
Convention on Cluster Munitions

9 September 2025

English only

Thirteenth Meeting of States Parties
Geneva, 16-19 September 2025
Item 10 of the provisional agenda
Review of the status and operation of the Convention
and other matters important for achieving
the aims of the Convention

Convention on Cluster Munitions 13MSP Progress Report: Monitoring progress in implementing the Lausanne Action Plan

**Submitted by the Presidency of the Thirteenth Meeting of States
Parties*, ****

I. Executive Summary

1. This Progress Report provides an assessment of the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) under the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP). Adopted at the Second Review Conference (2RC) in September 2021, the LAP serves as a guiding framework for the work of the CCM until the Third Review Conference (3RC), scheduled for 2026. This report specifically covers the period from 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025.¹
2. The report offers a factual overview of developments across all areas of the Convention during the reporting period and is intended to serve three purposes:
 - (a) **Assess Implementation:** Provide States Parties and stakeholders with a consolidated account of progress and remaining challenges under each of the Convention's thematic pillars.
 - (b) **Facilitate Dialogue:** Support informed discussions at the 13MSP, ensuring that deliberations are grounded in accurate data, critical analysis, and awareness of systemic trends affecting the Convention.
 - (c) **Prepare the groundwork for the 3RC:** Contribute to the preparatory process for the 3RC through the preliminary identification of issues that may require strategic decisions, institutional adjustments, or renewed political commitment.
3. In addition to reporting on this one-year period (1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025), the report includes sections highlighting an initial analysis of trends observed over the longer

* The present document was submitted after the deadline in order to reflect the most recent information.

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

¹ The elements under each thematic area have been summarized to provide a snapshot of the Convention's cumulative implementation status to date. This report does not replace the formal reporting requirements of State Parties to the CCM, nor does it provide a complete account of the activities outlined in the 50 Action Points of the LAP. The actions and indicators have been condensed for brevity. The report is based on information from publicly available sources, including official statements by states, Article 7 transparency reports, and Article 4 extension requests submitted between 1 July 2024 and 30 June 2025.

timeframe spanning the Tenth to Twelfth Meetings of States Parties (10MSP to 12MSP). This analysis is presented as a tool to help States Parties reflect on patterns and emerging issues as they start preparing for the 3RC, which will assess and review the Convention and the five-year implementation period of the LAP. By identifying areas of consistent progress as well as persistent gaps and challenges, this analysis aims to support informed discussions and practical planning for the next phase of the Convention's implementation.

4. The initial analysis of trends shows that while significant advances continue to be made in several pillars of the Convention, there are also areas where progress has slowed or where gaps remain between political commitments and practical outcomes. The Convention's normative strength remains widely upheld among States Parties, but new political and operational challenges have emerged, underscored by developments such as Lithuania's withdrawal – effective on 6 March 2025. Such events highlight the importance of sustained engagement and collective resolve to preserve the Convention's humanitarian objectives.

5. Notable areas requiring further attention include transparency reporting, securing sustainable financial resources, and translating policy frameworks into effective implementation on the ground, particularly in victim assistance, clearance activities, and risk education. Ensuring the meaningful participation of survivors and affected communities also remains a priority.

6. During this reporting period, an intersessional meeting was held on 7-8 April 2025 in Geneva under the leadership of the 13MSP Presidency of the Philippines. The meeting brought together representatives of States Parties, signatories, and States not party, international organizations and civil society to review progress and challenges in the implementation of the LAP. Coordinators provided updates on their respective thematic areas and facilitated substantive discussions. States Parties also provided updates on the implementation of their obligations under the Convention, including informal presentations and pending extension requests.

7. A key component of the meeting was the Stakeholder Dialogues, held under agenda item "Challenges and concerns raised in developments in the Context of the Convention and Humanitarian Disarmament at large". The discussions were structured around four sub-items: emerging challenges to the norm prohibiting cluster munitions; capacity constraints for victim assistance considering the significant increase in victims of war; substantial budget cuts impacting the implementation of operational actions under the CCM, including victim assistance, stockpile destruction and clearance through international cooperation and assistance; and the increased significance of risk education considering the reduced level of clearance activities.

8. These discussions were built on concerns raised at the 12MSP and the initial Stakeholder Dialogue held on 4 September 2024 and are expected to inform future deliberations. While the outcomes of this initiative fall outside the scope of this report, the event marked a noteworthy effort to stimulate reflection and participation in the lead-up to the 3RC.

9. Building on this momentum, the 13MSP offers a critical opportunity for States Parties and stakeholders to initiate the assessment of the Convention's humanitarian gains ahead of the 3RC and renew their collective commitment to a world free of cluster munitions.

II. Report summary: 1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

A. Guiding principles

- Seven (07) States Parties reported having integrated Convention implementation activities into various national plans;
- Nine (09) affected States Parties updated national standards according to the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS);
- One (01) State Party included a cluster munition victim in its 12MSP delegation;

B. Gender mainstreaming

- Twenty-two (22) States Parties provided information on gender mainstreaming;
- Eleven (11) States Parties have gender-inclusive policies in their national recruitment practices for CCM implementation;
- Twelve (12) States Parties integrated gender and diversity of populations into their national work plans and strategies.

C. Universalization

- One (01) State Party withdrew from the CCM during the period under review;
- Seventeen (17) States not yet party to the CCM participated in the 12MSP;
- Thirty-one (31) States not party voted in favour of the 2024 UNGA CCM Resolution.

D. Stockpile destruction

- All forty-one (41) States Parties with cluster munition stockpiles have declared compliance under Article 3;
- Ten (10) States Parties have retained cluster munitions in accordance with Article 3.6, and of these;
- Three (03) States Parties reported on the use of retained or acquired cluster munitions.

E. Survey and clearance

- Ten (10) States Parties currently have cluster munition contaminated areas;
- Nine (09) affected States Parties requested assistance for survey and clearance;
- Five (05) States Parties' extension requests were submitted for consideration at the 13MSP.

F. Risk education

- Ten (10) affected States Parties have integrated risk education into national strategies and work plans;
- Twelve (12) States Parties reported having carried out risk education activities;
- Six (06) affected States requested assistance for risk education.

G. Victim assistance

- Twelve (12) States Parties are considered to have cluster munition victims;
- Nine (09) States Parties took measures to obtain international assistance for victim assistance;
- Three (03) affected States reported having established national standards for victim assistance.

H. International cooperation and assistance

- Twenty-four (24) States Parties reported providing assistance to affected States Parties;
- Twelve (12) affected States Parties requested international assistance;
- Eight (08) States Parties reported having received international assistance.

I. Transparency measures

- Sixty-three (63) of 105 States Parties submitted their 2024 annual reports;
- Two (02) of seven (07) States Parties submitted their initial reports;

- Forty-six (46) States Parties used the revised Article 7 reporting form.

J. National implementation measures

- Sixty-seven (67) States Parties have enacted national legislation to implement the Convention;
- Twenty-five (25) States Parties have disseminated their CCM obligations to relevant national institutions.;
- Five (05) States Parties reported challenges in revising/adopting national legislation.

K. Compliance

- Four (04) of five (05) extension requests were submitted in a timely manner.

III. 10MSP – 12MSP Summary of Preliminary Trend Analysis and Considerations

10. Implementation of the Convention between the 10MSP to the 12MSP work cycle has revealed both enduring strengths and emerging challenges as the Convention approaches the 3RC.

11. This section outlines cross-cutting observations drawn from the thematic analyses in this report and from institutional developments within the Convention's framework.

IV. Challenges and emerging risks

A. Normative Achievements and Risks

12. The CCM has strengthened the global stigma against cluster munitions, contributing to declining global production, use, and transfers among States Parties. However, several factors have recently challenged the Convention's normative resilience:

- Lithuania's effective withdrawal in 2025;
- Although permissible under Article 20 of the Convention, this is the first time a State Party has left the Convention. Furthermore, it is the first time a State has withdrawn from a humanitarian disarmament treaty prohibiting a whole class of weapons. While no other States Parties have signalled -so far- intentions to follow suit, this development raises concerns about the Convention's ability to maintain universal adherence to the norm amid shifting security contexts and discourses;
- Ongoing use of cluster munitions by States not party;
- Continued use of cluster munitions by States not party undermines the humanitarian norm established by the CCM. Left unchallenged, these incidents weaken the normative consensus around these weapons and expose the urgent need to accelerate universalization efforts;
- Transfers of cluster munitions by States not party;
- Confirmed transfers of cluster munitions by States not party have raised additional concerns regarding the erosion of the norm against these weapons. Left unchallenged, these transfers risk undermining the Convention's humanitarian rationale and contribute to increased civilian harm. These developments further highlight the urgency of universalization and reinforce the importance of strong messaging by States Parties to uphold the Convention's normative authority;
- Emerging geopolitical tensions;
- Heightened geopolitical tensions have reduced the space for disarmament diplomacy in some regions, complicating efforts to universalize the Convention and sustain political momentum.

B. Institutional Resilience and Resource Constraints

13. The CCM's institutional architecture, including the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), continues to operate under significant financial constraints. While the number of States Parties contributing financially to the ISU has increased, the level of voluntary contributions has declined over several years. This limits the ISU's ability to:

- Support States Parties in national implementation, universalization efforts, and technical assistance;
- Organize informal meetings critical for dialogue and problem-solving;
- Develop communications, outreach, and awareness-raising materials necessary to sustain political attention and the normative momentum.

14. Without predictable and sustainable financing, the Convention risks losing both its operational effectiveness and its capacity to project a unified institutional voice.

C. Upholding Humanitarian Norms amid Thematic Fragmentation

15. The Convention operates in an increasingly complex disarmament landscape where political attention and financial resources are stretched across a number of processes. Many of these processes address individual weapon systems in isolation, with limited collective focus on the humanitarian consequences of weapons use more broadly. This fragmented approach risks obscuring the shared normative foundations of international humanitarian law (IHL) which sets the limits on the means and methods of warfare regardless of the weapon system involved. In this context, the CCM continues to assert its distinct humanitarian value while engaging constructively with parallel disarmament initiatives. A lack of coordination, both conceptually and operationally could dilute the visibility of universalization efforts or weaken support for implementation.

V. Opportunities for Strategic Re-engagement

16. Despite these challenges, significant opportunities exist to revitalize the Convention in the period leading up to the 3RC. This moment offers a chance to reaffirm the humanitarian rationale of the Convention, reinforce its legal obligations, and pursue concrete progress on universalization, implementation, and financing. The 3RC also provides a key platform to renew outreach to remaining signatories and States not Party, encouraging them to join the Convention and align with its humanitarian norms:

- a) Promoting the visibility of the Convention in broader humanitarian and development fora. By raising the profile of the CCM in spaces focused on the protection of civilians, sustainable development, and humanitarian response, States Parties and stakeholders can potentially unlock new avenues for political support and funding. This includes engaging with actors outside the disarmament community and positioning the Convention as part of a wider normative ecosystem.
- b) Deepening cooperation with other disarmament treaties, including the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and emerging norms under the Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas (EWIPA) Political Declaration framework, to strengthen the legal and humanitarian narrative of IHL around the protection of civilians and the prohibition of indiscriminate weapons. Greater alignment across these instruments can reinforce shared normative objectives.
- c) Strengthening regional approaches to universalization, clearance, cooperation and assistance, and victim assistance, recognising the specific security and political dynamics of different regions.
- d) Fostering peer-to-peer exchanges and coalitions that can accelerate progress in implementation and create shared solutions for financial and operational challenges.
- e) Addressing, in a structured dialogue, the sustainability of the Convention's financial structure and exploring options for predictable financing – including potential

adjustments and/or clarifications to the current model and exploration of innovative funding partnerships.

17. The Convention stands at a pivotal juncture. The year leading to the 3RC represents a critical window for States Parties, stakeholders, and partners to reaffirm the humanitarian imperatives that underlie the CCM, address emerging strategic risks, and ensure the Convention continues to deliver meaningful protection to people and communities worldwide.

VI. Monitoring progress in the implementation of the Lausanne Action Plan

A. Guiding Principles

<i>LAP</i>	<i>INDICATORS</i>	<i>10MSP</i>	<i>11MSP</i>	<i>12MSP</i>	<i>13MSP</i>
Action 1	States Parties (SPs) that report having included Convention implementation activities in humanitarian response plans, peace promotion plans, development plans and/or poverty reduction strategies and other pertinent documents.	00	02	07	07
	SPs that report having enhanced national capacity or made national financial and/or other material commitments to the implementation of their outstanding obligations under the Convention.	12	14	16	15
Action 2	Affected SPs that report having adopted a comprehensive national strategy to fulfil implementation of obligations under the Convention.	04	07	08	09
	Affected SPs that report having developed annual work plans to implement their national strategy.	00	02	04	10
Action 3	Donor SPs that report providing financial or other support to affected SPs, including as part of partnerships.	22	22	23	24
	Donor SPs that report providing multi-year funding to affected SPs.	09	10	06	09
Action 5	Affected SPs that report having developed their national strategies and work plans in an inclusive manner, in particular by involving victims, including survivors, and affected communities.	08	08	09	09
	SPs including victims or their representatives in their delegations taking part in the Convention meetings.	00	01	00	01

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 6	Affected SPs that report having adapted or updated their national standards to address new challenges and ensure the employment of best practices, taking into account the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS).	00	04	07	09
Action 7	Affected SPs that report having a sustainable national information management system (for clearance) in place.	00	10	11	10
Action 8	SPs that report having coordinated their activities relating to the implementation of the Convention with actions undertaken in relation with mine action, international humanitarian law, human rights law and environmental protection instruments that they are party to, and with peacebuilding and sustainable development activities, as relevant.	00	00	00	04
Action 9	SPs that pay their assessed contributions no later than three months before the Meeting of States Parties or Review Conference.	39	28	29	26
	SPs that contribute to the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) budget.	52	61*	59*	70

* Figures updated to reflect the final number of States Parties that contributed to the ISU's annual budgets.

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

18. Based on information provided in Article 7 transparency reports and extension requests submitted during the period under review, seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Chad, Cuba, Iraq, Lebanon, Lao PDR, and South Sudan) indicated that activities related to the implementation of the Convention have been integrated into broader national frameworks, including humanitarian response plans, peacebuilding strategies, national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, and other relevant policy documents.

19. Four States Parties (Afghanistan, Colombia, Lao PDR, and Somalia) reported that implementation of their Convention obligations is being coordinated with efforts related to mine action, as well as with international obligations under international humanitarian law, human rights law, environmental protection frameworks, and sustainable development initiatives.

20. Among affected States Parties, nine (Afghanistan, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having adopted a comprehensive national strategy to guide implementation of their obligations under the Convention.

21. All ten States Parties with cluster munition contamination (Afghanistan, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having developed annual work plans aligned with their national strategy to support effective implementation.

22. Seventy States Parties (Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eswatini, France, Gambia, Germany, Guyana, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Samoa, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom, and Uruguay) contributed to the 2024 budget of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU).

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) What steps can States Parties take to proactively defend the Convention's norms, including through engagement with remaining signatories and States not party, particularly in response to recent withdrawal developments?
- (b) How can States Parties strengthen the implementation and reporting of victim assistance obligations, ensuring that support for cluster munition victims, including survivors and affected communities, receives sustained attention, particularly given its long-term and non-time-bound nature?
- (c) How can States Parties improve their efforts to synergise and coordinate activities related to the CCM, with mine action, international humanitarian law, human rights law, environmental protection, peacebuilding, and sustainable development efforts?
- (d) What measures can States Parties adopt to ensure sustainability, predictability, and ownership in funding the Convention and the ISU to maintain a financially sound Convention and effective machinery?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

23. Between the 10MSP and the 12MSP, the Guiding Principles –conceived as cross-cutting best practices under the LAP– have continued to inform States Parties' implementation efforts under the Convention. These guiding principles are not legally binding but are intended to shape how States Parties fulfil their commitments under the Convention. They aim to embed national ownership, foster sustainable solutions, ensure inclusivity, and integrate CCM actions into broader humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding efforts.

24. Throughout this period, States Parties have consistently reaffirmed the importance of these best practices in political discourse and official statements. However, the practical application of the Guiding Principles has been uneven, with modest progress in some areas and persistent challenges in others. While certain technical domains have advanced, e.g. aligning national standards with international norms, as described below, other dimensions – such as sustainable national ownership, victim participation, integration into broader national agendas, and financial predictability– continue to reveal significant gaps between rhetorical commitment and operational reality.

25. A persistent trend has been the gradual yet incomplete embedding of CCM obligations into broader national frameworks. While there is growing recognition among States Parties that cluster munition clearance, risk reduction, and victim assistance are essential to broader humanitarian and development goals, integration into national development plans, peacebuilding strategies, or poverty reduction frameworks has often remained superficial. In many cases, CCM activities continue to be planned and budgeted as isolated technical interventions rather than as part of a coordinated, multisectoral response. This approach limits opportunities to leverage wider political support, funding streams, and synergies that could enhance the sustainability and impact of the Convention's efforts.

26. National ownership remains a core aspect of the Guiding Principles, and political will among States Parties has –in general– been reaffirmed through public commitments and engagement in Convention processes. However, translating this political will into tangible national capacity and domestic financial investment remains a challenge. Many affected States Parties continue to depend heavily on external funding and technical assistance for core obligations such as clearance, victim assistance, and reporting. Where national capacity has improved, gains often remain vulnerable to changes in political leadership, security contexts, or shifting national priorities.

27. There has been a noticeable increase in the adoption of strategic planning tools among affected States Parties. The development of national strategies and, more recently, annual work plans has become more common, reflecting a growing understanding of the need for structured, time-bound approaches to implementation. However, the quality and practical utility of these tools varies considerably. In some contexts, strategies remain high-level policy statements without clear operational priorities, resource allocations, or defined timelines. Annual work plans, where they exist, sometimes lack strong national ownership, often due to limited national capacity, technical expertise, or financial resources, and are developed primarily with external support. As a result, they may risk being perceived as donor-driven exercises rather than domestically anchored frameworks.

28. Inclusion and participation, particularly of victims and affected communities, continue to be areas of significant concern. While many States Parties express strong rhetorical support for inclusive approaches, concrete mechanisms to ensure the meaningful participation of victims, whether in planning processes, decision-making structures, or official delegations, remain limited in practice. Barriers include financial constraints, a lack of institutional channels for consultation and broader structural challenges in political systems that do not routinely integrate civil society perspectives. As a result, victim participation remains more of an aspirational goal than a consistent practice across the Convention.

29. A more positive trend has emerged in the technical domain, where there has been clear progress in aligning national standards with international norms, notably the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). This reflects growing technical professionalism within national mine authorities and a willingness to adopt recognised best practices. However, the gap between adopting standards on paper and implementing them effectively in the field persists in some contexts, particularly where resources and technical expertise remain limited.

30. Similarly, progress has been evident in the development of national information management systems, which are increasingly recognised as critical tools for planning, monitoring, and reporting on both, clearance and risk education. Yet the sustainability of these systems remains an open question. Many rely on international technical support and external funding, making them vulnerable to resource fluctuations and staff turnover. Without sufficient national investment and capacity building, there is a risk that these gains could erode over time.

31. One of the weakest areas of implementation remains coordination with broader frameworks such as other disarmament instruments and processes, international humanitarian law, human rights mechanisms, environmental treaties, and sustainable development or peacebuilding agendas. Despite frequent references in official statements to the importance of synergies, practical intervention has been limited. CCM obligations continue to be addressed in relative isolation within national structures, missing opportunities for resource efficiency, political reinforcement, and cross-sectoral cooperation.

32. The financial sustainability of the Convention’s institutional framework, including the ISU, has shown both encouraging signs and worrying trends. There has been an increase in the number of States Parties making financial contributions to the ISU, reflecting a wider sense of shared responsibility. However, the overall level of funding has become increasingly volatile, with several traditional donors reducing contributions due to shifting global crises and budget pressures. Late or partial payments of assessed contributions further strain the ISU’s operational capacity, threatening its ability to provide consistent support to States

Parties and maintain the institutional functions essential for the Convention's effective implementation.

33. Across the board, the aggregated reporting periods have highlighted a persistent disconnect between political commitments and practical implementation. While the Guiding Principles remain deeply embedded in the Convention's identity and are regularly reaffirmed in public fora, significant operational and institutional gaps continue to undermine the full realisation of these commitments. The withdrawal of Lithuania from the Convention in March 2025 has further underscored the Convention's vulnerability to external security dynamics and serves as a stark reminder that political support cannot be taken for granted.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

34. As the CCM community approaches the 3RC, the emerging picture is one of a Convention that remains normatively robust whilst disclosing operational challenges in key areas. There is real and measurable progress in certain technical domains, yet fundamental challenges persist in ensuring sustainable national ownership, adequate resources, victim participation, and integration with broader policy frameworks. Without renewed collective efforts, there is a risk that the CCM's humanitarian promise will be weakened, undermining both its practical impact on affected communities and its moral authority.

35. Looking ahead to the 3RC, it will be essential for States Parties to translate the reaffirmed Guiding Principles into practical, sustained action. The period since the 10MSP has shown that while political support for the CCM remains high in discourse, significant gaps persist in operationalizing its cross-cutting best practices. The following considerations are offered for reflection by States Parties in the lead-up to the 3RC, to help bridge this gap and ensure the Convention remains a strong humanitarian instrument.

- *Reinforcing National Ownership as a Priority*

36. States Parties are encouraged to explore ways to integrate CCM implementation more explicitly into national budgets, institutional structures, and policy frameworks. This includes developing clear national policies that designate lead institutions, allocate dedicated financial resources, and provide for ongoing training and capacity building. While external assistance will continue to be critical for many States, increased national investments even on a modest scale would strengthen sustainability and signal long-term political commitment.

- *Translate High Level Strategies into Operational Planning*

37. There is a clear need to move beyond high-level strategies toward more detailed and operational planning. States Parties should be encouraged to develop annual work plans that translate strategic objectives into concrete activities with measurable timelines, responsibilities, and resource requirements. The 3RC could serve as a platform for sharing examples of effective national planning practices, helping to build confidence and capacity among States Parties still developing these processes.

- *Enhance Inclusivity*

38. Enhancing inclusivity remains crucial. States Parties should consider practical steps to facilitate the participation of victims and affected communities not only in national planning but also in regional and international CCM discussions. This could include providing dedicated resources for travel and accommodation of victim's representatives, as well as creating institutional mechanisms for consulting victims in policy development and monitoring. The Convention's humanitarian credibility depends significantly on ensuring that those directly affected by cluster munitions have a meaningful voice in shaping the response.

- *Continued Support for Technical Standards*

39. While progress in technical areas is evident, support for implementing technical standards must continue. States Parties that have updated national standards in line with the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) should be supported in ensuring these standards are effectively applied in the field and should be sustained. Peer-to-peer exchanges and regional workshops could help share practical experiences and solutions to common challenges, especially for States with limited technical capacity.

- *Deepen Integration with Broader International Agendas*

40. There is an urgent need to deepen integration with broader humanitarian development, and peacebuilding frameworks. The 3RC could encourage States Parties to identify specific entry points for including CCM objectives within national sustainable development strategies, reconstruction plans, and poverty reduction programmes. Stronger connections with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) framework could also help align CCM activities with broader funding and policy priorities, increasing both visibility and access to resources.

- *Address Institutional Sustainability*

41. Institutional sustainability remains a core concern. The 3RC should address the need for more predictable and stable funding for the ISU. States Parties might consider exploring multi-year funding commitments, revised contribution formulas, clarifications to the ISU's financial procedures, or other mechanisms to reduce the ISU's reliance on unpredictable voluntary contributions. Securing the ISU's financial stability is essential to preserving its capacity to provide substantive and technical support and in general, to deliver on its mandates.

- *Resilience*

42. Finally, the CCM community should be prepared to respond proactively to political and operational challenges that could threaten the Convention's normative strength. The 3RC might consider adopting guidance to help States Parties navigate future instances where geopolitical tensions or security crises could place obligations under strain. Lithuania's withdrawal underscores the need for contingency planning and collective strategies to maintain the Convention's credibility even under challenging circumstances. This includes proactive efforts by States Parties to promote universal adherence, engage remaining signatories and discourage any use, production or transfer of cluster munitions that run counter to the Convention's humanitarian aims.

B. Gender mainstreaming

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 4	SPs whose national work plans and strategies integrate gender and the diversity of populations.	01	02	06	12
	SPs with women presiding over the Convention.	04	04	05	05
	Women taking part in the Coordination Committee.	08	07	17	18
	Women in SPs' delegations attending Convention meetings.	104	81	85	98
	SP delegations headed by women.	22	24	18	25

1. Gender mainstreaming: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions

43. Seventeen States Parties (Afghanistan, Australia, Antigua and Barbuda, Belgium, Croatia, Cuba, Germany, Japan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, New Zealand, Norway, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) provided information using Form J of the amended CCM reporting template.

44. Five States Parties (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Iraq, and Somalia) reported on gender mainstreaming but did not use Form J to do so.

45. Eleven States Parties (Afghanistan, Australia, Chile, Cuba, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having gender-inclusive policies in their national recruitment practices (e.g., in mine action teams) for CCM implementation.
46. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) provided disaggregated information, including gender, in relation to their risk education efforts.
47. Nine States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) reported that their victim assistance databases contain disaggregated information, including by gender.
48. Twelve States Parties (Australia, Croatia, Cuba, Germany, Japan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Norway, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, and the United Kingdom) reported taking gender considerations into account in their participation in Convention meetings.
49. Five States Parties (Belgium, Germany, Lebanon, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom) reported providing assistance to specific projects with targeted actions related to gender and diversity.
50. At the Second Review Conference (2RC), States Parties decided that the Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention would also act as the Gender Focal Points to provide advice on gender mainstreaming and ensure the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities are considered in implementing the LAP, in cooperation with other thematic Coordinators.
51. During the period under review, the Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention / Gender Focal Points, (Austria and Germany) followed a three-track approach: (1) intensifying coordination with thematic Coordinators, (2) strengthening cooperation on gender and diverse needs with other disarmament conventions, especially the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC), and (3) initiating research on CCM gender issues with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).
52. On track 1, close engagement with other Coordinators was mainly achieved during and alongside the Coordination Committee meetings. On a broader scale, engagement with other thematic Coordinators was necessary in order to present a working paper on gender and diversity at the 12MSP, financed by Germany, which received support from 24 States Parties, and to secure the support of 36 States Parties for a joint statement on gender and diversity also presented at the 12MSP.
53. On track 2, the Coordinators contributed, upon invitation by Mexico, to an exchange on the proposal to designate Gender Focal Points within the framework of the Arms Trade Treaty. The aim of this exchange was to share good practices and experiences from other disarmament mechanisms, including the CCM, regarding Gender Focal Points. On 9 April, upon invitation by Ambassador Thomas Göbel of Germany, a discussion was held on gender-related structural and implementation issues relevant to both the CCM and APMBC. The Coordinators also participated in a briefing for Gender Focal Points held at the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) on 25 March, which introduced the Gender and Diversity in Mine Action Working Group and discussed planning and support from the GICHD Working Group.
54. On track 3, on 28 January, the Coordinators held a Germany-financed online workshop exploring options to enhance gender-sensitive victim assistance in the CCM and across other disarmament instruments, such as the APMBC. This event was part of a UNIDIR research project aimed at: (i) enhancing understanding of gender-sensitive and non-discriminatory victim assistance in disarmament; (ii) exploring the synergies and complementarities among disarmament instruments at the policy and programmatic levels; and (iii) identifying action-focused and specific recommendations for national and international policy makers and implementers. The results of the workshop and key findings of the study were presented by UNIDIR on 2 June.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) How can States Parties ensure greater and more meaningful participation of women in meetings of the Convention?
- (b) How can women's leadership be further fostered, for example, to take on roles in the Coordination Committee and to preside over the Convention?
- (c) How can States Parties better report on the gender mainstreaming provisions of the LAP? Currently, the emphasis is on quantitative, rather than qualitative shifts, as measured through "indicator results in numbers".

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

55. Gender mainstreaming has steadily gained prominence as a cross-cutting priority within the Convention's implementation framework, reflecting a broader recognition that gender dynamics significantly influence how individuals and communities experience the impact of cluster munitions. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP reporting cycles, the progress reports have documented growing awareness and commitment among States Parties to integrate gender considerations into their policies and programmes. However, these reports also make clear that translating policy commitments into consistent practice remains an ongoing challenge.

56. A positive trend has been the increased inclusion of gender-related references in national reporting, particularly in areas of victim assistance, risk education, and survey and clearance operations. Many States Parties have acknowledged that women, men, girls, and boys may face different vulnerabilities, needs, and roles and that programming must reflect these differences to be effective and equitable.

57. Progress reports have noted that States Parties increasingly cite gender and diversity as a guiding principle in implementing the LAP.

58. However, reporting over the past three cycles consistently highlights variation in the depth and quality of gender mainstreaming efforts. While some States Parties have taken concrete steps such as collecting disaggregated data, ensuring gender-balanced community engagement, or adapting risk education messages, others limit references to general policy statements without providing evidence of practical measures or results. This unevenness suggests that gender mainstreaming is often still viewed by some States Parties as an aspirational goal rather than an operational requirement.

59. Another trend documented in the Progress reports is that gender-disaggregated data remains limited. Despite calls in the LAP and repeated encouragement through the Convention's mechanisms, relatively few States Parties systematically collect, analyse, or report data disaggregated by sex and age. This gap hampers the ability to design tailored interventions and to measure the differential impacts of cluster munition contamination on diverse populations.

60. Additionally, reports note that capacity constraints remain a barrier. Many States Parties acknowledge the importance of integrating gender considerations but indicate they lack the technical expertise, resources or institutional guidance to operationalise gender mainstreaming effectively across all aspects of their Convention obligations.

61. Encouragingly, there have been examples of innovative approaches. Some States Parties and partners have reported incorporating gender considerations into community liaison practices, training manuals and standard operating procedures. A few reports also reference engaging women in operational roles, such as survey teams, demining units, or community outreach, though these examples remain relatively limited in number and detail.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

62. As the 3RC approaches, the Progress reports collectively suggest that while the normative framework for gender mainstreaming has been established, greater efforts are needed to embed gender considerations into practical implementation and to ensure that all affected populations benefit equally from the Convention's humanitarian promise. The following considerations are offered for reflection by States Parties in the lead-up to the 3RC.

- *Strengthen Data Collection and Reporting:*

Encourage States Parties to systematically collect, analyse, and report sex- and age-disaggregated data across all Convention-related activities, enabling more targeted and effective programming.

- *Operationalize Gender Mainstreaming:*

Promote the integration of gender considerations into national mine action-cluster munition strategies, standard operating procedures, and programme design, moving beyond policy statements to concrete measures and accountability.

- *Provide Technical Assistance and Training:*

Support States Parties with technical expertise, training, and tools to build institutional capacity for effective gender mainstreaming in the mine action sector and in relation to cluster munitions.

- *Share Good Practices and Lessons Learned:*

Facilitate exchanges among States Parties and partners to showcase practical examples of successful gender mainstreaming, enabling peer learning and adaptation of proven approaches in diverse contexts.

- *Ensure Inclusive Participation:*

Encourage States Parties to promote the meaningful participation of women and marginalized groups in decision-making processes, operational roles, and community engagement related to Convention implementation.

- *Emphasize the Cross-Cutting Nature of Gender considerations:*

Reinforce that gender considerations should not be treated as a standalone issue but must be integrated across all Convention pillars, including survey and clearance, risk education, victim assistance, and international cooperation.

C. Universalization

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 10	New SPs to the Convention.	00	01	01 ²	00
	States not party took part in the Meeting of States Parties.	16	14	12	13
	States not party submitted a voluntary Article 7 report.	02	01	00	00
Action 11	Confirmed cases of cluster munition use.	02	01	02	01
	States not party voted in favour of the CCM UNGA resolution.	37	32	36	31
	States not party that report having adopted moratoria on the use, development, production, stockpiling and transfer of cluster munitions or that report having destroyed their stockpiles of cluster munitions.	00	00	00	00

² The new State Party acceded to the Convention on 3 August 2023, which falls within the 12MSP Progress Report cycle (1 July 2023-30 June 2024), but prior to the 11MSP (11-14 September 2023). Therefore, its accession was reported in the 11MSP Final Report.

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
	Dedicated meetings with States not party to the Convention still relying on cluster munitions.	00	00	03	00

1. *Universalization: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions*

63. As of 30 June 2025, a total of 123 States have committed to the CCM through signature, ratification or accession. Of these, 111 are States Parties whilst twelve States are signatories. One State Party (Lithuania) deposited its notification of withdrawal on 6 September 2024. In accordance with Article 20.3 of the Convention, the withdrawal took effect on 6 March 2025.

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

65. Four signatories participated at the 12MSP (Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania).

66. Thirteen States not party participated at the 12MSP (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Finland, Morocco, Myanmar, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Thailand, Türkiye, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, and Zimbabwe).

67. The 2024 United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution on the “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions” was adopted with 121 States voting in favour, including 31 States not party (Algeria, Armenia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, People’s Republic of China, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Yemen). This marked the lowest number of States voting in favour of the annual CCM resolution since its introduction in 2015. A total of 38 UN Member States, including 23 that have previously supported the resolution, were absent during the vote.

68. Iraq, in its capacity as Coordinator of the Arab Group for Disarmament, in cooperation with the 13MSP Presidency, the ICRC and the ISU, convened a focused discussion on the Convention on Cluster Munitions with Arab Group States on 10 February. The event aimed to foster dialogue on the humanitarian and security rationales of the Convention, raise regional awareness and explore pathways toward increased engagement from Arab States not yet party. The initiative was an important step in reactivating regional conversations on the CCM and creating space for future diplomatic follow-up.

69. In its capacity as Presidency of the 13MSP, the Philippines organized and hosted the Southeast Asia and Pacific Regional Workshop on the Convention on Cluster Munitions, from 18 to 19 March 2025 in Manila. The workshop was a major milestone in CCM universalization efforts, addressing the humanitarian, developmental, and security challenges posed by cluster munitions in the region. It provided a unique platform for open dialogue, peer exchange, and regional confidence building.

70. The event brought together 48 representatives from 21 Southeast Asian and Pacific Island States not yet party to the Convention, including senior officials, technical experts, civil society and diplomats. Their active engagement underscored both the relevance of the Convention in regional disarmament discussions and the importance of tailored outreach. Several States Parties – Austria, Lao PDR, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, and Switzerland – participated to share lessons learned and reaffirm their commitment to supporting universalization efforts in the region. Civil society and international stakeholders, notably the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), contributed expertise and strategic perspectives. The workshop was recognised as timely and impactful, helping catalyse renewed interest in the Convention and opening space for future

engagement by several States not party and signatories. A working paper summarizing outcomes and follow up recommendations will be issued by the 13MSP Presidency.

71. The Coordinators (Norway and Peru), organized two meetings of the Informal Working Group on Universalization, aimed at enhancing coordination among interested States Parties and identifying avenues for outreach to States not party. It is the Coordinators' goal to increase the meeting frequency of the group during the next work cycle.

72. The Coordinators conducted démarches in some signatory States encouraging them to ratify the Convention, including joint démarches in Kenya and Indonesia, where both Norway and Peru have diplomatic missions. The aim is to conduct additional démarches in other signatory States over the next months.

73. In March 2025, the Coordinators held a meeting with the Secretariat of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) to continue to explore avenues of cooperation and opportunities to raise awareness about the CCM in IPU meetings. The Coordinators will continue their dialogue with the IPU Secretariat to identify possible joint activities to promote the Convention to parliamentarians.

74. The Coordinators also participated in the event "Amplifying Pacific Voices in the Conventional Weapons Disarmament" organized by the Permanent Missions of Australia and Japan on 2 April. The event brought together representatives of the Geneva-based Permanent Missions of Pacific States to discuss opportunities, challenges, and engagement with the conventional disarmament conventions in the Pacific region.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

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

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

75. Universalization has remained a central priority for the Convention since its adoption, reflecting both its humanitarian imperative and the need to fully consolidate the global norm against the use of cluster munitions. Across the 10MSP to the 12MSP reporting cycles, progress reports have documented a mixed landscape of achievements and ongoing challenges, underlining that while the Convention's normative power is still acknowledged, significant work remains to bring all States under its legal framework and to reaffirm its value.

76. As of mid-2025, there were 111 States Parties to the Convention, following Lithuania's withdrawal on 06 March 2025, the first such occurrence under Article 20. While the withdrawal is legally permissible, it introduces new normative and political challenges and raises concerns about the Convention's resilience in shifting security contexts and discourses.

77. Moreover, the pace of new accessions/ratifications has slowed in recent years, as documented consistently in the Progress reports. Several States that have expressed political support for the Convention or voted in favour of the relevant UN General Assembly resolution have not yet taken steps to accede or ratify. Progress reports repeatedly note that while there is broad condemnation of cluster munitions, translating political support into legal commitments remains a significant challenge, particularly in regions where security concerns, regional dynamics, or defence relationships, influence national decisions.

78. Another trend is the persistent regional disparities in universalization. While the Convention has broad membership in Europe, Latin America, and parts of Africa, significant gaps remain in the Middle East and some parts of the Pacific. Progress reports have highlighted that geopolitical tensions, security concerns, and competing regional priorities have slowed universalization efforts in these areas. States in conflict-affected regions or with

complex security environments often cite perceived military utility of cluster munitions, or concerns over regional balance, as obstacles to accession.

79. Progress reports also indicate that outreach efforts have continued throughout the past three MSP cycles, led by States Parties, the ISU and stakeholders. Diplomatic engagement, bilateral dialogues and regional workshops have been instrumental in maintaining dialogue with States not party. Nonetheless, reports suggest that resource constraints and competing diplomatic priorities have sometimes limited the scale and intensity of universalization activities.

80. Progress reports consistently highlight the importance of sustaining political momentum and high-level advocacy. As time passes since the Convention's entry into force, maintaining visibility and political will for universalization has become more challenging, particularly amid competing global crises and national priorities. Progress reports warn that without renewed, consistent efforts, the momentum generated in the Convention's early years may diminish, slowing further accessions.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

81. Looking ahead to the 3RC, universalization remains both a legal obligation and a strategic priority. The humanitarian imperative of eliminating the suffering caused by cluster munitions, combined with the broad security benefits of norm consolidation, underscores the need for continued, coordinated, consistent and innovative efforts to expand the Convention's reach. States Parties may wish to consider the following actions:

- *Intensify High-Level Political Engagement:*

Encourage States Parties and stakeholders to undertake renewed high-level diplomatic outreach to signatories and States not party, emphasising both the humanitarian imperative and the security benefits of joining the Convention.

- *Tailor Regional Strategies:*

Promote region-specific universalization strategies that address unique security, political, and cultural factors influencing decisions about accession or ratification.

- *Engage States not party on Practical Benefits:*

Highlight the practical benefits of joining the Convention, including support for clearance, victim assistance, and international cooperation opportunities, which can address humanitarian and development priorities in affected States.

- *Consistently Leverage the Normative Power of the Convention:*

Encourage States Parties to continue public condemnation of any use of cluster munitions, reinforcing the global stigma and increasing political costs for continued non-adherence.

- *Facilitate Peer-to-Peer Dialogue:*

Support opportunities for dialogue between States Parties and States not party enabling the sharing of experiences and addressing specific concerns or misconceptions about Convention obligations.

- *Sustain Visibility and Advocacy:*

Invest in partnerships to maintain the Convention's visibility in international fora, ensuring universalization remains a priority amid shifting global agendas.

- *Provide Technical and Legal Support:*

Identify and offer tailored technical assistance to States not party interested in accession but facing domestic legal, technical, or policy hurdles, including support in legislative drafting and treaty accession processes.

D. Stockpile destruction

<i>LAP</i>	<i>INDICATORS</i>	<i>10MSP</i>	<i>11MSP</i>	<i>12MSP</i>	<i>13MSP</i>
Action 12	SPs with outstanding Article 3 obligations that have developed a destruction plan.	03	03	03	00
	SPs with outstanding Article 3 obligations reported on progress made.	04	04	04	00
Action 13	SPs having completed obligations and made an official declaration of compliance.	00	01	04	00
Action 14	SPs discovered previously unknown stockpiles and reported such findings through established channels.	01	00	00	01
Action 15	Article 3 extension requests – with detailed, costed multi-year work plans for the extension period.	02	02	00	00
Action 16	SPs provided information on their experience of the stockpile destruction process.	03	03	03	01
Action 17	SPs reported retaining or acquiring cluster munitions and/or explosive sub-munitions under, and the quantity of cluster munitions and explosive sub-munitions retained, under Article 3.6. These measures are understood within the context of Article 3.6 as solely for the “development of and training in, cluster munition and explosive submunition detection, clearance or destruction techniques, or for the development of cluster munition counter-measures”.	13	12	10	10
	Retained cluster munitions and/or explosive submunitions destroyed by States Parties.	226 / 15,497	199 / 15,539	41 / 4,034	21 / 1,328

1. *Stockpile destruction: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions*

82. All forty-one States Parties with obligations to destroy cluster munition stockpiles under Article 3 have declared completion, including fifteen that did so prior to the Convention’s entry into force for them.

83. Two States Parties (Peru and South Africa) that declared compliance in 2023 presented their declarations of compliance to the 12MSP in September 2024. Neither State Party has retained any cluster munitions for purposes permitted under Article 3.6.

84. One State Party (Peru) shared its experiences in stockpile destruction, including the challenges faced, the extension request that was submitted and granted, and the combination of national efforts with assistance from two States Parties (Germany and Norway) which contributed to the successful completion of its obligations.

85. During the reporting period, ten States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland) had retained cluster munitions in accordance with Article 3.6. Of these, nine (all except Bosnia and Herzegovina) submitted their 2024 annual reports.

86. One State Party (Switzerland) submitted updated annual reports for 2022 and 2023 containing revised information on its retained cluster munitions.

87. Two States Parties (Germany and Sweden) reported the use of retained cluster munitions in 2024, thereby reducing their retained stocks, for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) training.

88. One State Party (France) reported having acquired and used one explosive submunition for the development of neutralisation techniques, as permitted under Article 3.6.

89. Six States Parties (Bulgaria, Cameroon, Denmark, Netherlands, Spain, and Switzerland) reported no reduction in their retained cluster munitions during the reporting period.

90. One State Party (Denmark) reported allocating national resources for the destruction of its retained cluster munitions.

91. One State Party (Cameroon) has requested assistance for the destruction of its retained cluster munitions but has not yet received support.

92. One State Party (Afghanistan) reported that all its known cluster munition stockpiles were destroyed in 2014. However, some abandoned and residual cluster munitions were later identified in its stocks and subsequently destroyed during EOD operations.

93. One State Party (Italy) reported that cluster munitions transferred from Bulgaria for the purpose of destruction, in accordance with Article 3.7, were completely destroyed in April 2024.

94. During the reporting period, the Coordinator on Stockpile Destruction (Zambia), reported that a document had been drafted that provides an update on the implementation of Article 3 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The document focuses on stockpile destruction and retention for permitted purposes as of 2024 and primarily addresses the achievements, challenges, and recommendations concerning the implementation of CCM Article 3.

95. The document notes that, as of 2024, a significant milestone has been reached, with nearly 1.5 million cluster munitions and 179 million submunitions destroyed by States Parties. It also highlights ongoing challenges, including the continued stockpiling, transfer, and reported use of cluster munitions by some States not party, which undermines the norms established by the Convention. Concerns are also raised about the minimal or no progress reported by certain States in the use or destruction of retained stockpiles, particularly with regard to compliance with the requirement to retain only the “minimum number absolutely necessary”.

96. The document’s key recommendations include:

- Encouraging regular reporting on cluster munitions;
- Clarifying intentions regarding the use of retained munitions;
- Reducing retained stockpiles;
- Monitoring practices to ensure non-use;

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) What have been the lessons learnt by States Parties with current or completed Article 3 obligations, and how can these be shared to benefit others, including those retaining cluster munitions for permitted purposes?
- (b) How can States Parties retaining cluster munitions ensure that the quantity retained does not exceed the minimum absolutely necessary, in line with Article 3.6? What mechanisms or practices help support this determination?

- (c) How can States Parties retaining cluster munitions improve transparency in reporting under Article 3.8, particularly regarding the planned and actual use, types, quantities, and transfers for permitted purposes?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

97. Stockpile destruction has been one of the Convention's most notable successes, contributing directly to eliminating future risks to civilians and reinforcing the global norm against the use of cluster munitions. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP reporting cycles, Progress reports have documented continued progress in destroying stockpiled cluster munitions, while also highlighting emerging issues that require attention as States Parties approach the 3RC.

98. As of mid-2025, all 41 States Parties with stockpile destruction obligations have completed destruction of their declared cluster munition stockpiles, eliminating millions of submunitions from potential future use.

99. Despite the overall success in stockpile destruction, challenges persist: Some States Parties continue to report retention of large numbers of submunitions for permitted purposes under Article 3.6, such as the development of detection, clearance, and destruction techniques or for training in such techniques. While retention itself is permitted, the reports consistently highlight concerns about the quantities retained, which in some cases appear high relative to the stated purposes. Moreover, information on the use of retained submunitions and on how quantities are reviewed and reduced has often been limited or absent in States Parties' transparency reports. This lack of detail has raised questions about whether all retained stocks remain strictly necessary and whether States Parties are fulfilling their obligations to keep these stocks to the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes.

100. Positively, some States Parties have reported reductions in the quantities of retained cluster munitions, reflecting a commitment to minimizing holdings in line with the Convention's spirit. Others have confirmed that they no longer retain any cluster munitions at all, having completed their training or research objectives.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

101. The 3RC offers a crucial opportunity to preserve the CCM's prohibition norm and demonstrate that stockpile destruction is not only a technical exercise but a foundational commitment to humanitarian disarmament.

102. To consolidate the Convention's humanitarian gains and ensure robust implementation in the next review cycle, the following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Promote Transparency on Retained Stocks:*

Urge States Parties retaining cluster munitions for permitted purposes to provide detailed information in their transparency reports on the types, quantities, and specific uses of retained submunitions, as well as on measures to keep these stocks to the absolute minimum necessary.

- *Maintain Vigilance on Newly Discovered Stocks:*

Encourage States Parties to report promptly on any newly discovered stockpiles, ensuring transparency and timely planning for their safe destruction.

- *Share Good Practices:*

Promote the sharing of lessons learned and good practices in safe and efficient stockpile destruction, including successful experiences in managing retention for permitted purposes.

- *Address Fluctuations in Retained Quantities:*

Several States Parties have reported changes in retention figures without adequate explanation, creating uncertainty about inventory controls and actual operational needs.

- *Assess Practical Alternatives:*

Few States Parties have reported having explored alternatives to retaining live cluster munitions, such as using inert or simulated items for training.

- *Residual Contamination vs. Stockpiles:*

A distinction needs to be maintained between isolated munitions discovered during clearance operations and actual stockpiles retained for operational purposes under Article 3.6.

- *Reaffirmation of the Concept of Minimal Retention:*

States Parties should reaffirm politically and in their national policies that retention under Article 3.6 should be strictly limited to the minimum quantity necessary for permitted purposes.

E. Survey and clearance

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 18	Affected SPs reported completing an evidence-based and inclusive baseline survey.	08	08	09	08
	Affected SPs marked their hazardous area.	09	09	10	09
Action 19	Affected SPs reported developing evidence-based national strategies and work plans.	08	08	09	09
	Affected SPs reported detailed progress in implementing strategies and plans.	09	08	09	09
Action 20	SPs submitted Article 4 extension requests with detailed, costed work plans for the extension period.	03	01	02	05
Action 21	Affected SPs reported promoting research, application and sharing of innovative methodologies.	01	02	03	05
	Affected SPs reported progress in the effectiveness and efficiency of surveys and clearance.	09	08	09	09
Action 22	Affected SPs reported national strategies and work plans providing for the establishment of sustainable national capacity to address residual contamination.	04	05	06	10
Action 23	Affected SPs reported including humanitarian and sustainable development considerations in survey and clearance planning and prioritisation, in line with the SDGs.	00	02	02	03
	Affected SPs reported including gender and the diversity of populations in survey and clearance planning and prioritisation.	03	03	06	09
Action 24	Affected SPs reported providing disaggregated information on	08	08	09	09

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
	remaining cluster munition contaminated areas and on progress in survey and clearance efforts.				
Action 25	SPs reported completing Article 4 obligations and submitted voluntary declarations of compliance.	00	00	01	00
Action 26	SPs reported sharing experiences and lessons learnt.	02	02	03	13

1. *Survey and clearance: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions*

103. A total of eighteen States Parties have reported obligations to clear and destroy cluster munition remnants under Article 4, of which eight have declared completion, including two that had done so prior to the Convention's entry into force.

104. There are currently ten States Parties with cluster munition contaminated areas under their jurisdiction or control: Afghanistan, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan.

105. Nine of these affected States (Afghanistan, Chad, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) have submitted their 2024 annual reports with updates on survey and clearance.

106. Five States Parties (Afghanistan, Chile, Lebanon, Mauritania, and Somalia) also provided relevant updates through their Article 4 extension requests submitted for consideration at the 13MSP.

107. During the period under review, extension requests submitted by three States Parties (Chad, Germany, and Lao PDR) were considered and granted at the 12MSP.

108. Eight affected States Parties (Afghanistan, Chile, Germany, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) reported progress in land release through non-technical survey (NTS), technical survey (TS) and/or clearance in 2024. One State Party (Somalia) provided information on land release achieved in previous years, while another (Chad) indicated that no progress had been made due to financial constraints.

109. One State Party (Chad) is expected to submit its extension request during the following work cycle.

110. Nine of the ten affected States Parties reported having national standards for survey and clearance that are aligned with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). One affected State Party (Germany) reported relying on its own national regulatory framework, which it considers sufficient and binding, and noted that IMAS does not apply to its clearance operations.

111. Affected States Parties reported that survey and clearance efforts were further complicated by factors such as high-density and widespread contamination (Iraq and Lao PDR); difficult terrain (Lebanon and Mauritania); desert conditions (Chad and Mauritania); dense vegetation and environmental concerns (Germany); security constraints (Iraq, Somalia, and South Sudan); and adverse weather conditions (Afghanistan, Chad, Germany, Mauritania, and South Sudan). However, the most significant hurdle for almost all affected States Parties remains the lack of financial resources.

112. Of the nine affected States Parties (Afghanistan, Chad, Chile, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) that had requested assistance for survey and clearance, only seven (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having received such support.

113. All ten affected States Parties reported allocating national resources to survey and clearance. However, two of these States (Somalia and South Sudan) reported difficulties in accessing national funds and indicated that they are fully dependent on international support.

114. There is currently one country coalition in place (Lebanon) to support its Article 4 implementation. Four States Parties with outstanding Article 4 obligations (Chad, Chile, Mauritania, and Somalia) have indicated an interest in establishing similar coalitions.

115. One State Party (Lithuania),³ while not an affected State Party under Article 4 of the Convention, reported ongoing national efforts to reduce contamination by explosive remnants of war (ERW), including submunitions, resulting from past conflicts and Soviet-era military activities.

116. The Coordinators on Clearance (France and Italy) conducted and participated in the work of the Analysis Group, which brought together the Coordinators on Clearance, the Coordinator on Risk Education, the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance, the ISU, and organizations with relevant expertise and demining experts. The Analysis Group examined the extension requests submitted by States Parties to decontaminate their territories, relying on strict criteria to ensure that the requests were sufficiently detailed. This work would not have been possible without the support and experience of the ISU and the extensive expertise of civil society partners.

117. During the period under review, five States submitted extension requests: Afghanistan, Chile, Lebanon, Mauritania, and Somalia.

118. During the year, the Coordinators engaged with Mine Action Review to produce a working paper dedicated to the inclusion of environmental aspects in demining work plans. In this document, States Parties are encouraged to build on current momentum and ensure that environmental and climate responsibility becomes embedded in every aspect of mine action. The 3RC will be a pivotal moment to reflect on today's environmental and climate change realities and chart a sustainable path forward for the Convention.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States with legacy contamination to finish their Article 4 obligations by their respective deadlines?
- (b) How can States Parties and other implementation actors assist in mobilising funds required for affected States to eliminate the threat from cluster munitions and meet Convention obligations?
- (c) What other challenges are affected States facing related to Convention compliance, and what is the role of the international community in helping to eliminate the threat from cluster munitions and ensuring compliance with the Convention?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

119. Survey and clearance of cluster munition remnants remain central to the humanitarian objectives of the Convention directly contributing to saving lives, facilitating safe land use, and enabling development. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP reporting cycles, Progress reports have documented meaningful advances in survey methodologies and clearance outputs, while also highlighting persistent challenges that will require focused attention as States Parties approach the 3RC.

120. As of mid-2025, 28 States Parties have been identified at various points as having obligations under Article 4, of which seventeen States Parties have completed clearance and declared themselves free of known cluster munition remnants since the Convention's entry

³ Lithuania deposited its notification of withdrawal from the CCM on 06 September 2024. In accordance with Article 20.3 of the Convention, the withdrawal took effect on 06 March 2025.

into force.⁴ Encouragingly, several States Parties have reported substantial advances in national surveys, allowing more precise definition of contaminated areas and more efficient planning of clearance operations.

121. A significant positive trend has been the increasing adoption of evidence-based survey methodologies to more accurately define the extent of cluster munition contamination. Several affected States Parties have reported successful use of non-technical survey techniques, leading to reductions in estimated contaminated areas and enabling more efficient allocation of clearance resources. This shift from broad estimates to more precise definitions of hazardous areas has been repeatedly highlighted in the Progress reports as a hallmark of progress under the LAP.

122. Clearance achievements, as mentioned above, have also been notable during the reporting periods. These successes underscore the commitment and technical capacity of national mine action authorities and implementing partners.

123. However, challenges remain significant. Across all three Progress reports, several States Parties have reported delays in meeting clearance deadlines, often citing factors such as ongoing insecurity, difficult terrain, funding shortfalls, or newly identified contamination. In some cases, States Parties have sought or signalled the need for Article 4 extensions, reflecting the reality that initial clearance timelines were overly optimistic or that new challenges have emerged since original estimates were made.

124. Another persistent issue is the variability in the quality and completeness of reporting on survey and clearance activities. While some States Parties provide detailed annual figures on land release, methods used and challenges encountered, others offer minimal data or general statements without precise figures, hindering collective understanding of global progress and resource needs.

125. The Progress reports have also highlighted the impact of funding constraints on survey and clearance operations. Several affected States Parties have reported that financial limitations have forced them to scale back operations, delay planned surveys, or limit clearance to priority areas, leaving some contaminated land unaddressed.

126. Additionally, there is an emerging recognition that survey and clearance efforts must be closely integrated with broader development planning and community needs. The LAP emphasizes the importance of ensuring that land release translates into tangible socioeconomic benefits for affected communities, yet reporting suggests that the connection between clearance outcomes and development impacts remains insufficiently documented in many contexts.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

127. As the 3RC approaches, consolidating gains in survey methodologies, ensuring sustainable funding and improving reporting quality will be critical to sustaining momentum towards meeting Article 4 obligations and maximizing the humanitarian and development benefits of clearance. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Continue Promoting Evidence-Based Survey Practices:*

Encourage all affected States Parties to continue implementing non-technical and technical survey methodologies to better define contaminated areas and prioritize clearance resources effectively.

- *Strengthen Reporting Quality:*

Advocate for more detailed and consistent reporting on survey and clearance outputs, including specific figures on land released, methods used, challenges encountered, and socio-economic impacts.

⁴ Figures vary slightly across official CCM reports and external sources depending on updated survey results, contamination status changes, and differences in counting methodology. The numbers cited reflect approximate totals as of mid-2025.

- *Continue Supporting Realistic Planning and Extension Requests:*

Encourage States Parties facing delays to develop realistic plans for remaining contamination, including submitting well-justified, evidence-based Article 4 Extension Requests where necessary, accompanied by clear timelines and resource requirements.

- *Strengthen the linkage of Clearance with Development Goals:*

Promote stronger links between survey and clearance activities and national development plans, ensuring that released land contributes meaningfully to socio-economic recovery and community wellbeing.

- *Mobilize Sustainable Funding:*

Urge donors and partners to maintain or increase financial support for survey and clearance operations, recognising that sustained funding is essential to achieving Article 4 obligations and reducing humanitarian risks.

- *Facilitate Exchange of Good Practices:*

Encourage knowledge sharing among States Parties and operators on innovative survey and clearance techniques, efficiency improvements, and strategies for working in challenging operational environments.

- *Assess the operationalisation of the “Country Coalition” mechanism in the CCM and its Impact so far.*

- *Strengthen Regional Cooperation and Coalitions, foster partnerships among affected States Parties to:*

- Share technical expertise and lessons learned.
- Pool resources and develop regional capacity.
- Engage in joint fundraising efforts for clearance.

- *Consider expanding the mandate of the Article 4 Analysis Group to not only assess extension requests but also to systematically review extension patterns and identify systematic obstacles to timely clearance.*

F. Risk education

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 27	Affected SPs reported integrating risk education into national strategies and work plans on survey, clearance and victim assistance.	08	08	10	10
Action 28	Affected SPs reported on tailor-made risk education activities in annual reports.	08	06	08	09
Action 29	Affected SPs provided detailed, disaggregated reporting focused on most at risk groups.	05	05	06	07
	Affected SPs reported on measures to better understand impact of risk education, including in terms of behavioural change.	00	04	05	05
Action 30	Affected SPs reported on national strategies and work plans that include capacity to address residual	04	06	07	10

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
	contamination and with a risk education component.				

1. *Risk education: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions*

128. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) provided detailed disaggregated data by gender, age, and disability in relation to their risk education efforts.

129. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having or developing national standards for risk education, aligned with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS).

130. Six States Parties (Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) requested assistance for risk education in their transparency reports, while seven (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having received such support.

131. Nine States Parties (Afghanistan, Croatia, Cuba, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported allocating national resources to risk education. However, two of these States (Somalia and South Sudan) reported on difficulties in accessing national funds and indicated that they are fully dependent on international support.

132. Nine States Parties (Afghanistan, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) reported conducting risk education targeting children, youth or educational settings.

133. Ten States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported delivering risk education through locally adapted or community-based approaches.

134. Ten States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cuba, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported using mass media or public communication tools to broaden the reach of risk education.

135. One State Party (Chile) reported not having the need to carry out risk education activities for the civilian population, as no cluster munition casualties have ever been recorded and the remnants are located in remote, military areas inaccessible to civilians. However, risk education is planned for personnel involved in explosive ordnance disposal operations.

136. One State Party (Colombia) reported implementing risk education as part of its national strategy on mine action and distributed educational material to military personnel to raise awareness of the Convention and international humanitarian law.

137. One State Party (Cuba) reported that, although it has no areas contaminated with cluster munitions, risk education is provided through national media, educational curricula, and awareness-raising activities by NGOs and academic institutions, with a focus on international humanitarian law and the Convention.

138. One State Party (France) reported supporting international risk education projects in 2024 through its Crisis and Support Centre, while domestic activities remained on hold.

139. Lao People's Democratic Republic, as the first country to serve as Coordinator on risk education under the CCM, has played an important role in engaging with States Parties and relevant stakeholders to underscore the importance of risk education as a cornerstone of the collective efforts under the Convention's implementation. This work aims to protect civilians from the devastating impacts of cluster munition remnants and supports the broader humanitarian goals of the Convention.

140. In this context, the Coordinator presented its work plan and participated as a panellist in the Stakeholders' Dialogue on risk education during the CCM Intersessional Meeting held

on 8–9 April 2025. The discussions highlighted risk education as the primary tool for preventing civilian casualties, especially in situations where clearance activities have been scaled back.

141. To further implement the work plan, the Coordinator, with the support of the GICHD and the ISU, organized a hybrid workshop titled “From National Ownership to National Leadership in Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE)” on 16 June 2025. This workshop provided a platform for States Parties to exchange experiences, approaches, and innovations aimed at strengthening national leadership in this area. Participants showcased practical, nationally driven examples of how they have prioritized and developed risk education interventions under their own leadership. The event emphasized structural and strategic approaches, highlighting how countries are leading and innovating in the design, implementation, and improvement of such programmes, while also encouraging the development of context-specific resource mobilisation strategies.

142. Recognising the importance of risk education within the Convention’s framework, the Coordinator has also drafted a dedicated working paper to facilitate further discussion on this topic. The working paper will be presented at the 13MSP.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) How can States Parties ensure the sustainability of risk education programmes in the face of declining international funding and delayed clearance operations?
- (b) What practical steps can be taken to improve the integration of EORE with other sectors, such as education, health, disaster risk reduction, and displacement response?
- (c) How can States Parties strengthen the quality, reach, and adaptability of EORE through digital tools, behavioural change approaches, and local capacity building?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

143. Over the past three cycles, risk education remained a critical pillar of the Convention’s humanitarian objectives, aimed at preventing harm, even more so today, when in some contexts of active conflicts, it remains the only tangible measure for civilian protection.

144. A significant milestone was achieved at the 12MSP, where a standalone risk education coordinator role was officially established for the first time in a humanitarian disarmament convention. This decision represents a major advancement in recognising risk education as a distinct and essential component of humanitarian response and treaty implementation, providing a dedicated platform for sharing expertise, tracking progress, and promoting innovation.

145. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP periods, several initial trends have become clear, revealing both steady progress and persistent gaps that deserve focused attention as States Parties prepare for the 3RC.

146. A positive trend is the sustained commitment among affected States to deliver risk education activities, often integrated into broader mine action programmes. Affected States have regularly reported conducting sessions aimed at communities living in or near contaminated areas. These efforts have helped maintain awareness of the risks posed by cluster munitions remnants, contributing to reduced accidents in some contexts.

147. However, despite this commitment, significant challenges remain. The level of detail provided in States Parties’ reports varies widely, with many submissions offering only general statements rather than precise data. Few States Parties systematically report disaggregated data –by age, gender, risk group, or geographic coverage– limiting the ability to assess how effectively programmes are reaching the most vulnerable populations.

148. Moreover, measuring the impact of risk education remains a persistent gap. While activities are often listed in reports, there is minimal information on how these interventions translate into safer behaviours, risk reduction, or measurable declines in incidents. As a result, it is difficult to gauge the effectiveness of risk education efforts over time.

149. Funding constraints are another recurring theme. Several States Parties have noted that financial resources for risk education have been inconsistent or insufficient, leading to interruptions in programming or an inability to expand activities to newly identified at-risk areas. In some contexts, risk education activities remain heavily dependent on external support, raising questions about sustainability.

150. On the positive side, there are signs of innovation. Some States Parties have begun experimenting with new tools and methods, including digital platforms, and social media messaging, and tailored materials for specific communities. Yet these promising approaches are seldom documented in sufficient detail for wider replication or learning.

151. Finally, national coordination remains uneven. While certain States Parties have established strong partnerships among national authorities, operators and community stakeholders, in other contexts risk education is still implemented as isolated activities, risking duplication of efforts and gaps in coverage.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

152. As States Parties start preparing for the 3RC, there is a clear opportunity to address these gaps and ensure that risk education evolves into a more evidence-based, targeted, and sustainable pillar of the Convention's work. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Strengthen Reporting Quality and Data Collection:*

Encourage States Parties to provide more detailed and disaggregated information on risk education activities, including data on beneficiaries reached, risk behaviour change indicators, and coverage of marginalized groups.

- *Promote Measurement of Impact:*

Recommend that States Parties develop simple but systematic methods to assess the effectiveness of risk education interventions, moving beyond activity counts to measure actual outcomes such as changes in community knowledge, attitudes, or risk behaviours.

- *Integrate Risk Education to Broader Frameworks:*

Support integration of risk education into national education systems, health services, and local governance structures, to ensure sustainability and reduce reliance on external funding.

- *Facilitate Exchange of Good Practices:*

Create opportunities, possibly through dedicated sessions at the 3RC, for States Parties and stakeholders to share innovative approaches, lessons learned, and tools that have proven effective in diverse contexts.

- *Enhance Coordination mechanisms:*

Encourage affected States to strengthen national coordination platforms involving all relevant actors to avoid duplication, harmonise messaging, and better target at-risk populations.

G. **Victim assistance**

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 31	SPs reported collecting and analysing data disaggregated by gender, age and disability.	07	07	09	09
Action 32	SPs reported addressing the needs of cluster munition victims in national policies and legal frameworks aligned to the SDGs & CRPD.	03	03	04	07

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 33	SPs reported having a measurable national action plan in place.	07	08	08	09
	SPs reported designating a national focal point for VA coordinating.	12	11	12	12
Action 34	SPs provided emergency and continuing medical care to victims.	07	07	10	10
	SPs reported having well-functioning rehabilitation, psychological and psychosocial services, which are accessible, age and gender-sensitive.	07	07	08	08
Action 35	SPs reported on efforts to improve the socio-economic inclusion of cluster munition victims.	07	07	09	09
Action 36	States reported National laws and policies addressing victim assistance and developed with the inclusion of cluster munition victims.	06	06	09	09
	SPs included cluster munition victims in their delegations.	00	01	00	01
Action 37	SPs reported supporting the training of victim assistance professionals.	05	05	08	08
	SPs reported provision of victim assistance by qualified personnel.	09	09	12	12

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

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

154. Nine of these States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, and South Sudan) have submitted their 2024 annual report with updates on victim assistance. Two States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Somalia) provided relevant updates through other official channels during the period under review.

155. During the reporting period, two of the twelve States Parties with cluster munition victims (Lebanon and South Sudan) ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), meaning all twelve of these States now also parties to the CRPD.

156. Four States Parties (Afghanistan, Iraq, Lao PDR and Mauritania) reported new cluster munition victims during the period under review. Three States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Lebanon) reported on existing cluster munition victims, which may include new victims, although none were explicitly identified. Three States Parties (Albania, Somalia, and South Sudan) explicitly reported that no new cluster munition victims were recorded during the reporting period.

157. Three States Parties (Afghanistan, Iraq, and Lebanon) reported having or developing national standards for victim assistance, aligned with International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). One State Party (South Sudan) indicated that it had not yet developed such national standards and identified this as an area requiring external support.

158. One State Party (South Sudan) reported that although it has a draft national disability law under review, the absence of a legal framework for victim assistance remained a challenge. It also highlighted the need for further training of rehabilitation professionals.

159. Of the nine States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) that had taken measures to obtain international cooperation and assistance for victim assistance, only six (Afghanistan, Albania, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) reported having received such support.

160. One State Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina), although it had not requested assistance reported having received support for victim assistance.

161. Eleven States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Cuba, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported allocating national resources to victim assistance. However, two of these States (Somalia and South Sudan) reported difficulties in accessing national funds and indicated that they are fully dependent on international support.

162. One State Party (Chad) reported conducting awareness-raising activities on the risks of explosive ordnance in affected provinces.

163. One State Party (Lebanon) launched the largest nationwide awareness campaign on the rights of cluster munition victims and persons with disabilities, conducted after the ceasefire.

164. During the period under review, one State Party (Lebanon) reported having a cluster munition victim represented in its delegation participating in a CCM meeting.

165. One State Party (Cuba) reported that while it had no cluster munition victims, the care of persons with disabilities is prioritised without discrimination and aims to foster their full integration into society. Health services are free of cost, of high quality, and accessible to all citizens. During the reporting period, the State Party allocated a significant portion of its national budget to public health and social assistance for vulnerable populations.

166. One State Party (Guinea-Bissau), which previously reported having no cluster munition victims, indicated that it held a national dialogue with victims and persons with disabilities and that a national plan and budget for victim assistance was under development.

167. One State Party (Sweden) reported challenges in identifying victims specifically injured by cluster munitions, as its health system applies broad medical codes for war-related injuries. Approximately 40 such cases are recorded annually, although this may include repeat patients, particularly those registered with temporary identification numbers.

168. During the period under review, the Coordinator (Panama) focused on enhancing the implementation of victim assistance obligations under the Convention and increasing the exchange of information on good practices.

169. Building on previous efforts, the Coordinator continued to collaborate with other relevant disarmament conventions to improve coordination on victim assistance issues. On 11 February 2025, the Coordinator participated in the annual retreat organised by the Committee on Victim Assistance of the APMBC, alongside the Victim Assistance Coordinators of Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance of both the CCM and APMBC, the Implementation Support Units of the three conventions, UN agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and civil society organizations. The retreat provided a platform to share plans and priorities, reflect on obstacles and progress achieved, identify possible opportunities for cooperation, and promote concerted and synergistic approaches to victim assistance within broader frameworks, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), as well as policies and programmes related to health, rehabilitation, development, and humanitarian efforts.

170. In this same spirit, on 15 April 2025, the Coordinator attended a working lunch organised by the Committee on Victim Assistance of the APMBC, with the participation of the ISUs of the APMBC, CCM, and CCW, in order to explore options to strengthen synergies

with respect to victim assistance reporting requirements in the various relevant conventions, including the feasibility of developing a template.

171. The Coordinator also seized the opportunity to build stronger links between the CCM and human rights. During the 58th session of the Human Rights Council (HRC), the Coordinator participated in the interactive dialogues with the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict to raise awareness of the CCM, highlight how the victim assistance elements contained in the CCM intersect with various provisions of the CRPD and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), and encourage both mandate holders to participate in and contribute to CCM discussions.

172. At the 59th session of the HRC, the Coordinator participated in the annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women, specifically in its panel on gender-based violence against women and girls in conflict, post-conflict, and humanitarian settings, to raise awareness of the gendered impact of the presence and use of weapons including cluster munitions; how social norms and stigma disproportionately limit access to victim assistance for women and girls; the need to promote synergies and complementarity between the political agendas on gender equality, human rights, and disarmament instruments; and the role the HRC can play in this regard.

173. During the CCM Intersessional Meeting held on 7-8 April 2025, the Coordinator presented a progress report. A total of six delegations took the floor under the relevant agenda item, highlighting a number of challenges including funding cuts and lack of international support, especially in providing prostheses and psychological rehabilitation; the increase in casualties due to the expansion of contaminated areas; and the need to ensure the full, equal, meaningful, and non-discriminatory participation of victims and survivors. In the same meeting, the Coordinator actively contributed to the discussion on challenges and concerns raised in developments in the context of the CCM and humanitarian disarmament at large, led by the Coordinator on General Status and Operations, Austria, particularly on the discussion on capacity constraints for victim assistance considering the significant increase in victims of war.

174. The Coordinator recognised the need to update the “Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance”, developed in 2016, to align it with the Lausanne Action Plan and the new IMAS 13.10 focused on victim assistance, and to reflect other developments such as the recent WHO resolutions on emergency care, rehabilitation, and assistive technology. This effort will aim to strengthen national implementation mechanisms by clarifying the roles and responsibilities of national authorities involved in providing victim assistance. Since the Third Review Conference will be held next year and is expected to adopt a new action plan, it would be more appropriate to work on the update after the Review Conference. In the meantime, it is essential to identify the current challenges to an integrated approach to victim assistance as originally envisaged in 2016.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) What obstacles hinder States from developing national disability/victim assistance plans?

How can the roles of national authorities be clarified to address these gaps?

- (b) How can cooperation and assistance, including the sharing of good practices, enable States to enhance the collection and analysis of disaggregated data (by gender, age and disability) and support the development of sustainable and integrated victim assistance frameworks?

- (c) How can States ensure meaningful participation of victims in policy and decision-making while also strengthening access to mental health and psychosocial support?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

175. Victim Assistance remained a central pillar of the Convention’s humanitarian purpose over the past three reporting cycles. It is also a distinct feature in the CCM context, as it

provides the highest legal victim assistance standards in any humanitarian disarmament treaty.

176. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP periods, the collective commitment of States Parties to address the needs and uphold the rights of cluster munitions victims has been evident, yet the pace and depth of progress have been in many cases fragile.

177. A consistent trend is that most States Parties with victims continue to acknowledge their obligations under Article 5 and have maintained some level of assistance activities, often integrated into broader disability rights or social protection frameworks.

178. Importantly, there has also been growing recognition that victim assistance must be rights based, and survivor centred, reflecting the broader principles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

179. However, significant gaps remain in translating this commitment into measurable and sustainable progress. Reporting has frequently lacked precise information on the number of victims assisted the scope of services provided, and the outcomes achieved. Many reports continue to describe broad intentions or general activities rather than offering data that can demonstrate real improvements in victim's quality of life or the removal of barriers to inclusion.

180. Another persistent challenge is the limited availability of financial and human resources dedicated specifically to victim assistance. Several States Parties have noted that services for victims are underfunded or depend heavily on external support, making them vulnerable to funding fluctuations and broader political or economic crises.

181. Coordination is also an area of ongoing concern. While some States have established interministerial committees or national victim assistance plans, in practice, victim assistance services are often fragmented among various actors –including ministries of health, social affairs, and NGOs- without clear mechanisms for information sharing, referral, or strategic planning.

182. The period under review has seen an increased awareness of the importance of survivor participation. Some States Parties have reported involving victims or their representative organizations in planning and monitoring processes, though such engagements remain often limited to consultation rather than genuine decision-making power.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

183. Looking ahead to the 3RC, progress in victim assistance will require not only sustained political commitment but also more robust systems to track outcomes, ensure coordination, and secure resources that enable victims to fully exercise their rights and participate in society. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Enhance Data Collection and Reporting:*

Encourage States Parties to collect and report more detailed information on the number and profile of victims assisted, types of services provided, and outcomes achieved, to enable evidence-based planning and progress monitoring.

- *Strengthen Integration into National Systems:*

Promote the integration of victim assistance services into broader national health, social protection, and disability frameworks, ensuring sustainability beyond donor support and promoting the principle of national ownership in victim assistance.

- *Improve Coordination Mechanisms:*

Support the establishment or reinforcement of national coordination platforms that bring together all relevant actors –including survivors and their representative organizations– to avoid duplication, improve referrals, and ensure coherent delivery of services.

- *Secure Sustainable Funding:*

Advocate for the allocation of national budget resources for victim assistance and explore innovative funding mechanisms to reduce reliance on external donors.

- *Foster Survivor Participation:*

Encourage States Parties to systematically involve survivors and their representative organizations in decision making processes related to victim assistance planning, implementation, and monitoring, ensuring their voices guide policies and programmes.

H. International cooperation and assistance

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 38	SPs committed national resources towards meeting Convention obligations.	13	14	18	15
	SPs reported leveraging used alternative and/or innovative sources of financing.	00	00	00	00
Action 39	SPs reported sharing best practices/lessons learnt through diverse cooperation frameworks.	14*	15*	16*	16
	SPs reported engaging in diverse types of reciprocal cooperation.	43	31	36	32
Action 40	SPs reported providing or receiving assistance and mobilized resources to support other SPs in implement the CCM.	43	31	35	32
Action 41	SPs reported developing coherent and comprehensive national plans to strengthen national ownership, enhance national capacity, incorporate SDG goals in assistance request.	00	00	02	03
	SPs seeking assistance that provided information on progress, challenges and requirements for cooperation and assistance.	13	10	11	10
Action 42	SPs reported taking or taken advantage of the country coalition mechanism.	02	02	02	01

* Figures updated for consistency and include only reports of cooperation between States Parties, in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention.

1. International cooperation and assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions

184. Fifteen States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported that they had allocated national resources to meet their Article 3, 4 and/or 5 obligations. However, two of these States (Somalia and South Sudan) reported challenges in obtaining these funds from their national budgets.

185. While no State Party reported leveraging alternative and/or innovative sources of financing, one State Party (United Kingdom) reported carrying out an innovative finance pilot project with a State not party.

186. Sixteen States Parties (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) reported sharing best practices/lessons learnt in the form of training, capacity building, technical assistance, institutional development, sector coordination and innovation, including the transfer of relevant technologies.

187. During the period under review, twenty-four States Parties (Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,⁵ Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) reported having provided international assistance.

- Two States (Australia and Ireland) reported having provided assistance for stockpile destruction;
- Twenty-two States (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania*, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) reported having provided assistance for survey and clearance;
- Nineteen States (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) reported having provided assistance for risk education;
- Eighteen States (Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) reported having provided assistance for victim assistance.

188. Nine States Parties (Australia, Canada, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom) specifically reported having provided multi-year funding to affected States Parties.

189. Two States Parties (Canada and Spain) specifically reported allocating funds to support CCM universalization.

190. Of the twelve affected States Parties that requested assistance (Afghanistan, Albania, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Mauritania, Somalia, and South Sudan), only eight (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having received such support.

- One State Party (Cameroon) has requested assistance for the destruction of its retained cluster munitions but has not yet received support;
- Seven States (Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Somalia, and South Sudan) reported having received assistance for survey and clearance and risk education;
- Six States (Afghanistan, Albania, Iraq, Lao PDR, Lebanon, and South Sudan) reported having received assistance for victim assistance. One State (Bosnia and Herzegovina) that had not requested assistance reported having received support for victim assistance.

191. In addition to the above, during the reporting period, two States Parties (Nigeria and South Sudan) requested assistance in drafting national legislation to implement the Convention domestically.

⁵ Please see Footnote N°3.

192. There is currently one country coalition in place (Lebanon) to support its Article 4 implementation. Four States Parties with outstanding Article 4 obligations (Chad, Chile, Mauritania, and Somalia) have indicated an interest in establishing similar coalitions.

193. During the second quarter of 2025 the members of the CCM Committee for International Cooperation and Assistance had an informal meeting with the members of the APMBC Committee for the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance in order to exchange views and share experiences and good practices in the field of international cooperation. The objective of the discussions was to identify potential synergies between the two committees and to find out how these synergies could be strengthened.

194. The Coordinators (Netherlands and Switzerland) were also invited to take part in the work of the ad hoc Article 4 Analysis Group during the evaluation of the extension requests submitted by five States Parties (Afghanistan, Chile, Lebanon, Mauritania, and Somalia). They also participated in the Analysis Group meetings in order to consider the updated extension requests of Afghanistan and Mauritania.

195. During the CCM Intersessional Meetings in April 2025, the Coordinators invited States Parties experiencing challenges in implementing Article 6 of the Convention due to budget cuts to reach out to the Coordinators and engage in dialogue. States Parties were encouraged to share insights into their current situations, including the impact of recent funding constraints, and to engage in discussions aimed at identifying practical ways forward. In addition, the Coordinators concentrated on finding information about past or existing Country Coalitions in affected States. In this context, and during the CCM Intersessional Meetings, the Coordinators encouraged States Parties with well-functioning national coalitions to come forward and share their experiences.

196. For the remaining time until the 13MSP, the Committee will continue to carry out its activities according to the 2024-2025 work plan.

2. Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP

- (a) How can cooperation and assistance under Article 6 be better aligned with the specific obligations of the Convention, given that many contributions are reported broadly under mine action rather than for CCM-specific implementation?
- (b) What measures can be taken to enhance the implementation of partnerships under the Convention, including country coalitions and complementary finance measures?
- (c) How can information sharing on needs and capacity to provide assistance under the Convention be improved? How can Article 7 reporting reinforce this?

3. Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP

197. Over the past three reporting periods, international cooperation and assistance has remained a cornerstone of the Convention's practical implementation, serving as a mechanism through which affected States Parties seek technical, financial, and material support to fulfil their obligations. From the 10MSP through the 12MSP, several consistent trends have emerged, revealing both significant strengths and critical areas requiring renewed attention as States Parties prepare for the 3RC.

198. Over the past reporting cycles, Progress reports have noted the continued engagement of several donor States in supporting international cooperation and assistance activities. These contributions, particularly in the areas of clearance, risk education, victim assistance, and stockpile destruction, have played a meaningful role in sustaining progress in some affected States.

199. Nonetheless, reports over the three cycles have highlighted persistent disparities in access to resources. While some affected States have successfully mobilised bilateral support, others continue to struggle to attract assistance, due to limited capacity to develop compelling project proposals, insufficient data to demonstrate needs, or broader geopolitical shifts diverting donor attention. This imbalance risks widening implementation gaps and leaving certain regions or thematic areas underfunded.

200. Another recurring observation is that reporting on international cooperation and assistance tends to focus predominantly on financial contributions or technical support provided by donor States in general mine action contexts rather than assistance directed specifically towards CCM obligations. In several cases, States Parties reported assistance provided to countries that are either not party to the Convention or not affected by cluster munitions.

201. According to Article 6(2) of the Convention:

“Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide technical, material and financial assistance to States Parties affected by cluster munitions, aimed at the implementation of the obligations of this Convention. Such assistance may be provided, inter alia, through the United Nations system, international, regional or national organisations or institutions, non-governmental organisations or institutions, or on a bilateral basis.”

202. Noteworthy, Progress reports frequently note contributions in financial resources but offer limited analysis of how these resources translate into tangible results on the ground or contribute to building national capacity.

203. Coordination remains a mixed picture as well. In some contexts, strong national platforms or mine action authorities have facilitated effective dialogue between donors and affected States, helping align assistance with national priorities. However, other reports indicate challenges in harmonizing efforts, with occasional duplication of activities or gaps where needs remain unmet.

204. A further trend is the growing emphasis on integrating Convention implementation into broader humanitarian, development and peacebuilding agendas. While widely recognised as essential for sustainability, practical examples of how such integration is put into practice remain limited in most reporting, suggesting that more work is needed to operationalise this goal.

205. Finally, States Parties have consistently emphasized the need for predictability and multi-year funding. Although donors’ commitment has remained relatively steady during the reporting cycles, uncertainty over future funding cycles, has complicated long-term planning and could impact the continuity of national programmes.

4. Considerations towards the Third Review Conference

206. As the 3RC approaches, these trends highlight the importance of ensuring that cooperation and assistance remain robust, strategic, transparent, and results-focused, so as to advance the Convention’s humanitarian goals equitably and sustainably. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Encourage affected States Parties to strengthen their capacity to develop clear evidence-based project proposals, including the collection and use of data to demonstrate needs and anticipated outcomes.*

- *Promote Equitable Distribution of Resources:*

Support mechanisms that help ensure assistance reaches all affected States Parties, including those with lesser visibility or less capacity to advocate for support, to reduce disparities in Convention implementation.

- *Integrate CCM Efforts into Broader Frameworks:*

Encourage States Parties to connect cluster munition work with broader humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding agendas, enhancing sustainability and leveraging additional funding resources.

- *Foster Coordination Platforms:*

Urge States Parties, stakeholders, and partners to establish national coordination platforms that facilitate dialogue between donors and affected States, aligning assistance with national priorities and avoiding duplication. Critical discussion on the suitability of the CCM “Country Coalition” mechanism is warranted.

- *Increase Predictability of Funding:*

Encourage donors to provide multi-year funding commitments where possible, to enable more stable planning and implementation of national programmes.

I. Transparency measures

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 43	SPs submitted an initial and annual Article 7 reports by 30 April.	51	33	41	48
Action 44	SPs with Articles 3 and 4 obligations or that retain cluster munitions under Article 3.6 submitted Article 7 transparency reports in the last two years.	25	22	24	23
Action 45	SPs have instituted the adapted Article 7 reporting form following its adoption at the 11MSP.	N/A	N/A	24	46
Action 46	SPs have sought and received assistance in the preparation or compilation of Article 7 reports.	00	00	02	03

1. Transparency measures: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions

207. As of 30 June 2024, 63 of the expected 105 annual reports covering calendar year 2024 had been submitted.

208. Two States Parties (Madagascar and Togo) submitted their initial reports during the period under review.

209. Forty-six States Parties (Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,⁶ Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niue, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Spain, State of Palestine, Sweden, Tunisia, United Kingdom, and Zambia) submitted their 2024 annual reports by the due date of 30 April 2024.

210. Seventeen States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Chile, France, Iceland, Italy, Lao PDR, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Peru, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, and Uruguay) submitted their 2024 annual reports after the 30 April 2024 deadline.

211. During the period under review, forty-six States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,⁷ Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Niue, Norway, Peru, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom, and Uruguay) used the revised Article 7 reporting form, following its adoption at the 11th Meeting of States Parties (11MSP), to submit their annual or initial reports.

212. During the period under review, eleven States Parties (Andorra, Austria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ghana, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and

⁶ Please see Footnote N°3.

⁷ Please see Footnote N°3.

Trinidad and Tobago) submitted overdue annual reports covering calendar year 2023 or earlier. Two of these States Parties (the Philippines and Trinidad and Tobago) submitted multi-year reports.

213. Five States Parties have yet to submit their long overdue initial reports: Cabo Verde (2011), Comoros (2011), Congo (2015), Guinea (2015), and Rwanda (2016).

214. During the period under review, the Coordinator on matters pertaining to Transparency Measures, (Australia), fulfilled its mandate by undertaking the following actions: conducting outreach to the six States Parties with overdue initial reports, including by sending individual letters to the Permanent Missions of the six countries in New York; and working with the ISU on communications to all States Parties reminding them of their annual Article 7 reporting submission deadline.

215. The Coordinator consulted with States Parties to the CCM, relevant international organisations and treaty implementation support units and secretariats to explore synergies in transparency reporting across conventional arms control instruments and identify possible next steps in improving reporting outcomes. As part of these consultations, the Coordinator convened an informal meeting on transparency reporting in March 2025 and held informal discussions in the margins of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Intersessional Meeting in June 2025.

216. These consultations provided a platform for States Parties and stakeholders to share ideas on practical measures, synergies and lessons learnt on reporting under the CCM and other relevant arms control instruments. Following these consultations, the Coordinator submitted to the 13th Meeting of States Parties of the CCM a working paper which identifies possible areas of focus for future CCM Transparency Reporting Coordinators in furthering this work.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

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

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP-12MSP*

217. Transparency measures have remained a central feature of the Convention's architecture, intended to ensure accountability, build trust among States Parties, facilitate cooperation, and provide a basis for assessing progress in implementation. Over the past three reporting cycles, from the 10MSP through to the 12MSP, several trends have emerged that reflect both improvements and enduring challenges in the submission and quality of transparency reports.

218. A positive trend is that most States Parties continue to recognise the importance of submitting annual transparency reports as required under Article 7 of the Convention. Many have used these reports to communicate updates on stockpile destruction, clearance achievements, risk education activities, victim assistance efforts, and international cooperation needs and support. Regular reporting has contributed to maintaining the Convention's culture of transparency and shared responsibility.

219. However, despite this overall commitment, timeliness and completeness of reporting remain significant challenges. Each of the past three Progress reports has noted a considerable number of States Parties that have either failed to submit reports altogether or have submitted them after the deadline, sometimes with incomplete or outdated information. This pattern has led to gaps in the collective understanding of the Convention's implementation status and hampered efforts to identify and address emerging needs in a timely manner.

220. Another trend is the significant variability in the quality and detail of the information provided. While some States Parties produce comprehensive reports containing disaggregated data and narrative explanations, many others submit sparse reports, often

repeating “no change” language or referring to previous years’ reports without providing substantive updates even where the broader context suggests that developments may have occurred.

221. Furthermore, several States Parties continue to face constraints in fulfilling their reporting obligations, such as limited technical expertise, language barriers, or insufficient institutional capacity. Several Progress reports have highlighted repeated requests from States Parties for assistance in understanding the reporting formats or meeting deadlines.

222. Finally, there has been growing recognition of the role that transparency reports can play not just as a compliance tool but as an instrument for resource mobilisation, coordination, and advocacy. However, this potential remains largely unrealised, as many States Parties still view reporting primarily as a formal obligation rather than a strategic communication opportunity.

4. Considerations towards the Third Review Conference

223. As States Parties prepare for the 3RC, enhancing the timeliness, completeness, and strategic value of transparency reporting remains essential for sustaining the Convention’s credibility and effectiveness. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Improve Timeliness of Reporting:*

Encourage States Parties to prioritize the timely submission of annual transparency reports, potentially exploring regional peer support initiatives to reduce late reporting.

- *Enhance Quality and Detail:*

Promote more comprehensive reporting by providing guidance and examples of good practice, emphasising the value of including disaggregated data and narrative explanations that go beyond minimal compliance.

- *Offer Capacity-Building Support:*

Support targeted assistance for States Parties facing challenges in fulfilling reporting obligations, including training on the report format, translation support, and technical guidance.

- *Highlight Strategic Value of Reports:*

Encourage States Parties to view transparency reports not merely as compliance tools but as opportunities to articulate needs, attract international support, and showcase progress, thereby leveraging reporting for broader strategic purposes.

- *Recognize and Share Good Practice:*

Consider developing mechanisms to identify and share high-quality reports as models for others, fostering peer learning and continuous improvement in transparency reporting.

J. National implementation measures

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 47	SPs reported having adopted all national measures. (Since the entry into force of the Convention) of these 32 States parties have reported that they have adopted national legislation regarding the convention (Since the entry into force of the Convention) and 33 consider existing law to be	63	64	65	67

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
	sufficient (Since the entry into force of the Convention).				
	SPs reported having disseminated CCM obligations to all relevant national institutions particularly the armed forces.	21	22	22	26
Action 48	SPs reported challenges faced in the revision/adoption of national legislation.	00	06	07	05
	SPs requested assistance in the revision/adoption of national legislation from SPs in a position to do so.	00	01	04	02

1. *National implementation measures: monitoring progress on the implementation of LAP actions*

224. During the period under review, eighteen States Parties provided substantial updates on their national implementation measures.

225. One State Party (Antigua and Barbuda) reported that it had recently enacted specific legislation that outlaws cluster munitions.

226. One State Party (Togo), in its initial transparency report, provided detailed information on its specific legislation prohibiting cluster munitions, as well as other arms control laws that support the prohibition, including penal sanctions for violations.

227. One State Party (Sierra Leone) reported on the adoption of a new law on arms and ammunition control, which it considers sufficient to prohibit cluster munitions.

228. Three States Parties (Bulgaria, Chile and Iceland) reported on updates to their national legislation on the prohibition of cluster munitions. Of these, two (Bulgaria and Chile) amended existing legislation, while one (Iceland) enacted new legislation.

229. One State Party (Madagascar), in its initial transparency report, indicated that specific regulations prohibiting cluster munitions were expected to be adopted.

230. One State Party (Nigeria) reported that it was in the process of drafting national legislation to domesticate the Convention and has established a dedicated budget line in its annual national budget beginning in 2025.

231. One State Party (South Sudan) reported having reached out to a partner organisation for support to develop national legislation but had not yet received the necessary assistance.

232. One State Party (Sri Lanka) reported that it had completed an assessment of the adequacy of its legal framework for implementing the Convention and had since progressed to drafting a bill.

233. One State Party (Guinea-Bissau) reported that national legislation and policies to implement Article 5 (victim assistance) needed to be developed as they were currently non-existent.

234. One State Party (South Sudan) reported that while no legislation was in place in 2023, a draft National Disability Law was under review by the Council of Ministers in 2024 and was due to be submitted to the National Legislative Assembly.

235. Three States Parties (Afghanistan, Lebanon and Somalia) reported on ongoing work to revise their national mine action standards.

236. One State Party (Colombia) reported updates to its national policy framework against explosive remnants of war, which supports the implementation of the Convention.

237. One State Party (Cuba) reported on the adoption of its 2024 Budget Law, which allocates funds to the public health system with the aim of ensuring people with disabilities have access to free, quality healthcare.

238. One State Party (Lao PDR) reported the adoption of a revised government decree on unexploded ordnance and mine action in 2025. The updated decree aims to strengthen the national legal framework for the management, coordination, monitoring and inspection of mine action activities, in support of national security and sustainable development objectives.

239. During the period under review, four States Parties (Antigua and Barbuda, Madagascar, Niger and Slovenia) reported having disseminated their CCM obligations to relevant national institutions, increasing the total number of States Parties that have done so from 22 to 25.

240. Since assuming the role of Coordinator on National Implementation Measures following the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties (12MSP), the Coordinator (Iraq) has taken proactive steps to strengthen the implementation of Article 9 of the Convention and promote national ownership and legislative alignment.

241. In coordination with the ISU, a targeted outreach campaign was launched in October 2024 to gather updated information on the legislative status of States Parties. A letter was circulated to 47 States Parties, grouped into three categories:

- 27 States Parties with legislation under consideration or in the process of being adopted;
- 9 States Parties for which clarification was required on the current status of national measures;
- 11 States Parties with no available data.

242. The purpose of this initiative was to generate updated inputs for the existing database on national implementation measures, to improve the accuracy and completeness of information available to States Parties and stakeholders.

243. During the 28th International Meeting of Mine Action Directors and UN Advisers (NDM-UN28), the Coordinator engaged bilaterally with a number of States Parties. These discussions revealed a recurring challenge: a lack of internal coordination among national authorities responsible for implementing the Convention. In several instances, government officials were unaware of who held the role of national focal point for CCM implementation or Article 9 obligations. This institutional ambiguity continues to impede effective reporting and legislative advancement.

244. Additionally, the Coordinator observed that while some States Parties have national mine action authorities, these are not always mandated to address Article 9 obligations or to liaise with legislative bodies. This fragmentation underscores the need for technical support that not only focuses on legislative drafting but also on institutional streamlining and clarity of roles at the national level.

245. Key challenges observed:

- Institutional fragmentation: Poor inter-agency coordination within States Parties, especially where responsibilities for mine action and treaty implementation are not clearly delineated;
- Focal point ambiguity: Inadequate designation or awareness of the national focal points for CCM-related legislative responsibilities;
- Limited use of model legislation: Although model texts are available, many States Parties are unaware of them or lack the capacity to adapt them to their national legal systems;
- Information gaps: A substantial number of States Parties either have not reported on their national implementation measures or lack publicly available documentation on legislative progress.

246. Suggestions for consideration at the 13MSP:

- (a) Cross-sectoral dialogues: Promoting inter-ministerial roundtables at the national level to clarify institutional roles and responsibilities and ensure inter-agency cooperation.
- (b) Enhanced use of model tools: Disseminating simplified guidance notes on the adaptation of model legislation and providing legal technical assistance where necessary.
- (c) Regional and country coalitions: Encouraging the formation of regional or thematic coalitions –including those that already focus on stockpile destruction and clearance– to integrate support for national implementation measures where relevant.
- (d) Tracking and transparency: Finalizing the centralised Article 9 database and encouraging States Parties to validate or update their entries annually through direct ISU coordination.

247. There is an urgent need to sustain momentum and cooperation among all stakeholders –particularly the Coordinator, the ICRC, the ISU and civil society organizations– to support States Parties in fulfilling their Article 9 obligations. National implementation remains a cornerstone of the Convention’s effectiveness, and sustained attention to domestic legal measures is vital to upholding the humanitarian objectives of the CCM.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) What additional steps can be taken to improve compliance with Article 9, particularly among the 45 States Parties that have yet to report adopting national implementation measures?
- (b) How can targeted support be provided to help States Parties address internal coordination challenges and make effective use of existing model legislation?
- (c) How can the forthcoming centralised Article 9 database be used to promote transparency, facilitate knowledge-sharing and encourage annual updates by States Parties?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP -12MSP*

248. National Implementation Measures (NIMs) represent a core obligation under Article 9 of the Convention, serving as the legal and practical foundation for fulfilling States Parties’ commitments and enforcing the Convention’s prohibitions at the domestic level. Over the past three reporting cycles, from the 10MSP through to the 12MSP, a clear picture has emerged of both sustained progress and significant gaps in this critical area of implementation.

249. A positive trend has been the steady increase in the number of States Parties that have either adopted or initiated steps toward national legislation prohibiting the use, production, stockpiling and transfer of cluster munitions. Several Progress reports have highlighted new or amended laws introduced in this period, demonstrating continued recognition of the importance of embedding the Convention’s obligations into domestic legal systems. This progress has contributed to reinforcing the global stigma against cluster munitions and to establishing clearer legal frameworks for enforcement.

250. However, challenges remain substantial. Across all three Progress reports, a significant number of States Parties have still not adopted specific national legislation or explained how existing laws sufficiently implement the Convention’s provisions. Many States Parties continue to report that relevant laws are under development or pending parliamentary approval, a status that has sometimes remained unchanged over multiple reporting cycles. This persistent gap weakens the Convention’s legal certainty and may undermine efforts to prevent prohibited activities.

251. Another trend is the variability in the scope and clarity of national measures. Even among States Parties that have enacted legislation, some laws remain narrowly focused on criminalising certain acts but lack provisions addressing key elements such as stockpile destruction timelines, victim assistance rights, or measures related to international

cooperation and assistance. This variability has made it difficult to assess whether national measures fully cover all Convention obligations.

252. Furthermore, the quality of reporting on NIMs varies significantly. Some States Parties provide detailed descriptions of legislative texts, institutional responsibilities, and enforcement mechanisms, while others simply report “no change” or cite general prohibitions in their national legislation without clarifying whether these provisions comprehensively cover the Convention’s specific requirements.

253. Finally, the Progress reports repeatedly note requests from States Parties for technical or legal assistance in drafting or finalizing legislation. Many States Parties face resource constraints, limited technical expertise, or complex legal systems that slow progress in developing comprehensive national measures.

4. Considerations towards the Third Review Conference

254. As the 3RC approaches, ensuring that all States Parties adopt effective and comprehensive national implementation measures remains a priority for strengthening the Convention’s legal foundation and ensuring its obligations are enforceable at the national level. Along with the areas identified by the Coordinator for discussion during the 13MSP, the following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Accelerate Adoption of Legislation:*

255. Encourage States Parties that have not yet enacted national legislation to prioritize this work, recognising that effective domestic laws are essential for enforcing Convention obligations.

- *Enhance Reporting Clarity:*

256. Promote more detailed and precise reporting on national measures, including the scope of legislation, enforcement provisions, and any gaps that still need to be addressed.

- *Provide Targeted Technical Assistance:*

257. Support initiatives offering tailored legal and technical assistance to States Parties working on drafting or finalising national legislation, including sharing model laws or legislative templates.

- *Address Gaps in Existing Legislation:*

258. Encourage States Parties with partial or limited legislation to review and strengthen their legal frameworks to ensure comprehensive coverage of all Convention obligations, including prohibitions, stockpile destruction, victim assistance, and penal sanctions.

- *Facilitate Peer-to-Peer Learning:*

259. Foster exchanges among States Parties with similar legal systems, enabling those that have successfully adopted national measures to share experiences, best practices, and practical solutions to those still in process.

K. Compliance

LAP	INDICATORS	10MSP	11MSP	12MSP	13MSP
Action 49	SPs found in non-compliance with the Convention by the Meeting of States Parties or the Review Conference.	00	00	00	00
Action 50	SPs submitted extension requests in a timely manner.	00	01	00	04

1. *Compliance: monitoring progress in the implementation of LAP actions*

260. No State Party was found to be non-compliant by the 12MSP held from 10 to 13 September 2024. In accordance with Article 8, no request for clarification was submitted, and no compliance matter was brought before the Meeting for consideration. To date, no instances of non-compliance have been identified or addressed through the procedures outlined in Article 8.

261. However, developments in 2024 raised concerns about adherence to the Convention's norms. Reports of cluster munition transfers between States not party, including through State Party territory, raised concerns about the possible normalisation of practices contrary to the spirit of the Convention. These issues were highlighted in the working paper submitted by the 12MSP President (CCM/MSP/2024/WP.3), which emphasised the importance of reinforcing Article 21 obligations for all States Parties to encourage States not party to join the Convention, promote its norms, and make their best efforts to discourage the use of cluster munitions by States not party.

262. Although retention is permitted under Article 3.6 for specific purposes, it should be limited to the minimum number absolutely necessary. In accordance with Article 3.8, States Parties are required to provide detailed information on the planned and actual use of retained cluster munitions. Of the nine States Parties that reported having retained cluster munitions in 2024, seven did not reduce the number of their retained stocks.

263. While no State Party has been found non-compliant with its clearance obligations, most affected States Parties have submitted extension requests, some multiple times, due to their inability to meet Article 4 deadlines. This reflects the complex challenges faced in cluster munition clearance, including issues of accessibility, limited resources, and operational constraints. The timely submission of comprehensive extension requests is essential to ensure continued compliance. During the reporting period, four (Afghanistan, Chile, Lebanon, and Somalia) of the five requests were submitted at least nine months ahead of the 13MSP deadline, as required by the Convention. The only exception (Mauritania) submitted its request shortly after the nine-month deadline.

264. Out of 112 States Parties during the period under review, 66 did not comply with their Article 7 reporting obligations, either by failing to submit their 2024 annual report by the 30 April deadline or by not submitting their initial transparency report within the timeframe required by the Convention.

265. As of the reporting period, sixty-seven States Parties had reported having national legislation in place to implement the Convention, including the imposition of penal sanctions to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited under the Convention, in accordance with their obligations under Article 9. This indicates that forty-five States Parties have yet to report the adoption or confirmation of legislative measures required to implement the Convention domestically.

2. *Questions/challenges for discussion at the 13MSP*

- (a) How can States Parties collectively respond to developments that risk undermining the norm prohibiting cluster munitions and may affect adherence to the Convention?
- (b) How can States Parties be better supported in overcoming the complex challenges to fulfilling their Article 4 obligations and ensuring timely compliance?
- (c) What steps can be taken to support States Parties in fulfilling their obligations under Articles 7 and 9 to submit transparency reports and adopt national legislation to implement the Convention?

3. *Overview of Trends 10MSP -12MSP*

266. As with any legally binding international instrument –compliance meaning adherence to the Convention's provisions– remains central to its credibility and humanitarian legitimacy. Compliance ensures that the prohibitions and obligations established under the treaty are respected by all States Parties and underpins confidence in the Convention as an effective humanitarian instrument.

267. Across the 10MSP to 12MSP reporting cycles, Progress reports have consistently noted the absence of allegations of confirmed use or production of cluster munitions involving States Parties. This continued record of compliance represents a significant achievement for the Convention and reflects the strong normative commitment among its members.

268. At the same time, the past three Progress reports have documented situations that raise compliance-related concerns, primarily linked to reports of cluster munition use in conflicts involving States not party. The presence of cluster munitions in ongoing conflicts has continued to draw attention to the risks of contamination, the need for clearance, and potential cross-border impacts. In some cases, States Parties neighbouring conflict zones have reported increased contamination risks or security challenges that indirectly affect their own implementation obligations. Additionally, stockpiles held by States not party remain a concern with the risk of proliferation and acquisition also among States that have previously not held stocks of cluster munitions. Transfers of such stocks have raised concerns due to possible transit through or over territory belonging to States Parties to the Convention.

269. Progress reports have also highlighted that a number of States Parties still retain cluster munitions for training and research purposes as permitted under Article 3.6. While retention itself is not a breach of compliance, the reports repeatedly note that the number of retained submunitions often remains high relative to the minimal amounts required for permitted purposes.

270. Another area highlighted in the Progress reports concerns transparency and timely reporting as essential components of compliance. Late or absent transparency reports impede effective monitoring and can obscure potential compliance issues. Although a failure to report is not necessarily an indication of non-compliance, it is a legal obligation under the Convention. Persistent reporting gaps undermine the Convention's confidence-building function and hamper collective efforts to track implementation progress.

271. Positively, the Progress reports document ongoing cooperation among States Parties to clarify matters related to compliance. States have engaged constructively in resolving technical issues, such as clarifying discrepancies in reported stockpile figures or timelines for destruction obligations. This reflects a shared commitment to mutual accountability and the cooperative spirit of the Convention.

4. *Considerations towards the Third Review Conference*

272. As States Parties look ahead to the 3RC, maintaining the Convention's strong compliance record will depend on continued vigilance, proactive transparency, and collective engagement in addressing any emerging concerns. The following areas of action are presented to States Parties and stakeholders for their further reflection:

- *Maintain Vigilance Against Use:*

Encourage States Parties to continue publicly condemning any use of cluster munitions, by any actor and under any circumstances, reinforcing the norm against such weapons and helping to deter their use by States not party.

- *Clarify Retention Practices:*

Urge States Parties retaining cluster munitions for permitted purposes under Article 3.6 to provide detailed information on the quantities retained, their intended use, and efforts to minimise stockpiles to the strict minimum necessary.

- *Strengthen Transparency Reporting as a Compliance Tool:*

Reinforce the importance of timely and complete reporting under Article 7 as an integral element of demonstrating compliance and maintaining confidence among States Parties.

- *Facilitate Dialogue on Compliance Concerns:*

Encourage the use of existing cooperative mechanisms to address and clarify any compliance-related questions, ensuring that potential issues are resolved transparently and constructively.

- *Address Regional Implications of Conflicts:*

Support efforts by affected neighbouring States Parties to manage risks arising from conflicts in nearby States not party, including contingency planning for new contamination or humanitarian needs.

Advance copy