4th Meeting of the CCM Coordination Committee

Tuesday 24 January

Minutes and Action Points

List of Attendees:

- Lebanon (President),
- Norway (President-Designate),
- Holy See (General Status and Operation of the Convention in 2012)
- Zambia (General Status and Operation of the Convention in 2012 and 2013)
- Japan (Universalisation in 2012)
- Portugal (Universalisation in 2012 and 2013)
- Bosnia and Herzegovina (Victim Assistance in 2012 and 2013)
- Ireland (Clearance and Risk Reduction in 2012 and 2013)
- Germany (Stockpile Destruction and Retention in 2012)
- Croatia (Stockpile Destruction and Retention in 2012 and 2013)
- Spain (Cooperation and Assistance in 2012, and for 2012 and 2013)
- Mexico (Cooperation and Assistance in 2012, and for 2012 and 2013)
- Belgium (Transparency Reporting in 2012 and 2013)
- New Zealand (National Implementation Measures in 2012 and 2013)
- CMC
- ICRC
- UNDP in capacity of Exec Coord team

Intro by President

- Thanked CorCom members for their continued collaborative efforts in support of the CCM’s work, and wished everyone a happy new year. Made reference to the documents that had been circulated via email prior to the meeting, as well as the Provisional Intersessional Agenda and “potential lines of enquiry” in relation to a questionnaire on possible ISU financing models. Stated that this meeting would in part be dedicated to going through the documents, and opened the floor for any comments regarding the meeting agenda, to which there were none.

Agenda Item 1 – Work Plan

- The President stated that, as indicated in the last CorCom meeting on 13 December, members would need to focus on developing work plans aimed at assisting States Parties in how they best can prepare for the inter sessions, to encourage activities and developments in-country among States Parties and seek the support and assistance of active friends in civil society and among international organisations to ensure strong progress.

- The President then guided attendees through the proposed work plan for 2012, with the aim of gaining feedback on the timeline, establishing a course of action that aims to secure a successful intersessional meeting resulting in the finalisation of the Oslo Progress Report, preparations for the 3rd MSP, and a proposal for the establishment of an Implementation Support Unit upheld by a sound financial model. The President reminded Coordinators that dates are tentative, and asked that they save these provisionally into their agendas.
• The President suggested two open-ended consultations in February: the first being an open briefing regarding the action plan for elaboration of a proposal to establish an ISU and its associated financial architecture, and the second to be an open-ended consultation, as indicated in the draft work plan. The President expressed her wish that these events assist in developing a proposal acceptable to all in the lead up to the intersessional meetings in April. The President also stated that her intention would be to have a first draft of a Host Agreement to discuss during the intersessions themselves, aiming to then revise the draft accordingly following those discussions.

• The President again referred to the work plan, highlighting the deadline of 1 July for submission of the Oslo Progress Report for translation by UN ODA and conference services. In line with this it was therefore suggested that substantive content would need to be submitted by 15 May. The President stated that she would come back to the actual progress report itself but that it would first be necessary to establish and agree on the milestones that would be used to ensure objectives were met.

Action point: The President informed those present that separate invitations with agendas would be sent out confirming the meetings ahead.

• The President then opened the floor for comments regarding the documents that had been circulated, to which there were none.

Agenda Item 2 - Updates from Coordinators

• The President thanked the Coordinators on Clearance and Risk Reduction for their "Food for Thought" paper, as well as the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance for the letter addressed to CCM States Parties with regards contributions to a "best practice catalogue".

• The President then gave the floor to Coordinators for updates on progress since the last CorCom meeting.

• (Coord. Stock. Destruct.): Have met bilaterally to discuss the structure and agenda for the intersessional meetings. Seems that a 3 hour session would be sufficient for Stockpile Destruction and Retention. Regarding the plans of the Coordinators for the intersessional meeting: The focus will be on information sharing regarding progress in national implementation. Since continued engagement of States not yet party to the Convention is crucial for universalizing the norms of the Convention, the Co-Chairs will encourage also signatory States to share information relevant for the destruction of stockpiles

Action point: Letters will be sent out to States [or, to States parties as well as Signatories] in February in order to achieve this.

• (Coord. Stock. Destruct.): The Coordinators were planning to consult with relevant actors who might be able to contribute to a discussion on safety management at the intersessional meeting, which could take the form of one or two short presentations, followed by a discussion

• (Coord. Universalisation): With regards to universalisation, there are not many new developments. However, Costa Rica has joined the universalisation team, working alongside Chile to target South American and Caribbean countries.

• The Coordinator on Universalisation then gave the floor to the Coordinator on General Status and Operation to provide details on an upcoming regional meeting in Accra.
(Coord. Gen. Status & Op.): A three-day meeting on the CCM is being scheduled for within the first three weeks of May, which will consist of a two-day seminar and a workshop on the final day. Sub-Saharan African States will be invited to the event. Non signatories and signatories to the Convention will specifically be targeted in the first two days with a view to encourage further universalisation in the region, and States Parties that have already ratified the CCM will be targeted on the third day, in order to address implementation challenges that may be faced within these contexts.

Norway has indicated that they will possibly be able to contribute to the meeting, and a concept note is currently being developed in this regard.

(Coord. Universalisation): Would be ready to assist in engaging the Portuguese speaking countries on this matter. Perhaps this could be explored further at a later date.

The President then expressed the wish that significant progress with regards to global universalisation and implementation efforts would be made in advance of the 3MSP.

(Coord. Trans. Reporting): Have already conducted discussions with various actors concerning the production of a reporting guide. Funds towards this project have subsequently been committed by the GICHD, and Germany has provided substantive input into the elaboration of this guide.

(Coord. Coop. & Assist.): Working together on a booklet, and will most likely send another letter to signatory States to encourage them to share their cases of best practices for this catalogue. Intend on presenting a work plan at the intersessional meetings.

(Coord. Coop. & Assist.): Would also like to highlight the impressive interactive and participatory nature of the Austria’s approach at the 2MSP, with respect to Victim Assistance. Would look to mirror this ‘match making’ approach, as it would be useful to encourage States to share information and identify together where needs exist and where they can be met.

(Coord. Coop. & Assist.): The Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation has enlisted the project, and it seems likely that they will be able to contribute to the production of the booklet. The challenge that is now faced is to gain the critical mass of examples of promising practice for this project from States Parties. Would request Coordinators’ assistance in gaining contributions from the other States Parties. Of course, a good starting point would be to first collect contributions from the Coordinators themselves.

The President stated that she hoped Coordinators would be able to contribute in this vein, and that all States Parties should feed their input into this document to achieve an optimal final product. The President also thanked the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance for reaching out bilaterally to States Parties, and commended the idea.

(CMC): CMC stands ready to work with all the Coordinators, and would like to raise a couple of points. With regards to Universalization, CMC is planning on picking up the momentum again this year, as it was felt that the past year has been relatively slow on this front. There were eighteen countries present at the CCW Review Conference that had not yet ratified the treaty but had expressed concern over the draft Protocol VI. Within this same bracket there were also three States that had yet to accede to the CCM. CMC is working on an Universalisation target list that will be circulated shortly.
• (CMC): Would also like to explore the possibility of maintaining a database pertaining to Universalisation goals and targets.

• (Pres. Des.): Welcomes the project being undertaken by the Coordinators on Cooperation and Assistance, and are currently in touch with NPA concerning a possible joint contribution to the costs of the best practices catalogue.

• (Coord. Coop. & Assist.): Plans are drawing from the experiences gained from other fora, particularly that of the APMBC. Believes that maintenance of a database is something that should be looked into at a later date, but that other concerns should take precedence at this moment in time. The focus should now be to show that work is being carried out to ensure implementation of the Convention. This idea of a database would be useful when consulting countries regarding their own needs, and it should be considered at that point. Believes that the database should only serve as a means of information storage, as opposed to full-time project to which substantial staff time is dedicated.

• The President thanked the CMC for their statement, as well as the Coordinator on Universalisation for their comments.

• (Coord. Clearance): Have already received comments on the paper that was circulated with regards to the working group on Clearance and Risk Reduction, and would welcome any more feedback that there may be on this.

• (ICRC): Would just like to echo the comments of the CMC, as the ICRC sees this year as an opportunity to re-launch universalization efforts. Recent developments in the CCW have been useful, as there is now only one discussion taking place. There are a variety of upcoming events taking place in several regions, and the CCM will be tabled as one of a few treaties that need to be discussed within these forums.

**Agenda Item 3 – ISU Paper**

• (President): The elements of the President’s Working Paper on a possible ISU will be presented to States during the open briefing taking place on 3 February. This will serve as a good starting point to ask what is needed and expected from the ISU for these tasks ahead.

• (CMC): At this juncture would like to pose two questions; was there an active decision made for the ISU not to be involved in the universalisation of the CCM? This comes to mind because it has not been mentioned where implementation features in the working paper. Secondly, referring to the “resource base of relevant technical expertise” that has been mentioned in the paper, would this be internally focused? There have been two functions listed in the proposed model, one being “the public face” of the CCM, and the other “the one-stop reliable and relevant source for information on what the Convention is and does”. The Monitor also sees itself as a reliable source, is there another way to imply, perhaps through alternative wording, to imply that other reliable sources exist?

• (President): Should be clarified that nothing in relation to the ISU has been finalized, and that all elements are still open for discussion. The paper serves as the basis from which to work and reach consensual agreement. What remains as of the utmost importance is the functioning of the Convention. The main elements of the progress of the ISU proposal is to be presented 3 February, so that all States Parties are aware of the work that is being done. Lebanon, as President, sees it as imperative that a consensus is realized.
• (Coord. Stock. Destruct.): The point raised by the CMC is a relevant one. The focus should remain on implementation support. Rather, Germany would view that aspect of the mandate as being PR-related. There are other reliable sources that exist, including the Cluster Munition Monitor and UN ODA websites, so it may be difficult to establish ISU as the authority in this area. Would like to enquire as to how the ISU structure came about?

• The President thanked the CMC and the Coordinator on Stockpile Destruction and Retention for their comments, and assured them that they would receive a response to these questions following consultation. She provided some background on the thought-process behind the structure that had been devised, stating that with regards to the ‘organogram’ that was developed, we referred to the experiences from other Conventions, including primarily the MBT. Based on some of the challenges identified, it was argued that a slim body of staff was to be suggested for the ISU, as a starting point. It was also argued that the Director should hold a more general position, and that only a small number of permanent staff would be required, and that, where and when necessary, expertise could be contracted for relevant thematic areas on consultancy basis. However, it was stated that this should be open subject to further discussions.

• (President): Referring to the Directive on the ISU issued at the 2MSP, given the number of States Parties at this moment in time, this size and structure would be the appropriate composition. Furthermore also that she considers it necessary not to exclude universalization efforts in the functions of the ISU at this stage. Following previous consultations, the idea to include universalization within the scope of work was established as a means of supporting the President’s work, as indicated in the mandate set out by the Directive and to lend support the universalization efforts by states.

• The President then moved the discussion over to the development of a questionnaire that could be used to determine views on financing models for the future ISU. She informed those present that, along with the Executive Coordinator, they had met with the office responsible for assessing and collecting contributions to UN conventions. She also indicated that various aspects of this meeting had been reflected in the paper on the ISU that had been circulated at the beginning of the meeting.

• (President): It is clear that we are facing the possibility of three different models; assessed, voluntary and a “hybrid” of the two. She added that generous contributions thus far to support the work of the convention has been done on voluntary basis but that although we may be helped by “seven fat years”, it cannot be guaranteed that such contributions would be equally forthcoming during the “lean years”.

• Action point: The President informed CorCom members that a presentation will be delivered to provide some useful background information for this discussion. The presentation would be developed on the basis of the views presented by states.

• (Exec. Coord.): As Lebanon did not attend the APMBC meeting last year in Phnom Penh, your views and information regarding financial models would be highly valued given that many states recently has engaged in the similar discussion under the APMBC.

• (Exec. Coord.): Will leave the issue of the questionnaire open to CorCom members for further discussion.
Coord. Universalisation: Looking at the “potential lines of enquiry” that have been circulated, the document does not seem to address one of the three possible models, i.e. a model based on voluntary contributions, and it would therefore be appropriate to reflect this alternative more clearly in the potential questionnaire.

The President emphasized that all input on the questionnaire would be welcome, and that commentary and suggestions from CorCom members would be appreciated, prior to any feedback that may be received from other States Parties during the open briefing.

Agenda Item 4 – Oslo Progress Report

The President then directed attendees to a working paper on the Oslo Progress Report that had been circulated in the previous week, and stated that as mentioned in the document that was distributed, expectations are that the Oslo Progress Report will follow a similar format and approach as that of the Beirut Progress Report last year. The President suggested to CorCom members that the Beirut Progress Report be used as a starting point in contributions for the 3MSP, building on the trends and analysis that had been set out. Rather than language/text, what would really be required would be substantive points.

Preparations for the Intersessional will be useful in raising a series of questions and implementation challenges that can be used to frame contributions to the Oslo Progress Report. It is likely that much of the information/commentary that can be used in the report can be derived from recording the various challenges and issues encountered within the efforts of working groups in the respective thematic areas, and the preparation of updates for the sessions that CorCom members will be chairing. The President then opened the floor for any comments on this approach, to which there were none.

Action point: The President assured that a draft outline would be shared at the next CorCom meeting.

Agenda Item 5 – Draft Intersessional Agenda for discussion

The current draft is very much based on the agenda of the last intersessional meeting. For reasons of time management, taking into consideration that the CCM intersessional meeting this year precedes the Mine Ban Convention intersessional meeting, states may be prone to more in-depth deliberations on operational aspects of the conventions implementation such as on clearance and victim assistance.

Would like however to hear from CorCom in case there is any comment on this draft, and would like to finalise the first draft before the second open-ended consultation scheduled tentatively for the 29 February.

Last year issues that fell under General Status and Operation of the Convention received a fairly small amount of attention, for example matters such as legal issues and interpretation. Again, have noticed that General Status and Operation is being linked to issues such as compliance, reports on consultations, etc. Would suggest moving this over to Thursday to make allowances for a lengthier discussion, and in turn shifting “other implementation measures” to Wednesday afternoon, as it is more closely linked with national implementation measures.

The President took note of and thanked the ICRC for their comments.
Agenda Item 6 - Preparation for 3MSP

- The President made reference to the first advance mission in Oslo last December, and then invited the President-Designate and Executive Coordinator to say few words on this.

- (Pres. Des.): Practicalities are going well, have established good contact with the Executive Coordinator and her team.

- (Exec. Coord.): Can confirm that both the Executive Coordinator, UN ODA and representative of the CMC were present on the mission. The venue is in fact the same that was used 10 years ago for the APMBC diplomatic conference. It is a very central venue, with excellent facilities for participants. The usual practical issues that will arise will be fairly simple to arrange in this context. UN ODA and UNDP are very satisfied with the set up and are looking forward to the planning and organization of the 3MSP.

- (Pres. Des.): Working group has been established, in which CMC will be represented by NPA.

Agenda Item 7 – AOB

- (Exec. Coord.): Would like to draw attention to the fact that the proposal for the interim executive coordination of work in support of the convention that has just been circulated should be read in the context of the President’s paper that was distributed a few days ago.

- (Exec. Coord.): Some funds have been secured for the work ahead, but gaps still remain. Also, currently working on the assumption that a large donor proposal will not be required for fund related to the 3MSP. In terms of preparations for the intersessional meeting, sponsorship programmes for the intersessional meeting as well as the MSP, interpretation and translation, etc., we would kindly ask that CorCom members consult capitals as to whether they could contribute. Small, in-kind contributions are also more than welcome.

- **Action point**: It was agreed that the President would send out a letter to those Coordinators that will be leaving their roles at the 3MSP, to ask that, together with those that will continue in the role for 2013, they seek out and engage new potential candidates. It was also suggested that the President designate undertakes consultations with regards to nominations for the Presidency of the 4MSP.

- The President declared the meeting closed and reiterated that, along with the Executive Coordination team, she would remain at their disposal in the lead up to upcoming events.