
Convention on Cluster Munitions

21 September 2016

Original: English

Sixth Meeting of States Parties

Geneva, 5–7 September 2016

Item 8 of the revised provisional agenda

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

Geneva Progress Report — monitoring progress in implementing the Dubrovnik Action Plan

Submitted by the President of the Sixth 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 (1RC) in 2015 to the Second Review Conference scheduled for 2020. This report specifically focuses on the progress made since the 1RC until 30 June 2016.

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 Sixth Meeting of States Parties 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 publically available information, including States Parties' initial and annual transparency reports due annually on 30 April and information provided by international and civil society organizations. The Report was finalized on 30 June 2016 therefore any changes that may have occurred after that date are not reflected in this Report and will be reported on in the next Progress Report.

II. Report Summary

Universalization:

- (a) Four new States parties bring total to 100;

GE.16-16302(E)



* 1 6 1 6 3 0 2 *

Please recycle



- (b) Challenge remains to meet the 2020 target of 130 States Parties.

Stockpile Destruction:

- (a) Three States parties completed destruction of stockpiles ahead of their Convention deadlines;
- (b) Ten States parties remain with obligations under Article 3;
- (c) Stockpile destruction is proceeding well though reporting on the objective of developing a resourced plan still has to be met by 8 out of the 10 States.

Clearance:

- (a) Eight out of twelve States parties provided information concerning the size and/or location of contaminated areas in their article 7 reports, on measures taken to prevent civilian access to contaminated areas and on the use of survey in their programmes and standards of operations;
- (b) Three States Parties reported to have released land;
- (c) Information on Action 3.4 which requires States parties to report on the inclusion of affected communities in the development and implementation of national clearance plans, the mainstreaming gender and age sensitiveness in the development of the response remains lacking.

Victim Assistance:

- (a) Of the 13 States parties reported to have obligations under Article 5, 10 States report to have designated a national focal point;
- (b) Eight of the thirteen have developed a national plan while five States report to have integrated their victim assistance efforts into the broader disability sector;
- (c) Seven States parties reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making process.

International Cooperation and Assistance:

- (a) Nine States parties requested assistance in their 2015 Annual Report, 14 reported to have provided assistance to affected States and four to have received assistance;
- (b) Eleven States parties reported allocating national resources to implement the CCM;
- (c) Twenty-three States parties in their 2015 Article 7 Reports either requested for or informed to have provided assistance.

Transparency Measures:

- (a) Forty-four States parties submitted their 2015 reports;
- (b) Twenty-three States are yet to submit their 2015 Article 7 Reports;
- (c) Eight States parties submitted initial transparency reports;
- (d) Eighteen States parties still need to submit overdue initial transparency report;
- (e) Seven States parties have submission dates that are not yet due.

National Implementation Measures:

(a) Three States parties adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the CCM, bringing to 25 the total number of States parties that have done so;

(b) Two States parties provided information in their initial reports on implementation of new legislation;

(c) Five States parties reported to be in the process of developing legislation while there is lack of clarity on progress from 44 States parties.

III. Progress Report for the period 12 September 2015 to 30 June 2016

A. Universalization

Table 1

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Universalization</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
An increased number of States parties to the Convention (130 at least)	Increase adherence with the Convention	Four countries have become State parties
A decreased number of reported alleged and confirmed instances of use		Current total of 100 States Parties Nineteen Signatory States Thirty States to go to reach the DAP 2020 objective of 130 States Seventy-four UN Member States still to adhere to the CCM Slowdown in universalization rate
	Promote the universalization	Coordinators held bilateral meetings with 16 States
	Reinforce the norms being established by the Convention	One informal meeting organized Four statements were issued by the Presidency

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Sixth 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, four States have become parties to the CCM: Somalia (30 September 2015); Mauritius (1 October 2015); Cuba (6 April 2016); and Palau (19 April 2016). At the time of this Report, the Convention had not entered into force for Cuba and Palau. As of 30 June 2016, a total of 119 States have joined the CCM by signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention. Of these, 100 are States parties whilst 19 are signatory States.

4. After a rapid rate of ratifications and accessions in the first years of the CCM, the universalization rate saw a slow-down between the former reporting period (12 new States) and the current one (four new States) though the new members spanned from the Caribbean to the Pacific Region. Furthermore, in line with Action 1.1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan another 30 States should join the CCM by the Second Review Conference, thereby reaching the objective of 130 States parties. Additionally, 74 Member States of the United Nations are neither signatories nor parties to the Convention.

5. Since last reported, two signatory States (Somalia and Palau) have ratified the CCM. This means that over five years after entry into force, 19 signatory States have yet to ratify the CCM. These States are: Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, São Tomé and Príncipe, Tanzania, Uganda.

6. Universalization and outreach actions included bilateral meetings with signatory States and States not Party convened by the Presidency and the Coordinators on universalization throughout the period of their mandate. Bilateral meetings were held to encourage States to join the Convention and when requested provided further information to facilitate solutions to potential obstacles and challenges faced by signatory and non-signatory States in the process of ratification/accession. In this regard, Coordinators on universalization met with representatives of 16 States: Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Indonesia, Madagascar, Namibia, Uganda, Serbia, South Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, the United States of America, Venezuela and Yemen. The Coordinators were also working in collaboration with the African Union on the hosting of an Africa Regional workshop aimed at providing an opportunity for signatory and non-signatory States in Africa to discuss challenges and possible solutions to joining the CCM to be held in August 2016.

7. The Presidency sent out letters to 53 states that are not yet party with a request to join the Convention. The Presidency also planned demarches in 32 States.

8. Since the First Review Conference, a number of efforts have been made to reinforce the norm established by the Convention and to place it high on the agenda, among them, the submission of a Pledge by the Presidency to condemn any use of cluster munitions by any actor during the World Humanitarian Summit held in Istanbul on 23-24 May 2016. The Presidency also co-organized, with the Cluster Munition Coalition, an informal meeting on universalization and strengthening of the norms against the use of Cluster Munitions on 17 May 2016 with a group of States and partner organizations. The meeting aimed at discussing how to advance the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan in regard to stigmatization and universalization as well as to provide recommendations based on best practices.

9. In the period covered by this report, there has been confirmed use of cluster munitions in two States not party to the CCM (Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen). Four statements were issued by the Croat and Dutch Presidencies expressing concern over continued use or alleged use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen.

B. Stockpile destruction and retention

Table 2

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>		<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Stockpile Destruction</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>	
An increased number of States parties that finished stockpile destruction	Develop a resourced plan		Four States parties reported having a destruction plan or a plan in process
Increased levels of reporting on matters pertaining to Article 3 implementation, including information on the amount and planned use of sub-munitions retained			Three States parties reported applying standards related to safety and environment
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency			Six States parties provided information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction
			One State party requested international assistance and cooperation under Article 3
	Increase exchanges of promising practices		One State reported receiving support from an INGO
	Apply an appropriate approach to retention		Five States declared having retained cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention
	Announce declaration of compliance on stockpile destruction		Three States announced compliance with Article 3
	Act upon unexpected developments		There were no reports of newly discovered stockpiles

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Sixth 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 to ensure that the amount of explosive sub-munitions retained or acquired 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

10. Since entry into force of the CCM, a total of 39 States parties have reported to have obligations under Article 3. Of these, 29 have declared completion of their stockpile destruction or indicated the destruction of their stocks before the ratification of the CCM.

11. There are, therefore, 10 States parties with current obligations under Article 3 (Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain and Switzerland). Out of these, only 5 provided information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction (Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland).

12. During the reporting period, three States parties (France, Germany and Italy) announced compliance with obligations under Article 3 either through their Article 7 or public media reports. Italy announced completion of its stockpiles destruction five years ahead of the date set by Article 3 (March 2020) while Germany announced that the destruction of its stockpile had been completed on 25 November 2015 also ahead of its 2018 treaty deadline. Similarly, France announced on 30 June 2016 that it had destroyed its entire stockpile of cluster munitions which is two years ahead of schedule.

13. Four states have become States parties to the CCM since the Review Conference (Cuba, Mauritius, Palau and Somalia). According to the Cluster Munition Coalition, Cuba, which became a State party in April 2016, possesses a stockpile of cluster munitions, although Cuba has not confirmed this. It is hoped that Cuba will report on its stockpile in its initial transparency report due on 30 March 2017. Two other States (Palau and Mauritius) who also became State parties during this reporting period have declared not having stockpiles of cluster munitions whilst the fourth new State party (Somalia) is not known to have stockpiled cluster munitions.

14. In line with Action 2.1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan, among States parties with remaining stockpile destruction obligations, five States parties (Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland) have reported that a destruction plan is in place or that a process of developing concrete implementation plans is underway.

15. In addition, three States (Croatia, Spain and Switzerland) reported that they would ensure that the plan is in compliance with international standards in terms of safety and protection of the environment. Furthermore, these States parties have provided updated information on the expected completion date of destruction under Article 3 and should therefore be in compliance with the Article 3 obligation, before 2018. Slovakia also reported that it will meet its Article 3 deadline in 2023.

16. Through their 2015 annual transparency report, six States (Croatia, Germany, Italy, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland) have 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).

17. One State (Cameroon) submitted two reports during the period under review; its initial report and its 2014 annual report that cover the period of 2013 and 2014 respectively.

It reported having retained some cluster munitions which were going to be used only for the purposes permitted by the Convention.

18. Among States parties with remaining obligations under Article 3, five States (Botswana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Peru and South Africa) have not provided any additional information either through outstanding initial or annual Article 7 reports.

C. Clearance and Risk Reduction Education

Table 3

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Clearance and risk reduction education</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
A decreased number of new victims, with the aim of zero	Assess the extent of the problem	Twelve States parties are subjected to obligations under Article 4
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.	Eight States parties provided information concerning the size and/or location of contaminated areas in their article 7 reports
Better targeting of scarce clearance resources		Three States parties reported to have released land during the reporting period
Larger freedom and safer movement	Protect people from harm	Eight States parties reported in their Article 7 report on measures taken to prevent civilian access to contaminated areas
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Develop a resourced plan (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	Eight States parties reported on the use of survey in their programmes and standards of operations
	Be inclusive when developing the response	No update was provided during the report period
	Manage information for analysis, decision-making and reporting	Seven States parties provided information on the type of cluster munition found in contaminated areas

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Clearance and risk reduction education</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	Nine States parties requested international assistance and cooperation for clearance
	Apply practice development	One State party reported working closely with an INGO and exchange good practises
	Promote and expand cooperation	Eleven donor States parties reported having supported clearance activities

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Sixth 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

19. In order to meet the goals set out in the Dubrovnik Action Plan of "a decreased number of new victims, with the aim of zero, increased amounts of suspected land released for subsistence, cultural, social and commercial purposes, and larger freedom and safer movement", States have taken actions implementing the Action 3.1. of the Dubrovnik Action Plan "assessing the extent of the problem" which requires affected States parties subject to obligations under Article 4 to 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.

20. Twelve States parties have reported or been reported to be contaminated by cluster munition remnants and therefore have obligations under Article 4 (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique and Somalia).

21. Nine States parties out of eleven States parties with obligation to report in 2015 have submitted their 2015 Article 7 report (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, and Mozambique).

22. Seven States parties have provided information on the type of cluster munitions found in contaminated areas.

23. Eight States parties have provided information concerning the size and/or location of contaminated areas. In addition, under the reporting period three States parties have reported to have released land (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Lebanon).

24. Moreover, eight States parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, and Mozambique) reported that measures have been taken to provide risk reduction education and/or to prevent civilian access to areas contaminated by cluster munitions remnants.

25. Nine States parties requested international assistance for clearance (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and Palau), whilst 11 donor States reported having supported clearance.

26. In line with Action 3.4, none of the States parties with obligation under Article 4 have provided information on the inclusion of affected communities in the development and implementation of national clearance plans, the mainstreaming gender and age sensitiveness in the development of the response.

27. On 20 April, the Presidency met with representatives of clearance operators to discuss ideas and options for accelerating clearance operations in the field.

28. In their capacity as Coordinators for Clearance and Risk Reduction Education, and in order to meet the goals set out in the Dubrovnik Action Plan on amongst other, "increased exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency", Norway and Bosnia Herzegovina have taken the following steps:

(a) Related to Action 3.7. on applying practice development, the Coordinators have through the fall of 2015 and spring of 2016 held discussions with key operators on challenges in methods and technologies, and ways in which States can support the work to reach the goals set forth by the Convention. The Coordinators' focus has been on the critical importance of adequate survey practices and standards, as good survey practices are a precondition for effective implementation of Article 4 of the Convention. Through the last years' increased focus on clearance of cluster munitions, operators have gained more insights on how best to undertake surveys and identify actual contamination. States parties have responded to this progress in operational methodologies, by clarifying the obligations contained in the Convention with regards to survey, clearance and the end-state. There is however more to be done. There are still examples of overestimations of suspected hazardous areas, resulting in a systematic waste of expensive clearance resources.

(b) Related to Action 3.8. on promoting and expanding cooperation, the Coordinators are considering holding workshops targeting specific country situations. The workshops would convene local government actors, operators and donors in a specific context to discuss experiences and opportunities, in proximity to the field.

D. Victim Assistance

Table 4

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Victim Assistance</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
An improvement in the quality and quantity of assistance provided to persons with disabilities	Strengthen national capacity (a) Designating a focal point within the government to coordinate victim assistance	(a) the end of 2016 Ten States parties have reported to have designated a national focal point
Strengthened respect for human rights to all persons	(b) Develop a national disability action plan or	Under the reporting

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Victim Assistance</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective practices	develop a national action plan on victim assistance	period, there was no new information provided as to the designation of focal points
Increased involvement of victims in consultations and policy-making and decisions making processes on issues that concern them		(b) the end of 2018 Eight States parties reported to have developed a national plan
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		Five affected States reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector
Increased demonstration of results achieved and/or expected results in Article 7 transparency reports		Two donor States reported victim assistance was integrated in their overseas development assistance policies
	Increase the involvement of victims	Seven States parties reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making process
	Share information	Twenty-three States parties shared information about their activities in relation to victim assistance in their 2015 Article 7 report One Workshop on <i>An integrated approach to Victim Assistance</i> was organized across Conventions
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	Five States parties requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance Twelve States parties indicated that they provided cooperation and assistance in the area of victim assistance

1. Questions for discussion at the Sixth 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

29. To date, thirteen States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Guinea Bissau, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Somalia) and three Signatories (Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda) have reported or have been reported to have cluster munition victims in areas under its jurisdiction or control, giving rise to obligations under Article 5 of the Convention. In addition, sixteen States not party (Cambodia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Israel, Kuwait, Libya, Russian Federation, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Viet Nam and Yemen) and three territories (Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara) are reported to have cluster munitions victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control.

30. The Coordinators on Victim Assistance noted the following from annual transparency reports under Article 7 of the Convention submitted for 2015:

- (a) Three States Parties (Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon) reported accidents giving rise to new cluster munition victims;
- (b) Five States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lebanon and Mozambique) reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector;
- (c) Two States Parties (Denmark, Netherlands) reported that victim assistance was integrated in their overseas development assistance policies;
- (d) Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Chad, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania and Mozambique) reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes on victim assistance;
- (e) Twenty three States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Iraq, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Mauritania, Mozambique, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Spain, Switzerland, Zambia) shared information about their activities in relation to victim assistance in their Article 7 reports;
- (f) Five States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique) requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance; and

(g) Twelve States Parties (Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland) reported that they provided cooperation and assistance in the area of victim assistance.

31. In the period under consideration, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance focused first on the implementation of time-bound commitments in the DAP - that is, those commitments requiring specific outcomes by a given time before the next Review Conference.

32. There are two specific, time-bound commitments that States Parties with obligations under Article 5 of the Convention make under the DAP, both under Action 4.1 of the Plan on strengthening national capacity.

33. Under Action 4.1 in para 32(a), States Parties with cluster munitions victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control commit to designating a focal point within the government to coordinate victim assistance (if they have not yet done so), as required by Article 5, paragraph 2, by the end of 2016.

34. With the assistance of the ISU, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance identified five States Parties with obligations under Article 5 which were yet to inform the ISU of the designation of a victim assistance focal point (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone and Somalia). In February 2016, the Coordinators wrote to each of those States Parties to remind them of their commitment under the DAP to designate a victim assistance focal point by the end of 2016, and to request an update of their progress towards implementing this commitment. The Coordinators did not receive a response from any of the States Parties.

35. Under Action 4.1 in para 32(c), States parties with cluster munitions victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control commit to develop a national disability action plan as soon as possible, or develop a national action plan on victim assistance, as required by Article 5, paragraph 2, by no later than the end of 2018.

36. With the assistance of the ISU, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance identified five States Parties believed to have obligations under Article 5 which were yet to inform the ISU of the development of a national disability action plan or a national action plan on victim assistance (Colombia, Iraq, Montenegro, Sierra Leone and Somalia). In February 2016, the Coordinators wrote to each of those States Parties to remind them of their commitment under the DAP to develop a national disability action plan as possible, or develop a national action plan on victim assistance, by the end of 2018, and to request an update of their progress towards implementing this commitment. The Coordinators did not receive a response from any of the States Parties.

37. In the period under consideration, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance also focused on assisting States Parties in the implementation of their commitments in Article 5 of the Convention, and paras 32 (c) and (d) under Action 4.1 of the DAP, to integrate victim assistance into national laws, policies and plans.

38. In collaboration with the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance, and with technical support from Handicap International, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance launched an initiative to develop Guidance for States on integrating victim assistance into national laws, policies and plans. In line with the principle that the needs of victims are similar regardless of the cause, the Coordinators aim for this Guidance to be applicable under other disarmament conventions including commitments on victim assistance, namely the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

39. Under this initiative, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and Cooperation and Assistance collected input on national experiences in implementing an integrated approach

to victim assistance through a questionnaire sent in March 2016 to a select group of 21 affected and 19 donor states, and at a workshop on 18 May 2016 to which this same group of states was invited. Participating states included States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, as well as the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The workshop also included representatives of victims and a range of international and non-state organisations.

40. From the input received in response to the questionnaires and at the workshop, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and Cooperation and Assistance have distilled a range of best practices and recommendations on effective implementation of an integrated approach and incorporated these into a draft Guidance document, which has been circulated to States Parties for comment. States Parties are invited to provide input on the draft Guidance during the discussion under the Agenda item on Victim Assistance at the Meeting of States Parties. On the basis of comments received, and broader consultations, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and Cooperation and Assistance aim to finalise and issue the Guidance later in 2016.

41. In the period under consideration, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance have also worked to improve coordination on issues of victim assistance with other disarmament conventions including commitments on victim assistance, namely the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

42. On 18 February, at their instigation, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and Cooperation and Assistance met with the Committee on Victim Assistance under the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Coordinators on Victim Assistance under Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. The representatives of the three conventions shared information on their priority areas of action on victim assistance in 2016. The Coordinators on Victim Assistance and Cooperation and Assistance discussed with the representatives of the other conventions their plans regarding the production of Guidance for states on the integrated approach to victim assistance.

E. International Cooperation and Assistance

Table 5

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>International Cooperation and Assistance</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
A decrease in the number of new victims and a better quality of life for victims	Strengthen partnerships at all levels	One workshop in collaboration with Coordinators on Victim Assistance on <i>An integrated approach to victim assistance</i>
An increased number of States parties that finish stockpile destruction in advance of their eight-year deadlines	Communicate challenges and seek assistance	Nine States parties requested assistance in their 2015 annual report.
A better targeting of scarce resources		Fourteen States parties reported on the provision of assistance to affected States.
Increased technical and material assistance, transfer of skills and good practices		Four affected States parties reported on
Increased and improved reporting on challenges and		

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>International Cooperation and Assistance</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
needs for assistance		assistance received from other States Parties.
An increase of multi-year partnerships for cooperation including multi-year funding arrangements	Evidence based needs for better results	Three States parties requested assistance in institutional capacity-building.
An increase in the exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance and stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Take ownership	Twelve States reported allocating national resources to implement the CCM.
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	Respond constructively to request for assistance	States providing assistance did not specify if support had been provided based on specific request submitted.
	Make use of existing tools, cost efficiency and effectiveness	Twenty-three States in their 2015 Article 7 Reports either requested for or informed to have provided assistance
	Support implementation support	ISU supported the Coordinators and individual States upon request.

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

- (a) How can States parties ensure that international assistance and cooperation efforts are linked to actual needs, national plans and priorities and facilitate long term planning?
- (b) How can all actors work together in building national capacities, strengthening national ownership and encouraging the use of most efficient methodologies?
- (c) How do States parties make use of available channels of information within the Convention to make their needs more clearly known?

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

43. Out of 12 States Parties that have reported or been reported to be affected by cluster munitions (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique and Somalia), nine States parties have requested international cooperation and assistance through their 2015 annual transparency report (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and Iraq).

44. Nine States parties requested assistance to fulfil obligations under clearance; one with regards to stockpile destruction (Croatia); five for victim assistance (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania and Mozambique); and five for risk reduction education (Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mauritania). Three States parties also requested assistance in other areas such as data collection and institutional capacity-building (Afghanistan, Mauritania and Bosnia and Herzegovina).

45. In its 2015 voluntary Report, Palau requested financial assistance for capacity building in documenting, reporting and monitoring victim data as well as in survey, mapping and clearance.

46. Out of nine States parties that have requested assistance in their 2015 annual report, four provided information on international cooperation and assistance provided by other States parties and/or civil society (Chad, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Mozambique).

47. In their 2015 annual report, 14 States parties recounted that they provided assistance to affected States (Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). In this regard, 11 donor States reported that they had provided support for clearance activities while 9 had given support to victim assistance and 6 to risk reduction education.

48. During the period under review, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance and the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance held a workshop on an *Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance in the context of Development, Human Rights and Humanitarian Initiatives*. The workshop provided an opportunity for States to share views on national examples of good practices and challenges in implementing an integrated approach to victim assistance. The input from States at the workshop, together with the responses to the questionnaires, will be used to prepare a guidance document on this approach that will be issued "by States for States" later this year by the CCM Coordinators.

49. During the reporting period, in performing the mandate, the Coordinators on matters pertaining to International Cooperation and Assistance sent 17 letters to traditional donor States and organizations requesting them to provide information on their priorities so as to enhance partnerships between States parties in need of assistance and those States in a position to provide the required assistance.

50. During the reporting period, the Coordinators used both formal and informal meetings to promote cooperation and assistance between States parties. As such, Coordinators held bilateral meetings with a number of affected States parties and civil society.

F. Transparency Measures

Table 6

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>Transparency Measures</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
An increase in the rate of submissions of transparency reports provided under Article 7	Report in time, initially and annually	Seventy-five States parties have submitted initial transparency reports
Improved quality in reporting		Eighteen States parties

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	
	<i>Transparency Measures</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective reporting practices		have overdue initial transparency reports
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		Forty-four States parties have submitted their 2015 annual report Twenty-three States parties still have to submit 2015 annual report
	Make practical use of reporting	Nine States parties have requested assistance through their 2015 annual report.

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Sixth 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

51. 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.

52. Since entry into force of the CCM, three signatory States (Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Palau) have submitted voluntary transparency reports. Two of these (Canada and Palau) have become States parties during the period under review.

53. During the reporting period, eight State parties (Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Mali, Panama, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Slovakia) submitted their initial transparency reports while three States (Guyana, State of Palestine, and South Africa) have missed the due date for submission of their respective initial transparency report.

54. In line with the requirements under Article 7, seventy-five of the ninety-three States parties with current reporting obligations have submitted their initial Article 7 transparency report, leaving eighteen States parties with overdue initial transparency reports. Furthermore, seven new States parties have their initial Report submission dates falling due after 30 June 2016 (Colombia, Cuba, Iceland, Mauritius, Palau, Rwanda and Somalia).

55. A total of 18 States parties have still to submit their initial transparency reports:

(a) Six States parties missed their submission deadline in 2011: Niger; Fiji; Comoros; Tunisia; Cape Verde; and Guinea-Bissau;

(b) Two States missed their submission deadline in 2012: Cook Islands and Dominican Republic;

(c) Two States missed their submission deadline in 2013: Honduras and Togo;

(d) Two States missed their submission deadline in 2014: Nauru and Bolivia;

(e) Five states missed their submission deadline in 2015: Congo, Guinea; Belize; Guyana; State of Palestine;

(f) One State missed its submission deadline in 2016: South Africa.

56. A total of 23 States were overdue with the submission of the 2015 annual report: Andorra, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, El Salvador, France, Grenada, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Monaco, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

57. Therefore, out of 93 States parties that should have submitted initial or annual Article 7 transparency report by 30 April 2016, only 51 complied while 42 were yet to submit either an initial or annual report.

58. During the reporting period, in performing its mandate, the Coordinator on matters pertaining to Transparency Reporting sent 45 letters to States parties that had overdue submissions of initial transparency or 2014 annual reports. Of these, 6 out of 23 States parties that had overdue initial reports submitted their reports (Cameroon, Chad, Mali, Panama, Paraguay and Saint Kitts and Nevis) whilst another 8 out of 22 States parties that had overdue 2014 annual reports complied with the obligation (Antigua and Barbuda, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ghana, Lebanon, Monaco, Nicaragua and Samoa).

59. Out of 12 States Parties affected by cluster munitions, 9 States have requested international cooperation and assistance through their 2015 annual transparency report. These States are Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Iraq, Lebanon, Mauritania and Mozambique. In its 2015 voluntary Report, Palau requested financial assistance for capacity building in document, reporting and monitoring victim data as well as in survey, mapping and clearance.

60. Nine States parties requested assistance to fulfil obligations under clearance; one with regards to stockpile destruction and five for victim assistance. Seven States parties also requested assistance in other areas such as risk reduction education, data collection and institutional capacity-building.

61. By 30 June 2016, forty-four States parties had submitted their 2015 annual transparency report.

G. National Implementation Measures

Table 7

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>National Implementation Measures</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</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	Three States parties adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the CCM.
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		Two States provided initial reports on implementation of new legislation Five States informed that they are developing legislation to implement

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
	<i>National Implementation Measures</i>	<i>The Second Review Conference</i>
reflection, where necessary in military doctrine, policies and training		the CCM
	Highlight challenges and request assistance	One workshop on strengthening the implementation of the CCM.
	Raise awareness of national implementation measures	One workshop on strengthening the implementation of the CCM. Bilateral and regional outreach.

1. Questions/Challenges for discussion at the Sixth 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

62. 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".

63. In the absence of inter-sessional meeting States parties have been encouraged to submit written updates on their national implementation measures, particularly through the timely submission of Article 7 transparency reports. There has continued to be a focus on the adoption of national legislative and regulatory measures to ensure implementation of the CCM, both for existing States parties and for those looking to ratify or accede to the Convention in the future.

64. 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. New Zealand hosted a workshop in Geneva on 17 May 2016 to gather new ideas for strengthening implementation of the CCM and will circulate to all States parties and Signatory States, a summary of the proposals made at that meeting. New Zealand has worked closely with the Implementation Support Unit and the Coordinators for Universalisation to prepare for a regional workshop to be held in Africa in August 2016.

65. New Zealand has also been working closely with a number of States parties to identify best practices for the dissemination of national obligations under the Convention, including with respect to the reflection of such obligations in military doctrine, policies and training.

66. In their 2015 transparency reports, three States parties (Bulgaria, Croatia and Lao People's Democratic Republic) have adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the CCM, bringing to a total of 25 the number of States Parties that have done so. A further 28 States consider their existing legislation to be sufficient, a figure unchanged over the current reporting period.

67. Out of the forty-four States that have provided Article 7 reports for calendar year 2015, five States informed that they are developing legislation relating to the Convention's implementation (Afghanistan, Lebanon, Swaziland, Mozambique and Zambia).

68. During the reporting period two States parties (Saint Kitts and Nevis and Slovakia) provided in their initial report information about the implementation of new legislation, relating to the Convention's implementation.

69. Of the ten States parties that have joined the Convention in 2015, one (Palau) reported ahead of its reporting deadlines that existing legislation regarding the prohibition of the use, production and transfer of cluster munitions is already in place.
