

Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention

22nd Meeting of States Parties

Working Paper

Building synergies and improving transparency reporting outcomes across conventional arms control instruments

Submitted by Australia

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore synergies in transparency reporting across conventional arms control instruments and identify possible next steps in improving reporting outcomes. In particular, this paper identifies possible areas of focus for the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) Implementation Support Unit (ISU), and Convention office holders, in furthering these objectives.

This paper builds on existing literature on transparency reporting and consultations with States Parties to conventional arms control instruments, relevant international organisations, treaty ISUs, and Secretariats. As part of Australia's role as Transparency Measures Coordinator for the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), Australia convened an informal meeting on transparency reporting in March 2025 and held informal discussions in the margins of the APMBC Intersessional Meeting in June 2025. Bringing together these efforts, in September 2025 at the CCM Meeting of States Parties, Australia published [working paper CCM/MSP/2025/12](#) on which the present working paper is based.

Australia encourages States Parties to the APMBC and the APMBC ISU, in particular, to consider the ideas outlined in this paper, share lessons learned and progress practical steps to improve transparency reporting.

The purpose and benefits of transparency reporting

Transparency reporting by States Parties on the implementation of their obligations promotes trust and confidence building between States Parties. It is an important tool to monitor progress in implementing the APMBC, and facilitates international cooperation and assistance between States Parties. Reporting can help highlight assistance needs and foster a collaborative environment for achieving common goals.

The benefits of transparency reporting further include, but are not limited to:

- ensuring parties have a clear view of developments relating to the APMBC and its implementation;
- enabling informed decision-making on the implementation of the APMBC;
- demonstrating the impact of the APMBC and progress in implementation – noting in particular that several indicators in the [Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan 2025-2029](#) impose reporting commitments; and
- identifying and addressing challenges or obstacles that may hinder implementation.

Transparency reporting under the APMBC

Under Article 7 of the APMBC, States Parties must report on progress in implementing their obligations including in relation to: national implementation measures; stockpiled anti-personnel mines; anti-personnel mines retained or transferred for permitted purposes; areas known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines; technical characteristics of anti-personnel mines; and conversion or decommissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities.

Article 7 requires States Parties to provide an initial transparency report no later than 180 days after the APMBC's entry into force or ratification. States Parties are then required to provide updated information on an annual basis by 30 April each year thereafter.

Every five years at the APMBC's Review Conferences, States Parties have stressed the importance of timely and detailed reporting. In addition to Article 7, APMBC Action Plans – particularly the Oslo and Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plans – require States Parties to report on various indicators. Further detail can be found in the [APMBC Guide to Reporting](#).

Transparency reporting trends

Despite the benefits of transparency reporting, the submission rate of Article 7 transparency reports has declined over time.

The APMBC ISU has advised that as of 11 November 2025, 72 of the expected 163 (44%) annual reports covering calendar year 2025 have been submitted.

The APMBC [Committee on Cooperative Compliance Preliminary Observations report](#) found that:

- out of 60 States Parties retaining anti-personnel mines under Article 3, 25 (42%) did not submit an Article 7 report in 2025;
- out of the two States Parties implementing Article 4 obligations, one (50%) submitted an Article 7 report in 2025; and
- out of 34 States Parties implementing Article 5 obligations, 12 (35%) have not submitted an Article 7 report in 2025.

Support for APMBC transparency reporting

In 2014, States Parties adopted the [APMBC Guide to Reporting](#), which was then updated in 2021. Its purpose is to provide updated and simplified advice on how States Parties may fulfil their Article 7 reporting requirements, and to ease the reporting burden. To date, no other conventional arms control instrument has adopted a Guide to Reporting.

In 2022, the APMBC Committee on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance launched the [Article 7 Online Reporting Platform](#). It continues to serve as a simplified way to fulfil reporting requirements for States that do not have obligations under the APMBC's articles. Only eight States have made use of the tool since its creation, and we encourage more to do so.

The APMBC ISU also offers support through:

- a general checklist for reporting on the Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan;
- an annual Article 7 workshop convened by the Committee on Cooperative Compliance, which is mandated to encourage reporting;
- letters from Compliance Committees and thematic committees to States Parties (in particular to those that have not reported in the previous year); and
- bilateral meetings with States Parties to encourage reporting.

Challenges in transparency reporting

Common challenges in transparency reporting across the APMBC and other conventional arms control instruments can be broadly grouped as follows:

- lack of awareness of reporting obligations and processes;
- lack of capacity and resources;
- lack of interagency cooperation and coordination; and
- lack of political support.

Some States Parties will face some challenges more than others. Some challenges are context-specific, and differ from region to region. Just as there is no one challenge faced by States in fulfilling their reporting obligations, there is likewise no one-size-fits-all solution to the challenges faced by States Parties in their reporting. That said, where States in a particular region share common challenges, there may be opportunities to explore regional responses to address them.

Practical measures to improve transparency reporting

Based on Australia's consultations, stakeholders identified the following practical measures that could be adopted by treaty officeholders and ISUs or Secretariats, where appropriate and applicable, to improve reporting outcomes:

- looking for opportunities for synergies to make it simpler to report across multiple areas within a Convention, or across Conventions;

- creating a calendar or matrix of due dates and obligations across conventional arms control instruments;
- considering the relative benefits of aligning or staggering reporting deadlines across conventional arms control instruments – where possible within existing Convention rules;
- creating clear procedures for updating initial and/or annual reports and for communicating those updated reports – particularly for States Parties with nothing to report, or where little has changed within a reporting period;
- providing training on how to complete, submit and update reports;
- holding meetings on transparency reporting (including joint meetings with other treaty ISUs and Secretariats) prior to reporting deadlines to assist States Parties with preparations;
- updating reporting resources regularly and making them available to States Parties;
- undertaking initiatives to help States better understand the benefits of transparency reporting;
- where possible and appropriate, preparing guidance documents and reporting tools in national languages to make them accessible to States Parties;
- using capacity building workshops to highlight how one process for collecting information and compiling a report can help with another; and
- creating a practical tool that outlines reporting commonalities between CCM and APMBC.

Synergies in transparency reporting across conventional arms control

Strengthening synergies between conventional arms control instruments – such as the CCM, APMBC, Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and United Nations Register of Conventional Arms (UNROCA) – could further enhance efforts to quantitatively and qualitatively improve transparency reporting.

For example, States have observed that one of the difficulties in using the same information for different Conventions, where it would otherwise be possible, is the different reporting periods in place. The reporting deadlines of the various arms control instruments are:

- APMBC and CCM have the same deadline of 30 April;
- CCW reporting deadline is 31 March;
- ATT and UNROCA have the same deadline of 31 May.

Possible synergies across conventional arms control instruments that could be further explored by States Parties, ISUs and Secretariats and civil society organisations include:

- synergies in data collection;
- synergies in awareness-raising activities on transparency reporting;
- promoting common approaches to reporting under conventional arms control instruments at the national level;
- providing international cooperation and assistance to States to assist reporting under multiple instruments; and
- encouraging dialogue between relevant treaty ISUs and Secretariats.

There are particular complementarities between the CCM and APMBC. Of the APMBC's 165 States Parties, 101 were also States Parties to the CCM as at 24 October 2025. Many States affected by cluster munitions are also affected by anti-personnel mines. Where this is the case, the same authority is often responsible for dealing with both types of contamination. In the context of the CCM and APMBC, there can also be synergies in reporting on some obligations, such as land release, victim assistance, cooperation and assistance, and risk reduction education.

Possible areas of action

Based on the review of existing literature, consultations and our work in this field, Australia has identified the following four possible areas of focus to improve transparency reporting and build synergies across conventional arms control instruments. These could be taken up by the APMBC ISU, future members of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance, or States Parties:

1. **Develop a common annual reporting calendar or matrix:** It can be difficult for States Parties to understand, track and fulfil their reporting obligations under conventional arms control instruments. Putting these in one place, alongside the relevant due dates, can facilitate the process and help identify synergies in reporting.
2. **Progress recommendations on practical measures for treaty ISUs and Secretariats on strengthening transparency reporting and building synergies:** Australia has identified in this working paper a number of practical measures that could be progressed to improve transparency reporting outcomes and build synergies across conventional arms control instruments.
3. **Convene biannual informal meetings to explore synergies in transparency reporting across conventional arms control instruments, and share good practices adopted in the APMBC context:** Australia held the first informal meeting on transparency reporting in March 2025. It included participation by the treaty ISUs and Secretariats of the CCM, APMBC, CCW, ATT and UNROCA, together with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Campaign to Ban Landmines and Cluster Munition Coalition (ICBL-CMC) and States Parties to the CCM interested in transparency reporting. The meeting was a valuable opportunity to share ideas and experiences on reporting challenges and good practices, and helped identify synergies in reporting. The continuation of such meetings could pave the way for further improvements in reporting processes and collaboration between treaty ISUs and Secretariats.

Conclusion

Australia supports transparent and timely reporting under the APMBC and in accordance with its Action Plans. We strongly encourage States Parties to submit their Article 7 transparency reports. These reports serve as a vital indicator of the APMBC's overall health and provide a benchmark for measuring the collective and individual progress of States Parties in achieving their goals.

Australia has sought in this paper to bring together information, ideas and experience from across conventional arms control frameworks to identify ways to improve reporting outcomes. Australia sees value in continuing work to identify and build synergies in transparency reporting across conventional arms control instruments.

Australia would like to thank, in particular, the treaty ISUs and Secretariats of the CCM, APMBC, CCW, ATT and UNROCA, together with UNIDIR, UNODA, ICRC, ICBL-CMC and relevant States Parties to the CCM and APMBC, for their valuable insights in preparing this working paper.