecting data on victims during the period under review and requested support for information management.

78. One State Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina) reported that its Coordination Body for assistance to victims of mines, cluster munitions, and explosive remnants of war, established in 2018, was inactive in 2023 due to its expired mandate and a lack of quorum. The body is expected to resume its work in 2024.

79. One State Party (Iraq) reported that a national standard for victim assistance had been developed & endorsed.

80. Two of the 12 States Parties with Article 5 obligations (Lebanon and South Sudan) reported not having yet ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

81. During the period under review, Panama and Austria, as current Coordinators, focused on enhancing the implementation of victim assistance obligations under the Convention and increasing the exchange of information on good practices.

82. Building on previous efforts, the Coordinators continued to collaborate with other relevant disarmament conventions to improve coordination on victim assistance issues. In 2024, they participated in a retreat organized by the Committee on Victim Assistance of the APMBC, alongside the Victim Assistance Coordinators of Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), and the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance of both the CCM and APMBC. This retreat served as a platform to share plans and objectives, discuss respective priorities, and identify opportunities for cooperation. The shared goal is to assist and empower victims and persons with disabilities and promote synergistic approaches to victim assistance.

83. The Coordinators also contributed to and supported a Joint Statement by the Victim Assistance Coordinators of the Conventions at the Fourth Meeting of the World Health Organization (WHO) Standing Committee on Health Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response, held on 17 and 18 April 2024. The statement emphasized the need to integrate victim assistance into access to first aid, healthcare, rehabilitation and assistive technology, mental health and psychosocial support. It also called for the meaningful inclusion and participation of survivors and persons with disabilities in discussions related to health policies and programs and encouraged stronger cooperation between victim assistance efforts in these Conventions and the WHO.

84. The Coordinators recognized the need to update the Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance, developed in 2016, to align it with the Lausanne Action Plan and the new IMAS 13.10 focused on victim assistance. To advance these efforts, they convened with Humanity and Inclusion (HI) to discuss the structure and drafting timeline of the document. This updated document will aim to strengthen national implementation mechanisms by clarifying the roles and responsibilities of national authorities involved in providing victim assistance.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties

- (a) What obstacles prevent States from developing national disability action plans and national action plans on victim assistance?
- (b) How can states enhance their efforts with respect to the collection and analysis of disaggregated data on gender, age and disability?
- (c) What can States do to better understand the different role and responsibilities of national authorities in supporting victim assistance?
- (d) How can cooperation and assistance and sharing of good practices help ensure the establishment of sustainable and integrated victim assistance frameworks?
- (e) What mechanisms/actions can help strengthen involvement, inclusion and meaningful participation of victims in policy and decision-making processes on issues that concern them?
- (f) How can States strengthen their efforts to provide mental health and psychosocial support for victims?

H. International Cooperation and Assistance

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 38	18 States Parties (SPs) committed national resources towards meeting Convention obligations. 00 SPs Reported leveraging alternative and/or innovative sources of financing.
Action 39	00 SPs reported sharing best practices/lessons learned through cooperation frameworks. 36 SPs reported engaging in diverse types of reciprocal cooperation.
Action 40	35 SPs reported providing or receiving assistance and mobilized resources to support other SPs in implement the CCM.
Action 41	02 SPs reported developing coherent and comprehensive national plans to strengthen national ownership, enhance national capacity, and incorporate SDG goals in assistance requests. 11 SPs reported seeking support for providing updates on progress made, challenges faced and requirements for implementation assistance.
Action 42	02 SPs reported taking advantage of the country coalition mechanism.

1. International Cooperation and Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions

85. During the period under review, 23 States Parties (Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom) reported having provided assistance to affected States Parties.

- 3 States (Australia, Ireland, and Italy) specifically reported having provided assistance for Article 3 implementation;
- 20 States (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands,

New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom) reported providing assistance for Article 4 implementation;

- 12 States (Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland) reported providing assistance for Article 5 implementation.

86. Six States Parties (Australia, Canada, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, and United Kingdom) reported providing multi-year funding to affected States Parties.

87. One State Party (Canada) specifically reported allocating funds to support CCM universalization.

88.

89. Thirteen States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Peru, Slovakia, Somalia and South Sudan) reported having received assistance from other States Parties and/or organizations.

90. Three affected States (Bulgaria, Peru, and Slovakia) reported having received assistance for Article 3 implementation. Two of these (Bulgaria and Slovakia) presented their declaration of compliance to the 11MSP, while Peru submitted its declaration after the 11MSP (as did South Africa).

91. Of the nine affected States (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Somalia, and South Sudan) requesting assistance for Article 4 implementation, only five (Afghanistan, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) reported having received assistance. Chad and Somalia reported receiving other support, however not for Article 4 implementation.

92. One State Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina), which declared compliance with its Article 4 obligation on 31 August 2023, also reported receiving assistance to implement Article 4.

93. Currently there is one country coalition in place (Lebanon) to support Article 4 implementation, while another has been concluded (Bosnia and Herzegovina) after the State Party met its Article 4 obligations.

94. Similarly, eleven affected States (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Somalia, and South Sudan) requested assistance for Article 5 implementation, whereas only seven affected States (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported receiving assistance for Article 5 implementation.

95. One State Party (Croatia) which did not request assistance also reported to have received assistance to implement Article 5.

96. Eighteen States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Peru, Slovakia, Somalia, and South Sudan) with Article 3, 4 and/or 5 obligations reported having allocated national resources to fulfill these obligations.

97. One new State Party (South Sudan), in its initial report, requested support for clearance and risk education, including the training of national authorities, securing additional financial resources, and developing a legal framework for mine action. For victim assistance, it requested support in identifying and documenting cluster munition survivors, developing strategies for securing resources, supporting survivors' sustainability projects, and enacting disability legislation to facilitate the implementation of Article 5.

98. The International Cooperation and Assistance Coordinators were also part of the ad hoc Article 4 Analysis Group in evaluating the three extension requests that were submitted during the period under review.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties

- (a) What are some specific means identified in which States Parties can provide cooperation and assistance under the Convention?

- (b) What measures can be taken to enhance the implementation of partnerships under the Convention, including Country Coalitions and complementary finance measures?
- (c) How can information sharing on needs and capacity to provide assistance under the Convention be improved? How can Article 7 reporting reinforce this?

I. Transparency Measures

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 43	41 States Parties (SPs) submitted an initial and annual Article 7 report as of 30 April.
Action 44	24 SPs with Article 3 and 4 obligations, or which retain cluster munitions under Article 3.6, submitted Article 7 transparency reports in the last two years.
Action 45	24 SPs have instituted the adapted Article 7 reporting form following its adoption at the 11MSP.
Action 46	02 SPs have sought and received assistance in the preparation or compilation of Article 7 reports.

1. Transparency Measures: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

99. As of 30 June 2024, 51 out of the 103 expected annual Article 7 transparency reports for the calendar year 2023 have been submitted.

100. Two States Parties (Nigeria and South Sudan) submitted their initial reports during the period under review.

101. Thirty-nine States Parties (Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Cuba, Germany, Holy See, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Mauritius, Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom) submitted their annual reports by the due date of 30 April 2024. One State Party (South Africa) submitted its annual report as a complementary report to its Article 3 voluntary declaration of compliance in September 2023.

102. Twelve States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Denmark, France, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Portugal, Slovakia, and State of Palestine) submitted their 2023 annual reports after the 30 April 2024 deadline.

103. Twenty-four States Parties (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Senegal, South Sudan, Slovakia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) used the revised Article 7 reporting form to submit their annual or initial reports, following its adoption at the 11MSP.

104. During the period under review, 16 States Parties (Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Costa Rica, Denmark, Gambia, Guyana, Holy See, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, and Tunisia) submitted their overdue 2022 and other previous years' annual reports. Five States Parties submitted multi-year reports (Antigua and Barbuda, Costa Rica, Lesotho, Senegal, and Sri Lanka).

105. As of 30 June 2024, 105 of 112 States Parties had submitted their initial transparency reports.

106. Seven States Parties have yet to submit long overdue initial reports: Cabo Verde (2011), Comoros (2011), Togo (2013), Congo (2015), Guinea (2015), Rwanda (2016), and Madagascar (2018).

107. During the period under review, Australia, the Transparency Measures Coordinator, fulfilled its mandate by undertaking several actions. These included conducting outreach to the seven States Parties with overdue initial reports, sending individual letters to the Permanent Missions of these countries in Geneva and New York, and collaborating with the ISU on a reminder communication to all States Parties about the annual Article 7 reporting submission deadline.

108. Furthermore, on 30 May, Australia, together with Belgium and Germany as the Gender Focal Points of the Convention, and event co-sponsors, the ISU and UNIDIR, co-hosted a hybrid workshop on gender and diversity reporting under the CCM. The purpose of the workshop was to take stock of progress in gender and diversity reporting under Article 7 of the CCM and to raise awareness of the adapted reporting template adopted by the 11MSP, which included the introduction of a new Form J on Gender and Diversity of Populations. The workshop featured a panel of experts from State Parties, the GICHD, Norwegian People's Aid, and Mine Action Review. It provided an interactive platform for discussing the opportunities and challenges faced by States Parties in collecting relevant data and facilitated the exchange of good practices in this area. Close to 50 representatives from States Parties, national mine action authorities, mine clearance operators and non-governmental organisations participated both online and in-person.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the 12MSP

- (a) What mechanisms can States Parties establish to support timely submission of initial and annual transparency reports?
- (b) What actions or measures can be taken to support the universal uptake by States Parties of the revised Article 7 reporting form, incorporating actions laid out in the LAP?

J. National Implementation Measures

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator results in numbers</i>
Action 47	<p>65 States Parties (SPs) reported having adopted all national measures (Since the entry into force of the Convention) of these 32 States parties have reported that they have adopted national legislation regarding the convention (Since the entry into force of the Convention) and 33 consider existing law to be sufficient (Since the entry into force of the Convention)</p> <p>22 SPs reported having disseminated CCM obligations to all relevant national institutions particularly the armed forces.</p>
Action 48	<p>07 SPs reported challenges faced in the revision/adoption of national legislation.</p> <p>04 SPs requested assistance in the revision/adoption of national legislation from SPs in a position to do so.</p>

1. National Implementation Measures: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions

109. During the period under review, 10 States Parties reported having strengthened or amended national implementation measures:

110. One State Party (Mexico) reported that its existing law was deemed sufficient to implement the Convention.

111. Four States Parties (Gambia, Malawi, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Somalia) reported progress in drafting legislation to implement the Convention domestically.

112. One State Party (Afghanistan) reported amending an existing regulation, to specify the function of its National Mine Action Authority and incorporate this within the broader National Disaster Management Authority.

113. One State Party (Chile) reported having prepared administrative documents for the clearance of cluster munition remnants in a specific region.

114. Two States Parties (Croatia and South Sudan) reported adopting new National Mine Action Strategies.

115. One State Party (Colombia) reported adoption of new legislation on national peace.

116. Two States Parties (Nigeria and South Sudan) reported a need for national legislation enforcing the provisions of the Convention domestically. Both States requested support to do so. An additional two States Parties (Senegal and Seychelles) responded to a survey indicating a need for similar assistance.

117. During the period under review, 12 States Parties (Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, France, Iraq, Lao PDR, Peru, Spain, and Switzerland) reported having disseminated their CCM obligations to all relevant national institutions. Ten other States Parties (Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroon, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ireland, Republic of Moldova, Norway, and Sweden) previously reported doing so. To date, 22 States Parties have reported disseminating CCM obligations at national level.

118. The Coordinator, Iraq, has continued to promote existing implementation tools, including the model legislations, and has engaged with numerous States Parties to better understand the challenges affecting their progress. These meetings have underscored the critical role of domestic measures in upholding the principles of the CCM.

119. In collaboration with the ISU, Iraq circulated a letter encouraging States Parties to fulfil their obligations under Article 9, particularly those with legislation under consideration, in the process of being adopted, or lacking updates. The letter highlighted useful resources, including model legislations developed by the ICRC, the CMC, and New Zealand, to support States Parties in meeting their obligations.

120. Additionally, in March 2024, the Coordinator with the support of the ICRC and the ISU distributed a survey to States Parties that have not yet fulfilled their Article 9 obligations. The survey aims to assess and track the efforts of States Parties in implementing the Convention and to enable the ISU to provide advice to SPs on how to better tailor technical assistance in this regard. To date, several responses have been received, which will guide the Coordinator's future work. These responses will provide valuable insights, ensuring continuity and effectiveness in ongoing and future efforts.

121. The ISU continued to regularly update the table on the Convention website highlighting the status of the national legislation of those States Parties with specific implementation laws on the CCM, including the prohibition of investments in cluster munitions.

122. In this regard, 12 State parties have declared that they have enacted national legislation prohibiting investments in all producers of cluster munitions and their crucial components (since the entry into force of the Convention).

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the 12MSP

- (a) What more can be done to increase overall compliance by States with Article 9, in keeping with Action 47 of the LAP and considering the current uptake (65 of 112 SPs)?
- (b) How can States Parties and Signatory States be assisted to identify specific supports and tools needed to effectively implement the Convention, and how we ensure these supports are provided?
- (c) What role can investment prohibitions play in making a practical contribution to the Convention's goals? What tools can States Parties deploy in this regard?

K. Compliance

<i>LAP Action No.</i>	<i>Indicator Results In Numbers</i>
Action 49	00 - States Parties found in non-compliance with the Convention by the Meeting of States Parties or the Review Conference.
Action 50	00 - States Parties submitted extension requests in a timely manner.

123. No State Party was found to be non-compliant by the 11MSP held from 11 to 14 September 2023.

124. However, of the three States Parties that submitted extension requests to be considered at the 12MSP, none of them submitted more than nine months prior to the meeting as stipulated in Articles 3 and 4 of the Convention and highlighted in the Guidelines for Article 3 and Article 4 Extension Requests approved by the 8MSP (CCM/MSP/2018/WP.1 and CCM/MSP/2018/WP.2, respectively).