

UK intervention – National Implementation Measures

29/06/11

Thank you very much Madam Chair

The UK would like to thank Norway and Switzerland for their useful explanatory note, and Mr John McBride for all his preparatory efforts.

The UK supports many of the points set out in the paper, including the principles for a future ISU and its location in the GICHD. I said at the last open meeting that we should 'get this right, rather than getting it quick', but we have moved on considerably since then, and the UK is also content with the idea of taking such a decision to establish the ISU at the 2MSP.

However, the UK has considerable reservations with the current recommendation on the financing of the ISU and related issues about its mandate. I would like to support many of the points made by Mexico, Belgium, Chile and Columbia in this regard. The UK believes that, like the Ottawa ISU, contributions should be made on a long term voluntary basis, and the extent of the ISU mandate considered accordingly. Like others, I would like to see greater assessment of the financial expectations of the Unit.

We need to ensure that the ISU is as efficient and effective as possible. To assist in delivering both of these principles I would support the sentiment of my distinguished Austrian colleague of yesterday, that we need to look for synergies with other bodies to ensure cost effectiveness.

Indeed, Madam Chair, perhaps it is worth continuing to consider the possibility of a joint Ottawa and Oslo ISU to maximise policy and financing efficiencies? In this regard, as they usually do, Civil Society has shown us the way, with the merger of the ICBL and the CMC representing a potential model to consider here.