

Convention on Cluster Munitions

23 September 2014

Original: English

Fifth Meeting of States Parties San José, 2-5 September 2014

Final document

I. Introduction

1. Article 11 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions provides that the States parties shall meet regularly in order to consider and, where necessary, take decisions in respect of any matter with regard to the application or implementation of the Convention, including:

- (a) The operation and status of the Convention;
- (b) Matters arising from the reports submitted under the provisions of the Convention;
- (c) International cooperation and assistance in accordance with article 6 of the Convention;
- (d) The development of technologies to clear cluster munition remnants;
- (e) Submissions of States parties under articles 8 and 10 of the Convention;
- (f) Submissions of States parties as provided for in articles 3 and 4 of the Convention.

2. Article 11 also provides that the Meetings of States Parties shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations annually until the First Review Conference.

3. Article 11 further provides that States not party to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and relevant non-governmental organizations, may be invited to attend the Meetings of States Parties as observers in accordance with the agreed rules of procedure.

4. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 11 of the Convention, the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention decided to designate the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica as President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, assisted by the Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, and also decided to hold the Fifth



Meeting of States Parties from 2 to 5 September 2014 in San José (CCM/MSP/2013/6, para. 38). The Fourth Meeting considered the financial arrangements for the Fifth Meeting and recommended them for adoption by the Fifth Meeting (Ibid., para. 39).

5. Accordingly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations convened the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention and invited all States parties, as well as States not party to the Convention, to participate in the Meeting.

II. Organization of the Fifth Meeting

6. The Fifth Meeting of States Parties was held in San José from 2 to 5 September 2014.

7. The following States parties to the Convention participated in the work of the Meeting: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Montenegro, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia.

8. The following States, which had ratified or acceded to the Convention, but for which it was not yet in force, participated in the work of the Meeting: Belize and Congo.

9. The following States signatories to the Convention participated in the work of the Meeting as observers: Angola, Benin, Canada, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Jamaica, Madagascar, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

10. Argentina, Armenia, Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Finland, Gabon, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, the State of Palestine, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen also participated in the work of the Meeting as observers.

11. The United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Mine Action Service, the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights participated in the work of the Meeting as observers, pursuant to rule 1 (2) of the rules of procedure (CCM/MSP/2014/3).

12. The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Cluster Munition Coalition also participated in the work of the Meeting as observers, pursuant to rule 1 (2) of the rules of procedure.

13. The Organization of American States took part in the work of the Meeting as an observer, pursuant to rule 1 (3) of the rules of procedure.

III. Work of the Fifth Meeting

14. On 2 September 2014, the Fifth Meeting of States Parties was opened by the Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Encyla Sinjela, on behalf of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zambia and President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention, Harry Kalaba. This was preceded by an opening ceremony in San José on 1 September 2014, which was hosted by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, Manuel A. González Sanz, and attended by the President of Costa Rica, Luis Guillermo Solís Rivera.

15. The Meeting held seven plenary meetings. At its first plenary meeting, on 2 September 2014, the Meeting elected by acclamation Mr. González as President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention. The President was assisted by the Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Christian Guillermet Fernandez.

16. At the same meeting, Croatia, Lebanon, Norway and Zambia were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the Meeting.

17. Also at that meeting, Silvia Mercogliano of the Office for Disarmament Affairs in Geneva was confirmed as Secretary-General of the Meeting.

18. At the same meeting, the Meeting adopted its agenda, as contained in document CCM/MSP/2014/1, and the programme of work, as contained in document CCM/MSP/2014/2. The Meeting also adopted the financial arrangements for the Meeting, as recommended by the Fourth Meeting of States Parties and contained in document CCM/MSP/2013/4 and Corr.1, and confirmed the rules of procedure, as contained in document CCM/MSP/2014/3.

19. At the same meeting, messages were delivered by the Director of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, Virginia Gamba, on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the head of the regional delegation for Mexico, Central America and Cuba of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Juan Pedro Schaerer, and the Director of the Cluster Munition Coalition, Sarah Blakemore.

20. The Fifth Meeting of States Parties considered documents CCM/MSP/2014/1-6, CCM/MSP/2014/WP.1-3 and CCM/MSP/2014/L.1 and Rev.1 and 2 (see annex III).

IV. Decisions and recommendations

21. At the Fifth Meeting, States Parties expressed their strong concern regarding recent incidents and evidence of use of cluster munitions in different parts of the world. They condemned all use of cluster munitions that defies the international norm established by the Convention, which is an essential part of ensuring that civilians will no longer suffer the consequences of such weapons and moving closer to a world free of cluster munitions.

22. The Meeting was encouraged by the progress made in the implementation of the Vientiane Action Plan and warmly welcomed the San José progress report (annex I).

23. Emphasizing the importance of universalization, the Meeting warmly welcomed the accession of Belize and Saint Kitts and Nevis to the Convention on

Cluster Munitions and its ratification by the Congo. The Meeting noted that the accession of Belize to the Convention made Central America the first cluster munitions-free region in the world. The Meeting welcomed the interest expressed by States not party to the Convention to join in the near future and reiterated its call to all States that had not yet done so to consider ratifying or otherwise acceding to the Convention as a matter of priority.

24. Reiterating the importance of clearance and destruction of cluster munition remnants located in cluster munition-contaminated areas under a State's jurisdiction or control, the Meeting warmly welcomed the working papers submitted by Mauritania and Norway, entitled "Declaration of compliance with article 4.1 (a) of the Convention on Cluster Munitions" (CCM/MSP/2014/WP.3 and CCM/MSP/2014/WP.2, respectively).

25. Recalling the decision taken at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to establish an Implementation Support Unit for the Convention on Cluster Munitions and welcoming the steps taken to this effect by the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, the Meeting expressed its appreciation to the President of the Fourth Meeting for its efforts and welcomed the conclusion of an agreement with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining on the hosting of the Unit, as contained in document CCM/MSP/2014/INF/1.

26. The Meeting also noted with appreciation the steps taken by the President of the Fourth Meeting in the recruitment of the Director of the Implementation Support Unit and took note of the vacancy notice issued for the recruitment, as well as the composition of the selection panel, which comprised five States Parties, namely Costa Rica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, the Netherlands and Zambia. The Meeting then decided to request the President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, assisted by the selection panel, to finalize as soon as possible, preferably by March 2015, in a transparent way and in consultation with the coordinators, as well as taking into account the views of all States parties, the recruitment process for the Director of the Implementation Support Unit. The secretarial functions currently being provided by the interim Implementation Support Unit, based in the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery of the United Nations Development Programme, shall be handed over to the Director of the Implementation Support Unit for the Convention on the first day of the First Review Conference.

27. The Meeting noted that it was not possible at this stage for the States parties to agree on a funding model for an Implementation Support Unit. With a view to taking a final decision on this matter at the First Review Conference, the Meeting agreed to task the Co-Chairs for General Status and Operations with conducting consultations with States parties in order to come up with a draft compromise proposal on the funding model, to be included in the agenda of the preparatory process for the Review Conference. The Meeting agreed that a compromise proposal should be based on the principles of sustainability, predictability and ownership.

28. The Meeting warmly welcomed the initiative of the President to submit a President's summary of the Meeting (annex II).

29. At its last plenary meeting, on 5 September 2014, the Meeting decided to convene a two-day informal intersessional meeting in Geneva on 1 and 2 June 2015. The Meeting decided that the informal intersessional meeting should be held in English, French and Spanish and supported through voluntary funding.

30. At the same meeting, the Meeting decided to convene two meetings, in preparation for the First Review Conference, of half a day each in Geneva on 5 February and 3 June 2015.

31. Also at that meeting, the Meeting welcomed new coordinators who would work with sitting coordinators to guide the intersessional work programme, as follows:

Working Group on the General Status and Operation of the Convention: Lebanon (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with the Netherlands

Working Group on Universalization: Ecuador (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with Norway

Working Group on Victim Assistance: Australia (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with Mexico

Working Group on Clearance and Risk Reduction: Bosnia and Herzegovina (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with Switzerland

Working Group on Stockpile Destruction and Retention: France (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with Albania

Working Group on Cooperation and Assistance: Austria (from the Fifth to the Sixth Meetings of the States Parties) working with Chile

32. At the same meeting, the States parties welcomed the continued work of the working group Chairs, as follows:

Reporting: Belgium (until the First Review Conference)

National Implementation Measures: New Zealand (until the First Review Conference)

33. Also at that meeting, the Meeting decided to designate Croatia as President of the First Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and also decided to hold the Conference from 7 to 11 September 2015 in Dubrovnik, Croatia.

34. The Meeting considered and adopted the financial arrangements for the First Review Conference and its Preparatory Committees, as contained in documents CCM/MSP/2014/4/Rev.1 and CCM/MSP/2014/5.

35. At the same meeting, the Fifth Meeting of States Parties adopted its final document, contained in a conference room paper, as amended.

Annex I

San José progress report*

Monitoring progress in implementing the Vientiane Action Plan up until the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

Submitted by the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties

1. The present report provides an aggregate analysis of trends and figures in the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, operationalized in the Vientiane Action Plan, from the entry into force of the Convention on 1 August 2010 up to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, to be held in San José in September 2014. A special emphasis is placed on progress made since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, held in Lusaka in September 2013. The reporting period is from 29 June 2013¹ to 20 July 2014.

2. This progress report is intended to serve as informal documentation of the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions and to facilitate discussions at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties by monitoring progress and identifying key questions to be addressed. It does not replace any formal reporting. Nor does it provide a complete overview of all progress made in implementing the 66 action points of the Vientiane Action Plan. The list of challenges and questions to be discussed is not meant to be exhaustive.

3. The content of the report is based upon publicly available information, including States parties' initial and annual transparency reports, due annually on 30 April, and statements made during the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in Lusaka in September 2013, the intersessional meeting in Geneva in April 2014, and other open sources such as statements at informal meetings, press releases by States and information provided by international and civil society organizations.

4. The San José progress report is submitted to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties by Zambia as President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties. All thematic coordinators have been invited to provide additional information based on their own consultations and analysis.

5. When referring to States parties, signatories or States not parties, these terms are used explicitly; otherwise the term "States" is used for referring to States parties, signatories and States not parties in general. The Convention on Cluster Munitions has not yet entered into force for some of the States mentioned that have ratified the Convention, but they are still referred to as States parties in the present document.

* The present progress report was welcomed by the Fifth Meeting of States Parties at its final plenary meeting, on 5 September 2014. After the conclusion of the Fifth Meeting, an addendum to the progress report (CCM/MSP/2014/WP.1/Add.1), containing amendments suggested by Belgium, Canada, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the Cluster Munition Coalition and the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat, was issued. Any other update provided by States and organizations at the Fifth Meeting with reference to actions undertaken in the implementation of the Vientiane Action Plan after 20 July 2014 will be reflected in the progress report to be submitted to the First Review Conference in 2015.

¹ Day after the submission of the Lusaka progress report.

In general, the report does not distinguish between the information from statements given during the intersessional meetings, meetings of States parties, or the initial and annual transparency reports.

6. The present report was finalized on 20 July 2014. Changes that have occurred after that date are not reflected in it.

I. General trends

Universalization

7. As at 20 July 2014, the Convention on Cluster Munitions had 84 States parties and 108 signatories. Since the last reporting period, one State has acceded to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. More than half of the States Members of the United Nations have joined the ban on all use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster munitions, less than six years after the opening for signature. As a result of this rapid rate of ratifications and accessions in the first years of the Convention, the further universalization process has reached a plateau, bringing about a slowdown in the number of new States parties during the reporting period.

8. Since the entry into force of the Convention, there has been confirmed use and alleged use of cluster munitions in five States not parties, three of which saw cluster munitions used in the reporting period. While these allegations and instances of use are of great concern, the difficulties in establishing those responsible for the use in each case are an indication of the strength of the stigmatization of cluster munitions, even among States not parties.

Stockpile destruction

9. Since the entry into force of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, 33 States parties have reported to have obligations under article 3 of the Convention, of which 19 have declared completion of their stockpile destruction obligations. Three States parties have done so in the reporting period. There are thus 14 States parties with current obligations under article 3. In addition, the Cluster Munition Monitor 2013 states that six signatories and 48 States not parties have stockpiles of cluster munitions.

Clearance

10. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 16 States parties have reported to be contaminated by cluster munitions and therefore have obligations under article 4, of which five have declared completion of their clearance obligations. In addition, two signatories have reported or have been reported contaminated by cluster munitions. In 2013, the Cluster Munition Monitor reported that a total of 26 States and three territories were contaminated by cluster munition remnants.

Victim assistance

11. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 12 States parties and three signatories have reported or have been reported to have obligations under article 5. In 2013, the Cluster Munition Monitor suggested that 31 States and three territories had cluster munitions casualties and thus have responsibilities for cluster munition victims.

International cooperation and assistance

12. Since the entry into force of the Convention, six States parties and one signatory have requested cooperation and assistance to fulfil obligations under stockpile destruction, nine States parties have sought assistance for activities under clearance and/or risk reduction, and nine States parties and two signatories have expressed need for support in undertaking victim assistance. Twenty-five States have reported that they have provided funding for international cooperation and assistance since the entry into force of the Convention.

Transparency

13. Eighty-three States parties have had initial or annual article 7 transparency reporting deadlines in the period since the entry into force of the Convention to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties. Three additional States have submitted initial reports on a voluntary basis. From 2012 to 2014, the delivery rate of annual article 7 transparency reports continuously decreased, from 72 per cent in 2012 to 50 per cent in 2014.

National implementation measures

14. A total of 23 States parties have adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, while 14 States parties consider their existing legislation to be sufficient, and 3 States parties consider that no specific legislation is required. Eighteen States parties and two signatories are in the process of adopting legislation. Two States parties are undertaking reviews of their national legislation to ensure compliance with article 9 of the Convention.

Partnerships

15. Since the entry into force of the Convention, States, United Nations agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), civil society, including the Cluster Munition Coalition, survivors and their representative organizations, as well as other relevant stakeholders, have cooperated formally and informally at the national, regional and international levels on a broad range of implementation issues.

Questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

16. How can these partnerships further evolve to promote the universalization and full and effective implementation of the Convention, as well as strengthen the norm against the use of cluster munitions?

17. How to enhance the involvement and inclusion of civil society and other organizations in the work of the Convention?

II. Universalization²

Scope

18. As at 20 July 2014, the Convention on Cluster Munitions had 84³ States parties and 108 signatories. Since the last reporting period, one State⁴ has acceded to the Convention. More than half of the States Members of the United Nations have joined the ban on all use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster munitions, less than six years after the opening for signature. As a result of this rapid rate of ratifications and accessions in the first years of the Convention, the further universalization process has reached a plateau, bringing about a slowdown in the number of new States parties³ during the reporting period.²

19. Since the entry into force of the Convention, there has been confirmed use and alleged use of cluster munitions in five States not parties,⁵ three⁶ of which saw cluster munitions used in the reporting period. While these instances of use are of great concern, the difficulties in establishing those responsible for the use in each case are an indication of the strength of the stigmatization of cluster munitions, even among States not parties.

Progress

20. Since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, one State⁴ has acceded to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Nevertheless, universalization and outreach actions in line with the Vientiane Action Plan have resulted in continued interest by signatories and States not parties in formally joining the Convention. Six States⁷ have indicated that ratification/accession is imminent. With the support of the United Nations, ICRC, the Cluster Munition Coalition and other organizations, a variety of actions have been undertaken since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties. These include three Geneva-based workshops adapted linguistically, gathering representatives of Permanent Missions of African French-speaking countries, African English-speaking countries and Arabic-speaking countries convened under

² Annex II, “Graphs outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas — Universalization”.

³ See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas — Universalization”.

⁴ Saint Kitts and Nevis (13 September 2013).

⁵ Cambodia (in 2011), Libya (in 2011), Syrian Arab Republic (in 2012, 2013 and 2014), South Sudan (in 2014) and alleged use in Ukraine (in 2014).

⁶ South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic and Ukraine.

⁷ Colombia, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Jamaica, South Africa and United Republic of Tanzania.

the chairmanship of the Coordinators on universalization and with the support of the Coordinator on national implementation measures as well as a regional universalization workshop for Latin American and Caribbean States which took place in Santiago in December 2013.

21. Actions also include bilateral meetings with signatories and observers convened by the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties throughout the period of his Presidency. In line with its theme of “Universalization of the Convention”, the Presidency engaged 21 countries at international forums and visited several countries⁸ to encourage them to join the Convention. The actions undertaken by the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties included bilateral meetings on the sidelines of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Colombo in November 2013; bilateral meetings with Ministers for Foreign Affairs of several African countries on the sidelines of the Summit of Heads of State of the African Union in Addis Ababa in January 2014 and bilateral meetings with Foreign Ministers on the sidelines of the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa Heads of State Summit in Kinshasa. The subject of cluster munitions, particularly universalization, was for the first time included in the agenda of the African Union Heads of State Summit in Addis Ababa in January 2014. In addition, the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties reports that he undertook a country visit to the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to consult with his counterpart on the Convention and to promote universalization of the Convention in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Region.

22. In line with **Action #2**, 46 States parties,⁹ 13 signatories,¹⁰ seven observers,¹¹ as well as the European Union, the African Union and the Caribbean Community, have reiterated their support for the Convention on Cluster Munitions and have promoted adherence to the Convention as soon as possible in official statements delivered at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties as well as at the intersessional meeting to the Convention.¹²

23. At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, its President submitted a paper entitled “Universalization of the Convention” (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.3), and Ghana, together with Portugal, submitted the paper entitled “Universalization of the Convention” (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.6), which both reiterated the call to all States that have not yet done so to consider ratifying or otherwise acceding to the Convention on Cluster Munitions as a matter of priority. United Nations agencies, ICRC and the Cluster Munition Coalition reported at the Fourth Meeting of States

⁸ Mauritius, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

⁹ Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Holy See, Honduras, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Swaziland, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia.

¹⁰ Angola, Benin, Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa and United Republic of Tanzania.

¹¹ Cambodia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Mongolia, the State of Palestine, Thailand and Viet Nam.

¹² During the opening ceremony, the session on general exchange of views and the session on universalization.

Parties and at the 2014 intersessional meeting numerous and diverse actions to promote the universalization of the Convention, including through legal advice and advocacy efforts.

24. Outreach activities in line with **Action #7** have enabled the participation of signatories and observer States to the Convention on Cluster Munitions in formal and informal meetings of the Convention. Eighteen signatories and 30 observers participated in the Fourth Meeting of States Parties and 14 signatories and 18 observers participated in the 2014 intersessional meeting. Four States parties¹³ provided funding for the sponsorship programme for the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, while one State party¹⁴ provided funding for the 2014 intersessional meeting. Sponsorship enabled the participation of 15 signatories¹⁵ and 16 observers¹⁶ at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties and of 4 signatories¹⁷ and 1 observer¹⁸ at the 2014 intersessional meeting.

25. The norm against the use of cluster munitions has continued to strengthen throughout the reporting period. To date, 151¹⁹ States, including both States parties and States not yet parties to the Convention, have condemned or otherwise expressed concern with the ongoing and widespread use of cluster munitions in the Syrian Arab Republic that commenced in July 2012. Further, five of them²⁰ have been vocal in condemning the use of, or expressing concern with, cluster munitions in South Sudan that occurred in late 2013 or early in 2014.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

26. The challenges and questions raised at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties remain the same, namely:

(a) The promotion of ratification or accession to the Convention on Cluster Munitions by States contaminated by cluster munitions, in possession of stockpiles or producers of cluster munitions, and/or with responsibility for many survivors;

(b) To continue to promote and reinforce the norm against all use and to end the use of cluster munitions by States not parties, including the implementation of obligations under article 1 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions without exceptions.

¹³ Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway.

¹⁴ Norway.

¹⁵ Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

¹⁶ Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

¹⁷ Democratic Republic of the Congo, Madagascar, Somalia and South Africa.

¹⁸ Cambodia.

¹⁹ Available from www.stopclustermunitions.org/en-gb/cluster-bombs/use-of-cluster-bombs/cluster-munition-use-in-syria.aspx.

²⁰ Cambodia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Zambia.

27. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

(a) How can regional approaches be utilized to increase the rate of accession and ratification of the Convention on Cluster Munitions?

(b) How can international cooperation and assistance be used and promoted to increase the membership of the Convention on Cluster Munitions?

(c) How can States parties undertake activities to fulfil obligations under article 21 to promote universalization of the Convention on Cluster Munitions?

(d) How can States parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, individually, as a community and represented by the President, best respond to allegations of use by States not parties to the Convention?

(e) How can States parties work in partnership with civil society and other organizations to advance universalization of the treaty and reinforce the norm not to use cluster munitions under any circumstances and by any actor, as well as to investigate and report back on allegations of use?

III. Stockpile destruction and retention

Scope

28. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 33 States parties²¹ have reported to have obligations under article 3 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, of which 19²² have declared completion of their stockpile destruction obligations. Three States parties²³ have done so in the reporting period. There are thus 14 States parties²⁴ with current obligations under article 3. In addition, the Cluster Munition Monitor 2013 states that six signatories²⁵ and 48 States not parties²⁶ have stockpiles of cluster munitions.

²¹ See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Stockpile destruction and retention”.

²² Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Czech Republic, Côte d’Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Mauritania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

²³ Denmark, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

²⁴ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

²⁵ Angola, Canada, Guinea, Indonesia, Nigeria and South Africa.

²⁶ Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Libya, Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zimbabwe.

Progress

29. In the 2014 article 7 transparency reports, 11 States parties²⁷ provided an update on the total number of cluster munitions stockpiled. One State party²⁸ confirmed at the intersessional meeting in April 2014 that it had no stockpiles of cluster munitions. One signatory²⁹ confirmed possession of cluster munitions in a statement to the Fourth Meeting of States Parties and provided updated information on the destruction of its stockpile, which was well under way.

30. Eight States parties³⁰ reported on the status and progress in separating all cluster munitions under their jurisdiction and control from other munitions retained for operational use and in marking them for the purpose of destruction.

31. Ten States parties³¹ reported on the status and progress of destruction programmes and nine States parties³² reported on the types and quantities of cluster munitions destroyed in accordance with article 3. All these States parties, as well as one other,³³ reported on the methods of destruction used.

32. Eight States parties³⁴ have provided information on the safety and environmental standards observed. One of them³⁵ indicated that recycling of materials was maximized where possible.

33. Eight States parties³⁶ provided information on the type of cluster munitions retained in accordance with article 3.6 of the Convention, with a majority of them indicating retention for training purposes.

34. Five States parties³⁷ reported on the technical characteristics of each cluster munition produced, owned and/or possessed, and one State party³⁸ reported on the status and progress of programmes for the decommissioning of production facilities.

35. The Cluster Munition Monitor³⁹ reports that, as a result of efforts to implement the Convention on Cluster Munitions, a total of 130 million submunitions had been destroyed as at April 2014 with 19 States parties having declared completion of article 3 obligations. That constitutes 73 per cent of the stockpiles declared by States parties. Most States parties with obligations to destroy stockpiles have indicated that they will finish the destruction of all stockpiles well

²⁷ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

²⁸ Burundi.

²⁹ Canada.

³⁰ Botswana, Croatia, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden and Switzerland.

³¹ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, France, Japan, Spain, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

³² Croatia, Denmark, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

³³ Spain.

³⁴ Croatia, Germany, France, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

³⁵ Croatia.

³⁶ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, France, Spain and Switzerland.

³⁷ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Denmark and Switzerland.

³⁸ Croatia.

³⁹ Available from www.the-monitor.org/cmm/2013/pdf/2013%20Cluster%20Munition%20Monitor.pdf, p. 26.

in advance of their deadline. Moreover, stockpile destruction has proven much less costly and complicated to undertake than was previously anticipated.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

36. As stated in the Lusaka progress report, the main challenge is to ensure the continued momentum for rapid destruction of stockpiles, and to utilize provisions for international cooperation and assistance to that end (CCM/MSP/2013/6, annex I, para. 35).

37. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

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

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

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

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

IV. Clearance

Scope⁴⁰

38. Eleven States parties⁴¹ have reported to be contaminated by cluster munitions and therefore have obligations under article 4. In addition, two signatories⁴² have reported or have been reported to be contaminated by cluster munitions.

39. In 2013, the Cluster Munition Monitor reported that a total of 26 States⁴³ and three territories⁴⁴ were contaminated by cluster munition remnants.

⁴⁰ Annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Clearance and risk reduction”.

⁴¹ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Mozambique.

⁴² Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia.

⁴³ Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia (South Ossetia), Germany, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Montenegro, Norway, Russian Federation (Chechnya), Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Viet Nam and Yemen.

⁴⁴ Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara.

40. Since the First Meeting of States Parties, three papers have been submitted by States to the Meeting of States Parties with the aim of supporting States parties' compliance with their obligations under article 4.⁴⁵

Progress

41. One State party⁴⁶ announced at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties that it had completed its clearance and that it was taking the necessary administrative steps to make a formal declaration of compliance with obligations under article 4. One additional State party⁴⁷ announced at the 2014 intersessional meeting that it had cleared all areas suspected or known to be contaminated by cluster munitions and that a formal declaration of compliance would be submitted to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties in accordance with article 4.1 (c) of the Convention. That will bring the number of States parties that have completed their obligation under article 4 to five.⁴⁸ In addition, one signatory State affected by cluster munitions⁴⁹ has provided an update on the contamination in the voluntary report submitted in 2014.

42. Based on the information provided in the 2014 article 7 transparency reports, five States parties⁵⁰ and one signatory⁵¹ reported on measures taken to prevent civilian access to areas contaminated by cluster munitions, primarily by marking those areas in line with **Action #11**. One State party⁵² indicated that there was no specific warning needed as the contaminated area was not accessible to the population.

43. Nine States parties⁵³ and one signatory⁵⁴ have provided information on the size and location of contaminated areas and/or reported to have conducted or planned survey activities in line with **Action #12**. One State party⁵⁵ stated that two countries were cleared but that new contamination was found during the reporting period. One State party⁵⁶ mentioned that there had been no changes in the size and location of cluster munitions' contaminated areas since the previous reporting. Eight

⁴⁵ "Application of all available methods for the efficient implementation of article 4" (CCM/MSP/2011/WP.4), submitted by Australia at the Second Meeting of States Parties; "Implementation of article 4: effective steps for the clearance of cluster munition remnants" (CCM/MSP/2013/5/Rev.1), submitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Ireland at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties; and "Compliance with article 4" (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.1), submitted by the President of the Third Meeting of States Parties at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties.

⁴⁶ Mauritania, article 7 report, "La dépollution a été finalisée entièrement en 2013 et déclarée à la conférence de Lusaka".

⁴⁷ Norway.

⁴⁸ Albania, Grenada, Mauritania, Norway and Zambia. Both Albania and Zambia completed their clearances before the entry into force of the Convention.

⁴⁹ Democratic Republic of the Congo.

⁵⁰ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon.

⁵¹ Democratic Republic of the Congo.

⁵² Norway.

⁵³ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro and Norway.

⁵⁴ Democratic Republic of the Congo.

⁵⁵ Croatia.

⁵⁶ Lao People's Democratic Republic.

States parties⁵⁷ reported on the status and progress of programmes for the clearance of cluster munitions remnants and provided information on clearance methods.

44. Since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, three States parties⁵⁸ have provided updated information on the size and location of contaminated areas that have been released, and all have disaggregated this information by release methods in accordance with **Action #16**.

45. Four States parties⁵⁹ have reported on efforts undertaken to develop and provide risk reduction programmes to their population in line with **Action #17**.

46. In line with **Action #19**, three States parties⁶⁰ have reported on challenges and priorities for assistance. One State party⁶¹ indicated that the Syrian crisis and the flux of Syrian refugees into its territory had created a need to speed up clearance activities.

47. At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, the following two documents aimed at supporting affected States in efforts undertaken under article 4 were presented:

(a) “Implementation of article 4: effective steps for the clearance of cluster munition remnants” (CCM/MSP/2013/5/Rev.1), submitted by the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Ireland at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, which suggested that cluster contamination could be addressed effectively and relatively quickly if available resources were utilized appropriately and by adopting a systematic step-by-step approach;

(b) “Compliance with article 4” (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.1), submitted by Norway and intended to provide guidance on how to approach the planning and execution of survey and clearance operations, including how to identify contaminated areas and what constitutes “every effort” under article 4.2 (a).

48. Based on this work, at the 2014 intersessional meeting the Coordinators on clearance and risk reduction — the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Switzerland — placed special emphasis on best practices of survey under the Convention on Cluster Munitions and implications for the implementation of article 4, given the importance of survey methodology in the detection of cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

49. The challenges raised at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties remain the same, namely:

(a) The development and implementation of national strategic plans that apply context-relevant and up-to-date survey and land release methods;

⁵⁷ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Norway.

⁵⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Lao People’s Democratic Republic.

⁵⁹ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Lebanon.

⁶⁰ Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

⁶¹ Lebanon.

(b) The management of information gained through surveys with a view to assuring the necessary and sustainable quality of clearance activities;

(c) The identification and mobilization of resources to fulfil the obligations under article 4.

50. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

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?

V. Victim assistance

Scope

51. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 12 States parties⁶² and three signatories⁶³ have reported or have been reported to have obligations under article 5.1. In 2013 the Cluster Munition Monitor suggested that 31 States⁶⁴ and three territories⁶⁵ have had cluster munitions casualties and thus have responsibilities for cluster munitions victims.

Progress

52. Since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, one State party⁶⁶ has reported the establishment of a coordinating mechanism for victim assistance varying from single individual focal points to coordinating interministerial committees in line with **Action #21**, putting at eight States parties⁶⁷ and four States not parties⁶⁸ the number of States having done so since the entry into force of the Convention.

53. One State party⁶⁹ has started data collection, which puts at five the number of States parties⁷⁰ in line with **Action #22**. Of the nine States parties⁷¹ and one observer⁷² having reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated with

⁶² Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique and Sierra Leone.

⁶³ Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda.

⁶⁴ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Montenegro, Mozambique, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uganda, Viet Nam, Yemen and the territories of Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara.

⁶⁵ Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh and Western Sahara.

⁶⁶ Montenegro.

⁶⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Mozambique.

⁶⁸ Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda and Viet Nam.

⁶⁹ Montenegro.

⁷⁰ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

⁷¹ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Mozambique.

⁷² Cambodia.

existing disability-coordination mechanisms in line with **Action #23**, three States parties⁷³ provided updated information in 2014. Since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, out of the six⁷⁴ States parties having reported that they have reviewed their national laws and policies in line with **Action #26**, four States parties⁷⁵ provided updated information.

54. In 2014, four States parties⁷⁵ reported to have undertaken or to have planned actions to enhance the accessibility of victim assistance services in line with **Action #25**, such as improvements in prosthetics services, health-care and rehabilitation services in previously contaminated areas, and free medical care and distribution of disability cards to survivors. Two States parties⁷⁶ reported to have conducted outreach activities to raise awareness among cluster munitions survivors about their rights and available services in line with **Action #27**.

55. Three States parties⁷⁷ have reported on steps taken to mobilize national and international resources in line with **Action #29**.

56. Four States parties⁷⁸ have reported to have cooperated with cluster munitions survivors and their representative organization in their national implementation efforts, as laid out in **Action #30**.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

57. The challenges raised at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties remain the same:

(a) To ensure that victim assistance activities are based on the needs and priorities of those affected, and that resources are used efficiently;

(b) To create sustainable services and programmes and to ensure that the lifelong needs of victims are met;

(c) To ensure that victim assistance efforts are integrated with wider development, disability and human rights efforts, and to make best use of opportunities that allow for a holistic approach that encompasses all victims of landmines and explosive remnants of war as well as other people with similar needs;

(d) To improve collaboration and cooperation between States parties and civil society actors working directly with victims, to increase the involvement of victims and their representative organizations in the policy development and practical implementation of victim assistance measures.

58. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

(a) How can States parties link victim assistance efforts under the Convention on Cluster Munitions to activities promoting the rights of victims under other relevant instruments of international law, especially the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities as well as development cooperation efforts?

⁷³ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Lebanon.

⁷⁴ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Mozambique.

⁷⁵ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon.

⁷⁶ Bosnia and Herzegovina and Lebanon.

⁷⁷ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon.

⁷⁸ Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon.

(b) How can all actors work together to overcome challenges related to building national capacity and strengthening national ownership?

(c) How can States parties ensure that victims of cluster munitions can access services on an equal basis to others and have access to specialized services when needed? What successful experiences did States parties have in this area in 2013 and 2014?

(d) How can States parties best operationalize their obligations towards victims of cluster munitions, in particular by locating victims and assessing their needs and priorities as soon as possible, while observing their obligation not to discriminate on the basis of what caused the injury/disability?

(e) How can States parties better implement employment incentive programmes and training and microcrediting opportunities to reach victims and persons with disabilities, recognizing in particular the vulnerability of women with disabilities and the specific needs of families of persons killed? What successful experiences did States parties have in this area in 2013 and 2014?

VI. International cooperation and assistance

Scope

59. Fourteen States parties⁷⁹ have requested international assistance since the entry into force of the Convention; of these, two⁸⁰ have since fulfilled the obligations for which international assistance was required.

60. Since the entry into force of the Convention, six States parties⁸¹ and one signatory⁸² have requested cooperation and assistance to fulfil obligations under stockpile destruction, nine States parties⁸³ have sought assistance for activities under clearance and/or risk reduction, and nine States parties⁸⁴ and two⁸⁵ signatories have expressed the need for support in undertaking victim assistance.

61. Twenty-five States⁸⁶ have reported that they have provided funding for international cooperation and assistance since the entry into force of the Convention.

⁷⁹ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Peru, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Zambia.

⁸⁰ Côte d'Ivoire and Grenada.

⁸¹ Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Peru and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

⁸² Nigeria.

⁸³ Afghanistan, Chad, Croatia, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

⁸⁴ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ghana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique and Zambia.

⁸⁵ Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda.

⁸⁶ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Progress

62. Nine States parties⁸⁷ have reported to have received dedicated assistance for activities under the Convention on Cluster Munitions, eight⁸⁸ since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties.

63. Based on the information contained in the 2014 article 7 transparency reports, 19 States parties⁸⁹ have reported providing financial contributions for international cooperation and assistance, while eight States parties⁹⁰ have reported on assistance needs.

64. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 13 States parties⁹¹ have reported that they have provided funding for advocacy purposes to civil society, of which six⁹² provided funding in the reporting period.

65. Since the entry into force of the Convention, 22 States parties⁹³ have implemented **Action #33**, developing or updating national plans for meeting their obligations under the Convention.

66. National and international non-governmental organizations and/or the United Nations are reported to be partners in stockpile destruction, clearance and victim assistance activities, in line with **Action #44**.

67. Since the entry into force of the Convention, States and other actors have used the formal and informal meetings to exchange information and experiences and to promote technical cooperation, through panel discussions and contributions by technical experts, in line with **Actions #35 and #36**. The same framework has been utilized to discuss international cooperation and assistance in line with **Actions #43 and #45**.

68. In 2012, the Coordinators of international cooperation and assistance published a catalogue of best practices on cooperation and assistance, in line with **Action #47**. This catalogue is available from the Convention's website.⁹⁴ Following challenges raised in the Lusaka progress report, at the 2014 intersessional meeting the Coordinators put an emphasis on South-South and triangular cooperation exemplified by presenting training centres located in Africa, Latin America and the

⁸⁷ Afghanistan, Albania, Côte d'Ivoire, Grenada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro and Republic of Moldova.

⁸⁸ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

⁸⁹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

⁹⁰ Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

⁹¹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Ireland, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Spain and Switzerland.

⁹² Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Norway and Switzerland.

⁹³ Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Mozambique, Japan, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

⁹⁴ Available from www.clusterconvention.org/files/2012/11/FROM-WORDS-TO-ACTION-COOP-and-Assistance-kopi.pdf.

Middle East. A session was also dedicated to the experience of an electronic portal for cooperation and assistance established within the framework of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. Following discussions, at the 2014 intersessional meeting it was suggested that such a portal could be created also for the Convention on Cluster Munitions and would be available to all States and organizations on the Convention's website.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

69. How to increase the number of States parties with obligations under articles 3, 4 and/or 5, which could benefit from cooperation and assistance, to use the opportunity to communicate such needs through article 7 transparency reports?
70. How to diversify cooperation and assistance to consist not only in mobilizing and attaining financial resources from donors, but also ensuring the sharing and transfer of skills, expertise, experiences, lessons learned and technical exchanges?
71. How to maintain consistency and coordinated cooperation and assistance, ensuring the provision of well-integrated support within the framework of longer and broad-term perspectives?
72. How to increase regional cooperation for States and other implementation actors?
73. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:
 - (a) How could States make their needs more clearly known? How to gain a better understanding of the policies, approaches and best practices of donors with respect to future funding for stockpile destruction, victim assistance and other operative areas of the Convention in a long-term perspective?
 - (b) How can States parties ensure that international assistance and cooperation efforts are linked to actual needs on the ground and broadened to include exchange of equipment, technology, skills and experience?
 - (c) How can States parties and other actors providing assistance structure their support according to national plans and priorities, including through enabling long-term planning?
 - (d) How can all actors work together in building national capacities and strengthening national ownership?
 - (e) How can the provision of international cooperation and assistance be used to encourage the use of the most efficient methodologies?
 - (f) How can more States parties be mobilized to implement **Actions #37 to #42**?

VII. Implementation support

74. States, the United Nations, ICRC, the Cluster Munition Coalition, civil society and several other entities have participated in and contributed to the formal and

informal meetings of the Convention since its entry into force. The presidencies,⁹⁵ friends of presidencies, coordinators and other States parties have consulted broadly with relevant organizations, in accordance with **Actions #51 and #52**.

75. Since the adoption of the Vientiane Action Plan at the First Meeting of States Parties, an intersessional programme of work has been established, and since the Second Meeting of States Parties a Coordination Committee has met regularly, succeeding the Group of Friends under the first presidency. The coordinators of the six thematic working groups,⁹⁶ as well as the working group Chairs on Transparency Reporting and National Implementation Measures, have been progressively involved in the preparations for and the execution of intersessional meetings. Further, they have provided progress reports and substantive input at the Meetings of States Parties. The Coordination Committee includes representatives from the Cluster Munition Coalition, ICRC, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (as interim implementation support and executive coordination) and the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat. The UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, ICRC and the Cluster Munition Coalition have, together with others, continued to play vital roles in the implementation of the Convention, including as panellists in various thematic sessions and workshops at meetings under the Convention. In addition, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining has provided logistical support to the organization of the intersessional meetings.

76. Based on decisions during the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to overcome a challenge raised, the two-and-a-half day intersessional meeting in 2014 took place back-to-back with the Standing Committees of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, from 7 to 9 April.

77. At the Second Meeting of States Parties, States parties decided to establish an interim Implementation Support Unit, and the President of the Meeting was mandated to negotiate a hosting agreement and a funding model for its establishment.⁹⁷ The President of the Third Meeting of States Parties continued consultations on a funding model and the subsequent establishment of the Implementation Support Unit, building on the work undertaken by the President of the Second Meeting of States Parties. That has included consultations with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining on a hosting agreement for a future Implementation Support Unit. The consultations conducted by the President of the Third Meeting of States Parties have led to the formulation of draft decisions on the establishment of an Implementation Support Unit at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties⁹⁸ that was presented at the 2013 intersessional meeting, and of a draft decision on implementation support for the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM/MSP/2013/L.2), which was discussed at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties. Following consultations and discussions among States, the Meeting decided to mandate the President of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties to conclude, in consultation with States parties, an agreement with the Centre on the hosting of an Implementation Support Unit as rapidly as possible⁹⁹ and to decide in a transparent

⁹⁵ Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Norway and Zambia.

⁹⁶ General Status and Operation of the Convention, Universalization, Victim Assistance, Clearance and Risk Reduction, Stockpile Destruction and Retention, and Cooperation and Assistance.

⁹⁷ See the final document of the Second Meeting of States Parties (CCM/MSP/2011/5), para. 29.

⁹⁸ Available from www.clusterconvention.org/files/2013/01/Draft-as-of-April-11-2013-web.pdf.

⁹⁹ Final document of the Fourth Meeting of States Parties (CCM/MSP/2013/6), para. 31.

way and in consultation with the coordinators, as well as taking into account the views of all States parties, on the recruitment of the Director.⁹⁹ In line with the mandate given by the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, the President held a series of consultations with States parties and the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining and concluded the hosting agreement document.

78. In conformity with the Lusaka decision, the interim implementation support and executive coordination of work provided by UNDP remain in place until the first day of the First Review Conference. In the meantime, the process of the recruitment of the Director of the Convention on Cluster Munitions Implementation Support Unit has been initiated. The selection process and appointment of a Director to lead the work of the future Implementation Support Unit of the Convention will follow in the months ahead.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

79. One challenge that remains is to decide on a sustainable and predictable funding model for the Implementation Support Unit that ensures universal ownership and accountability towards all States parties. Experience gained from intersessional meetings also demonstrates the need to continue to adapt the intersessional work programme to ensure that it develops to constantly reflect the realities and needs of, and in, affected areas.

80. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

How can the formal and informal meetings be organized so that they function to best support the norms of the Convention and its effective implementation?

VIII. Transparency

Scope

81. Eighty-three States parties¹⁰⁰ have had initial or annual article 7 transparency reporting deadlines in the period since the entry into force of the Convention to the Fifth Meeting of States Parties. Three additional States have submitted initial reports¹⁰¹ on a voluntary basis.

Progress

82. To date, 64 States parties¹⁰² have submitted their initial article 7 transparency reports in accordance with article 7.1 and **Action #58**. Twenty States parties¹⁰³ have not yet submitted their initial article 7 transparency reports; of these, one¹⁰⁴ is not

¹⁰⁰ All States parties with Saint Kitts and Nevis initial submission due on 28 August 2014.

¹⁰¹ Canada, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Palau.

¹⁰² See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency reporting — States parties that have submitted an annual article 7 transparency report”.

¹⁰³ See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency reporting — States parties that have yet to submit an initial article 7 transparency report”.

¹⁰⁴ Saint Kitts and Nevis, initial submission due on 28 August 2014.

yet due. Since the publication of the Lusaka progress report, an additional three States parties¹⁰⁵ have submitted initial reports.

83. Eighty States parties¹⁰⁶ were required to submit their annual article 7 transparency reports by 30 April 2014 in accordance with article 7.2 and **Action #59**. Of these, to date, 40¹⁰⁷ States parties had yet to submit their annual report. From 2012 to 2013, the delivery rate of annual article 7 transparency reports continuously decreased from 72 per cent to 51 per cent in 2014.¹⁰⁸

84. The working group Chair on Reporting, with the support of the interim Implementation Support Unit, has sent letters on a regular basis reminding States parties of reporting obligations and matters of outstanding reports.

85. Since the entry into force of the Convention, reporting formats have been prepared by the Coordinator with the aim of facilitating coherent and comprehensive reporting. These and a draft “Guide to reporting”, in line with **Action #62**, are available on the Convention’s website.¹⁰⁹ In line with **Action #59**, the working group Chair on Reporting presented at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties the paper entitled “Transparency measures and the exchange of information in the context of the Convention: State of play and the way ahead for a better exchange of information” (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.4) aimed at maximizing reporting as a tool to assist and cooperate in the implementation of the Convention.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

86. How to ensure the timely submission of article 7 transparency reports by States parties, how to improve the quantity and quality of information contained in the reports, how to promote reporting as an essential component of the monitoring progress and how to raise awareness on implementation challenges? — are all questions for discussion.

87. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

(a) What steps could be taken to ensure that States fulfil the reporting obligations in due time?

(b) How can article 7 transparency reports be used as a tool for assisting and cooperating in implementation, particularly where States parties have obligations under articles 3, 4, and 5?

¹⁰⁵ Costa Rica, Iraq and Liechtenstein.

¹⁰⁶ See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency reporting — States parties required to submit an annual article 7 transparency report by 30 April 2014”.

¹⁰⁷ See annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency reporting — States parties that have yet to submit an annual article 7 transparency report for 2014”.

¹⁰⁸ Annex II, “Graphs outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency reporting — Number of annual article 7 reports due and actual submitted”.

¹⁰⁹ Available from www.clusterconvention.org/files/2011/01/Reporting_guide_CCM_-August-2012.pdf.

IX. National implementation measures¹¹⁰

Scope

88. A total of 23 States parties¹¹¹ have now adopted legislation specifically aimed at the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, while 14¹¹² States parties consider their existing legislation to be sufficient, and 3 States parties¹¹³ consider that no specific legislation is required. Seventeen States parties¹¹⁴ and two signatories¹¹⁵ are in the process of adopting legislation. Two States parties¹¹⁶ are undertaking reviews of their national legislation to ensure compliance with article 9 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Six States parties¹¹⁷ have reported on how they have informed other relevant State agencies about the prohibitions and the requirements of the Convention.

Progress

Action #63

89. Of the 23 States parties¹¹⁸ that have reported having adopted legislation specifically aimed at implementing the Convention on Cluster Munitions, 1 State Party¹¹⁹ has done so since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties. Among these States parties, one¹²⁰ has reported on adopting legislation additional to that adopted previously. Of the 14 States parties having stated that they consider their existing legislation to be sufficient, 2 States parties¹²¹ reported in their article 7 transparency reports that, as they were not affected by cluster munitions, no specific national legislation was required. Among the 17 States parties¹²² and two signatories¹²³ having reported being in the process of adopting legislation, 2 States parties¹²⁴ and

¹¹⁰ Annex I, “Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: National implementation measures”.

¹¹¹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

¹¹² Albania, Côte d’Ivoire, Denmark, Holy See, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹¹³ Bulgaria, Costa Rica and Senegal.

¹¹⁴ Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Croatia, Ghana, Grenada, Iraq, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Swaziland and Zambia.

¹¹⁵ Canada and Democratic Republic of the Congo.

¹¹⁶ Mozambique and Seychelles.

¹¹⁷ Australia, Croatia, Denmark, Ireland, Lebanon and Norway.

¹¹⁸ See footnote 111.

¹¹⁹ Liechtenstein.

¹²⁰ Ecuador.

¹²¹ Costa Rica and Senegal.

¹²² See footnote 114.

¹²³ Canada and Democratic Republic of the Congo.

¹²⁴ Afghanistan and Croatia.

one signatory¹²⁵ have provided updates on this matter since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties.

90. As indicated in past progress reports, ICRC has published a guidance paper entitled “Model law: Convention on Cluster Munitions — Legislation for Common Law States on the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions” to help States to develop appropriate legislation.¹²⁶ Likewise, the working group Chair on National Implementation Measures prepared and published a framework entitled “Model legislation: Cluster Munitions Act 201” (CCM/MSP/2011/WP.6), which was presented at the Second Meeting of States Parties. These two documents are available on the Convention’s website. In addition, Ghana is working with the support of ICRC and the Cluster Munition Coalition on the drafting of model legislation for African countries under civil and common law, with a view to holding a workshop, with the support of the working group Chair on National Implementation Measures, on the development of these texts in the near future.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

91. The main challenge under national implementation measures is to ensure that all States swiftly develop and adopt any legislation deemed necessary for the effective implementation of the Convention.

92. Questions to discuss at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties may include:

What are the factors preventing greater progress in national implementation and what assistance might States parties and signatories need to facilitate their adoption of implementing legislation?

X. Compliance

Compliance under article 7

93. At the intersessional meeting in 2014, the working group Chair on Reporting raised the issue of compliance of States parties with regard to article 7 transparency reporting under the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Since the First Meeting of States Parties, Belgium, as working group Chair, has continuously recalled that reporting is an obligation as outlined in articles 7 and 3.8 of the Convention, which stipulate that all States parties must submit an initial report as soon as practicable but no later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Convention for that State party, and that States parties must also submit an annual update on 30 April covering the previous year’s calendar.

94. Several tools, such as the “Guide to reporting under article 7 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”,¹²⁷ as well as the working paper entitled “Transparency

¹²⁵ Canada.

¹²⁶ Available from http://www.clusterconvention.org/files/2013/03/model_law_clusters_munitions.pdf.

¹²⁷ Available from www.clusterconvention.org/files/2011/01/Reporting_guide_CCM_-August-2012.pdf.

measures and the exchange of information in the context of the Convention: state of play and the way ahead for a better exchange of information” (CCM/MSP/2013/WP.4), submitted at the Fourth Meeting of States Parties, have been drafted by the working group Chair to support States parties in fulfilling their obligation under article 7 and in increasing the quality and quantity of the reports provided. Despite these efforts, 49 per cent of States parties have not yet submitted their initial or annual article 7 transparency report in 2014.¹²⁸

Action #66

95. In May 2014, national and international media reported on airdropped cluster munitions in South Sudan in late 2013 or early in 2014.¹²⁹ On 8 May 2014, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) published a report entitled “Conflict in South Sudan: a human rights report”,¹³⁰ which refers to the alleged use and findings of sub-munitions in the Malek area of Bor County in South Sudan. The report states that while opposition forces controlled Bor town, from 31 December to 18 January, they pushed south, and heavy fighting occurred between government forces supported by the Uganda People’s Defence Force and opposition forces along the Bor-Juba road. Between 11 and 16 January, UNMISS was aware of several instances of aerial bombardments by Ugandan forces in areas south of Bor. UNMISS military personnel in Bor at the time reported hearing loud explosions believed to be anti-aircraft fire from approximately 12 km south of the UNMISS compound in Bor, in the vicinity of Malek, while Human Rights Officers in Awerial County heard air strikes across the river. This is further supported by information received from retreating combatants and opposition forces leadership at the time (para. 107). While South Sudan is not a party to the Convention, Uganda has signed but not yet ratified it. Both States have denied the use of cluster bombs.

Challenges and questions for discussion at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

96. A key challenge under compliance is how States parties should address compliance concerns among States parties, as well as how to promote respect for the norm among signatories and other States not parties.

¹²⁸ See annex II, “Graphs outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas: Transparency (as of 18 June 2014)”.

¹²⁹ Available from www.bbc.co.uk/afrique/region/2014/05/140513_uganda.shtml; <http://www.newvision.co.ug/news/655471-updf-not-leaving-south-sudan-uganda-protests-un-report-on-cluster-bombs.html>.

¹³⁰ Available from <http://unmiss.unmissions.org/Portals/unmiss/Human%20Rights%20Reports/UNMISS%20Conflict%20in%20South%20Sudan%20-%20A%20Human%20Rights%20Report.pdf>, paras. 107-108.

Appendix I

Tables outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas

Universalization

84 States parties (by region)^a

29 signatories

Africa (23)

Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Zambia

Americas (18)

Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ecuador, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, *Saint Kitts and Nevis*, Trinidad and Tobago, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Uruguay

Asia (3)

Afghanistan, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic

Europe (32)

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Holy See, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Middle East (2)

Iraq, Lebanon

Pacific (6)

Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, Nauru, New Zealand, Samoa

Africa (19)

Angola, Benin, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania

Americas (5)

Canada, Colombia, Haiti, Jamaica, Paraguay

Asia (2)

Indonesia, Philippines

Europe (2)

Cyprus, Iceland

Middle East

Pacific (1)

Palau

Stockpile destruction and retention

| <i>States parties with obligations under article 3</i> | <i>States parties that have completed their article 3 obligations^b</i> | <i>States parties retaining stockpiles for training purposes</i> | <i>States parties that have provided information on retained stockpiles</i> |
|---|--|---|--|
| Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mozambique, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland | Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Czech Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark , Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Mauritania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, France, Spain, Switzerland | Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Croatia, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |

Clearance and risk reduction

| <i>States parties with obligations under article 4</i> | <i>States parties that have completed their article 4 obligations^c</i> | <i>States parties that provided updates on the status and progress of their clearance programmes</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Mozambique | Albania, Grenada, Mauritania, Norway , Zambia | Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Norway |
| <i>States that provided information on the size and location of contaminated areas and on survey activities</i> | <i>States parties that have reported on the development of risk reduction programmes</i> | |
| Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mauritania, Montenegro, Norway | Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon | |

Transparency reporting

| <i>States parties that have submitted initial article 7 transparency reports^d</i> | <i>States parties that have yet to submit an initial article 7 transparency report^e</i> | <i>Signatories that have voluntarily submitted article 7 transparency report and updates</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Afghanistan (2012), Albania (2011), Andorra (2014), Antigua and Barbuda (2012), Australia (2013), Austria (2011), Belgium (2011), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2011), Botswana (2012), Bulgaria (2012), Burkina Faso (2011), Burundi (2011), Chile (2012), Costa Rica (2014), Côte d'Ivoire (2013), Croatia (2011), Czech Republic (2012), Denmark (2011), Ecuador (2011), France (2011), Germany (2011), Ghana (2011), Grenada (2012), Guatemala (2011), Holy See (2011), Hungary (2013), Ireland (2011), Iraq (2014), Italy (2012), Japan (2011), Lao People's Democratic Republic (2011), Lebanon (2011), Lesotho (2011), Liechtenstein (2014), Lithuania (2011), Luxembourg (2011), Malawi (2011), Malta (2011), Mauritania (2013), Mexico (2011), Monaco (2011), Montenegro (2011), Mozambique (2012), Netherlands (2011), New Zealand (2011), Nicaragua (2011), Norway (2011), Peru (2013), Portugal (2011), Republic of Moldova (2011), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (2012), Samoa (2012), San Marino (2011), Senegal (2012), Seychelles (2013), Sierra Leone (2011), Slovenia (2011), Spain (2011), Swaziland (2013), Sweden (2013), Switzerland (2013), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2011), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2011), Uruguay (2011), Zambia (2011)</p> | <p>Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Cook Islands, Comoros, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Mali, Nauru, Niger, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia</p> | <p>Canada (2011, 2012 and 2013), Democratic Republic of the Congo (2011, 2012 and 2014), Palau (2011)</p> |

States parties required to submit an annual article 7 transparency report by 30 April 2014

States parties that have submitted an annual article 7 transparency report

States parties that have yet to submit an annual article 7 transparency report for 2014

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Cook Islands, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zambia

Afghanistan (2013, 2014), Albania (2012, 2013), Australia (2014), Austria (2012, 2013, 2014), Belgium (2012, 2013, 2014), Bosnia and Herzegovina (2012, 2013, 2014), Botswana (2014), Bulgaria (2013, 2014), Burkina Faso (2013), Chile (2013), Côte d'Ivoire (2014), Croatia (2012, 2013, 2014), Czech Republic (2013, 2014), Denmark (2012, 2013, 2014), Ecuador (2013), France (2012, 2013, 2014), Germany (2012, 2013, 2014), Ghana (2012, 2013, 2014), Grenada (2013), Guatemala (2012, 2013), Holy See (2012, 2013), Ireland (2012, 2013, 2014), Italy (2013, 2014), Japan (2012, 2013, 2014), Lao People's Democratic Republic (2012, 2013, 2014), Lebanon (2012, 2013, 2014), Lithuania (2012, 2013, 2014), Luxembourg (2012 and 2014), Mauritania (2014), Mexico (2012, 2013, 2014), Monaco (2012 and 2014), Montenegro (2013, 2014), Mozambique (2013), Netherlands (2012, 2013, 2014), New Zealand (2012, 2013, 2014), Nicaragua (2013), Norway (2012, 2013, 2014), Peru (2014), Portugal (2012, 2013, 2014), Republic of Moldova (2012, 2013), San Marino (2012, 2013, 2014), Senegal (2014), Slovenia (2012, 2013, 2014), Spain (2012, 2013, 2014), Swaziland (2014), Sweden (2014), Switzerland (2014), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2012, 2013, 2014), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2012, 2013, 2014), Uruguay (2013), Zambia (2012, 2013, 2014)

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Cook Islands, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mozambique, Nauru, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Republic of Moldova, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay

National implementation measures

| <i>States parties that have adopted legislation relating to the Convention's implementation</i> | <i>States considering existing legislation to be sufficient</i> | <i>States parties that are developing legislation relating to the Convention's implementation</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cook Islands, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Albania, Bulgaria, Denmark, Holy See, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Croatia, Ghana, Grenada, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Zambia |

^a New State party since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in **bold** and *italics*.

^b States parties that have completed their obligation since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in **bold** and *italics*.

^c States parties that have completed their obligation since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in **bold** and *italics*.


^d States in bold have submitted their initial article 7 report since the Fourth Meeting of States Parties.

^e Saint Kitts and Nevis (initial submission due on 28 August 2014).


Appendix II

Graphs outlining progress updates in the various thematic areas

Universalization



Transparency



Annex II

President's summary

Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, San José, 2-5 September 2014

Submitted by the President of the Fifth Meeting of States Parties

1. Delegations representing 99 States,^a the United Nations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the Cluster Munition Coalition and other organizations and foundations participated at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, held in San José from 2 to 5 September 2014, to assess the achievements to date and identify the remaining challenges to the full implementation of the Convention.
2. The meeting in San José is not only a unique opportunity but also a major responsibility. In the report of the Secretary-General entitled "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all" (A/59/2005), it is stated: "Unless we can agree on a shared assessment of these threats and a common understanding of our obligations in addressing them, the United Nations will lag in providing security to all of its members and all the world's people. Our ability to assist those who seek freedom from fear will then be partial at best."
3. It is therefore with a small but profound sense of satisfaction that all States present here in San José share our assessment of the humanitarian impact caused by cluster munitions and the need to react when fear is imposed and the protection of civilians is threatened by the use of cluster munitions.
4. With the timely and most welcome accession of Belize and the ratification by the Republic of Congo on the opening day of the Conference, the Convention on Cluster Munitions has reached 86 States parties and 108 signatories. This means that more than half of the States Members of the United Nations have joined the ban on all use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster munitions.
5. The accession of Belize contributed to fulfilling one of the early aspirations in Central America: to be the first subregion free of cluster munitions. Many States present do not possess cluster munitions and are not directly affected by these weapons but are fully aware of their catastrophic effects and, in solidarity with affected countries in the region and across the globe, have declared their full support for the aims and objectives of the Convention and continued commitment to the universal principles of international peace and security.
6. In his inaugural address to the Conference, the President of Costa Rica mentioned survivors' names: Mahmud, as well as Fatima, Ivan, Natasha, Marcos, Rosa, Akela and Giang-Long, a testament to the global nature of this problem and the need for universal solutions, joint efforts and solid bilateral and multilateral collaboration at all levels and in all regions of the world. Affected States have experience well beyond that of others, and if third parties support that exchange among States, triangular schemes can contribute to successful South-South cooperation.

^a Comprising 62 States parties, 15 signatories and 22 other observer States and entities (see CCM/MSP/2014/INF/2).

7. The Convention on Cluster Munitions was born of a collective awareness of the perverse human consequences of cluster munitions with the objective of preventing new victims by prohibiting the use, production, transfer and stockpiling of cluster munitions, as well as tackling the consequences, remedying the effects of past use by assisting victims, their families and communities, and clearing contaminated lands, the very elements that constitute the backbone of the Convention. Since its entry into force, the Convention has made substantial progress in these efforts and represents one of the most important developments in international humanitarian law in recent times.

8. However, with ongoing and extensive use in the Syrian Arab Republic, we wish to condemn these acts and express our deep concern regarding reports of new contamination in South Sudan and in Eastern Ukraine. Universalization of the Convention has become imperative to avoid unacceptable harm by cluster munitions, and we must remind States to comply with obligations under international humanitarian law and reiterate that the obligation to protect civilians from unnecessary harm applies to all States.

9. Many States expressed their strong concern regarding recent incidents and reports of evidence of use of cluster munitions in different parts of the world.

10. At the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, States parties to the Convention committed to continue condemning, at all times, any use of cluster munitions by any actor, in any place and under any circumstances, in order to further stigmatize cluster munitions and their use. This is an essential part of ensuring that civilians will no longer suffer the consequences of these weapons and moving us closer to a world free of cluster munitions. Prompt reaction by States when civilians come to harm and an increase in the number of States adhering to the Convention, from all regions of the world, will send a strong message to the international community that cluster munitions should never be used again and contribute to the effective stigmatization of cluster munitions and their use.

11. Further universalization and enhanced country ownership supported by effective partnerships for implementation are key elements in making the Convention truly life-saving. We therefore urge those that continue to use cluster munitions to end this practice and join us in achieving these goals.

12. Although our repeated demand for investigations in instances of use, seeking to clarify the circumstances behind these acts, cannot render the actions undone or soothe the harm inflicted, it serves to uphold the rule of law, bring those responsible to question and identify the punishment necessary and commensurate with the crime, and act as a deterrent for others who may try the same. To this end, States parties are making progress in adopting the legislative and administrative measures required at the national level to prevent and suppress violations of the Convention, and the incorporation of the Convention's norms into military doctrine and training are particularly important.

13. It is our aim while presiding over the Meeting to emphasize the norm established by the Convention, which effectively positions it as an instrumental piece of international humanitarian law with the prime objective of protecting civilians from harm and, with States parties as well as States not yet parties, providing the means of enforcement and demonstrating that it works.

14. We believe that our work began only in 2008 with the signing of the Convention on Cluster Munitions in Oslo, which Costa Rica considers a key element in the architecture of humanitarian disarmament. However, this was only a landmark in our long journey towards a more secure and peaceful world. Accordingly, we should continue to advocate hand in hand with all actors concerned, including civil society organizations, to ensure that the Convention remains a robust international instrument.

15. Once negotiated, adopted, signed and ratified, monitoring States' compliance with the security treaties that they have signed is an essential component on which to build mutual confidence and the foundation for further stability. This, in turn, is the very essence of norm setting. We therefore warmly welcome the message that emerged from the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, suggested by the Cluster Munition Coalition, that the Convention on Cluster Munitions is working, gathers strength every year and has a real humanitarian impact. Countries are destroying tens of millions of explosive sub-munitions from stockpiles, clearance operations are retuning land to productive use and the needs of victims are being better met.

16. The watchdog function performed by the Cluster Munition Coalition, as well as ICRC, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and its many national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, namely monitoring the performance of States so as to allow us to be accountable for the commitments that we have made, is an essential and welcome feature of the unique partnership of this Convention. Preserving this partnership is also a prerequisite for maintaining and furthering implementation, universalization and the progress achieved.

17. At the same time, we acknowledge the challenges set out in the San José progress report. In the lead-up to the First Review Conference of the Convention, to be held in Dubrovnik, Croatia, in September 2015, we recall the commitments made by States parties under the five-year Vientiane Action Plan: to progress clearance and stockpile destruction, to expand coverage of services for victims and survivors, to increase the level of resources provided for these tasks and to promote all forms of cooperation.

18. Embarking on the preparations for the Review Conference, we must now take stock of our collective achievements in preparation for a new evidence-based, needs-oriented and time-bound five-year plan, the Dubrovnik Action Plan. Together, we are compelled to do more, for as long as people remain at risk, to accomplish our collective goal: a world free of cluster munitions. To this end, it is important to support the current work to mainstream these efforts into the broader development framework, and, although not yet final in any way, the sustainable development goals in their current iteration appear promising.

19. As a continuation of the high-level panel's recommendations strongly advocating a more elaborated security dimension in the framing of our future development aspirations, this has supported the promotion of a goal within the sustainable development goals dedicated to peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice for all, and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels, a goal that at present includes targets on efforts to significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere and, by 2030, significantly reduce all forms of illicit arms flows.

20. States parties to the Convention must uphold these obligations and affirm strong references to the means, tools and instruments that can enable States to provide for peaceful and inclusive societies. The growing global interconnectedness puts the onus on us, as States parties to the Convention, to bring the successes of this Convention to bear in the further strengthening of international humanitarian and human rights law, which lays the foundations for sustainable development for all.

Annex III

List of documents

| <i>Symbol</i> | <i>Title</i> |
|----------------------------------|--|
| CCM/MSP/2014/1 | Provisional agenda |
| CCM/MSP/2014/2 and Add.1 | Provisional programme of work |
| CCM/MSP/2014/3 | Rules of procedure: Meetings of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions |
| CCM/MSP/2014/4/Rev.1 | Estimated costs of the First Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions |
| CCM/MSP/2014/5 | Estimated costs of the Preparatory Committees of the First Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions |
| CCM/MSP/2014/6 | Final document |
| CCM/MSP/2014/WP.1 | San José progress report: monitoring progress in implementing the Vientiane Action Plan up until the Fifth Meeting of States Parties |
| CCM/MSP/2014/WP.2 | Declaration of compliance with article 4.1 (a) of the Convention on Cluster Munitions |
| CCM/MSP/2014/WP.3 | Declaration of compliance with article 4.1 (a) of the Convention on Cluster Munitions |
| CCM/MSP/2014/L.1 and Rev.1 and 2 | Draft decisions, including the workplan for 2015 |
| CCM/MSP/2014/MISC.1 | Provisional list of participants |
| CCM/MSP/2014/INF/1 | Agreement between the States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining on the Hosting of the Implementation Support Unit for the Convention |
| CCM/MSP/2014/INF/2 | List of participants |

The documents above are available from the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>) and the website of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (www.unog.ch/ccm).