

Observations and Comments of the CCM Article 4 Analysis Group on the Extension Request submitted by Lao PDR in accordance with Article 4.5 of the Convention

The Analysing Group is grateful for the efforts made by Lao PDR in preparing its Article 4 extension request and for engaging with its members in a cooperative manner. The Analysis Group would like to commend Lao PDR on the following elements outlined in its request:

- Lao PDR has strong procedures and national standards in place, including the first-ever National Survey Standards that take into account IMAS. The Analysis Group acknowledges that Lao PDR's experience is beneficial to other affected States Parties;
- The adoption by Lao PDR of an evidence-based methodology to survey and clear cluster munition remnants, in line with international best practice, is a significant improvement on the request-based system used in the past;
- The SWOT analysis outlined on p.4 of the narrative provides valuable input into the generation of strategies to overcome past challenges.

However, the Group observed some information gaps on a number of key elements which require further elaboration by the requesting State. In this regard, the Analysis Group recommends some additional information be included in the Request on the following :-

1. A more detailed **WORK PLAN** for the extension period which would:
 - Make clear in the extension request that the primary focus will be on the **Nationwide Survey** as it will help Lao PDR define the scope of CMR contamination and create the basis upon which clearance prioritization would be developed. This information would also be beneficial to potential donors who would have a clearer picture of the extent of the problem and build confidence that (financial) resources are used in an efficient and effective manner;
 - It is briefly mentioned on Page 21 of the Request that focus will be on Survey but this is not well reflected in the tables presented on pages 19 and 20. It is recommended that more resources are directed towards Survey in accordance with Article 4.2 (a) of the Convention and Actions 3.1 and 3.3 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan. This should also be mentioned in the Executive Summary;
 - Present only one cost estimate with clear milestones and disaggregated information on how these costs were calculated (including information on staff, equipment, etc.);
 - Provide more information regarding the names of the villages, districts and provinces including the area size that will be prioritized for survey and clearance. Additionally on how these prioritization decisions are made regarding which, when and how;
 - The plan should say **who** (which operator) will work **where** (which village, district, and province), and **when** (which month of what year);

- Include more elements of risk assessment undertaken including possible impact of elements such as adverse weather, staff availability, financial shortfalls, etc.;
 - The plan should cover the whole extension period i.e. from 1 August 2020 to 31 July 2025.
2. The Request would benefit from the provision of additional information on Lao PDR's **RESOURCE MOBILIZING PLAN**, in particular:
 - Which exact strategy will Lao PDR employ to raise more funds to implement its work plan? How would new donors be attracted (page 6)?
 - Include information on national resources that will be dedicated to the implementation of the extension work plan;
 - Inclusion of survey results over the years would help justify the amounts being mobilized from donors and that they were utilized in an effective manner. This would also likely make them more responsive to requests for support;
 3. The Request should provide more information on coordination mechanisms between key actors in the sector (page 23). How will this be achieved?
 4. Further details would be welcomed on the calculations used to project the figure of 8'470km² as the total area to be addressed;
 5. Clarity should be provided on the quantity and types of explosive submunitions destroyed as numbers are not consistent throughout the document. For example, on pages 9 and 13 of the Detailed Narrative the figures given on explosive submunitions cleared do not match. Also it would be helpful to use the same terminology throughout the document;
 6. Table on page 14 does not state what causes accidents. It would be positive to show that without the extension there would be more accidents. Therefore, more information could be provided on accident reporting.