



MINUTES OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Friday 4 November 2016

at the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany, from 10:00 – 11:30 hours

1. PRESENT:

Germany - 7MSP President

H.E. Michael Biontino
Mr. Toralf Pilz

Australia

Mr. Hugh Watson
Ms. Thuy Nguyen
Mr. Joel Paterson

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Mr. Asim Dorović

Chile

Ms. Carola Muñoz

Costa Rica

Ms. Maricela Muñoz

Croatia

Ms. Ines Sprem Scigliano

France

Ms. Camille Gufflet

Iraq

Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi

Italy

Dr. Silvia Cattaneo

Mexico

Mr. Víctor Martínez

Netherlands

Ms. Sachi Claringbould

New Zealand

Ms. Katy Donnelly

Norway

Ms. Malgorzata Hauge

Switzerland

Ms. Aline Berdoz

Zambia

H.E. Ms. Encyla Tina Chishiba Sinjela

Cluster Munition Coalition

Ms. Amélie Chayer

ICRC

Mr. Louis Maresca

UNODA

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano

ISU-CCM

Ms. Sheila Mweemba
Mr. Matthieu Laruelle

2. Opening Remarks by the President

The second Coordination Committee meeting under the German presidency was opened by the President of the Seventh Meeting of States Parties (7MSP), Ambassador Michael Biontino of the Federal Republic of Germany, with a warm welcome to all the Committee members.

The President then presented the Agenda and enquired of the Committee if it had any additional items for discussion. There being none, he proceeded with the Agenda as presented.

3. Approval of the Minutes of 27 September 2016

The draft Minutes, which had been circulated in advance, were approved without comments as a correct record of what had transpired during the Coordination Committee Meeting held on 27 September 2016.

4. Updates from the 7MSP Presidency

The President started by reiterating that universalization would remain one of Germany's top priorities up to the 7MSP. In this regard, he informed the meeting that the Presidency had already drafted an outline which was currently being reviewed by CCM Coordinators on universalization (France and Zambia).

The President then gave a brief introduction of its non-paper on Country Coalitions which had been previously shared with the Coordination Committee members for comments. The President informed that he would provide more details on the document later during the meeting. The President then gave an summary of the positive discussions on the CCM that had taken place during the First Committee Meeting in New York that month. He informed the meeting that a Resolution on CCM (A/C.1/71/L.22) had been adopted with few abstentions.

Before giving the floor to Coordinators to present their thematic concept notes, the President proposed that these be discussed and adapted as necessary based on any comments from the other Committee members before uploading the final versions on the Convention's website alongside an executive summary. The President highlighted that this would showcase the work done by the Coordination Committee in full transparency. He acknowledged that this might also raise expectations and asked Committee members for their views in this regard.

New Zealand thanked the President for the initiative and supported the approach as the activities envisaged in the concept notes would not be undertaken by only members of the Coordination Committee but would also require the support of all States Parties and Signatories.

In contributing to the discussion, the ISU-CCM Director informed the meeting that the ISU-CCM had already created thematic specific pages on the Convention's website for Coordinators to upload content and boost visibility of their work.

The President thereafter invited the Coordinators to briefly introduce their respective concept notes that would enhance the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan up to the 7MSP. He concluded by requesting the Coordinators to provide concrete steps on the implementation of their plan at the next Coordination Committee meeting scheduled for December.

5. Presentation of Concept notes by thematic Coordinators of their work up to the 7MSP

5.1 Victim Assistance (Italy and Chile)

On behalf of the Coordinators on Victim Assistance, Italy explained that their concept note would focus on two types of activities; inward looking and outward looking. Italy explained that the primary objectives outlined in the concept paper consisted of strengthening joint approaches with CCM Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance as well as increasing coordination with other Conventions (mainly the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW)). Italy added that the strategies and activities proposed were all aimed at reaching the set objectives. The Coordinator then mentioned that one of its first tasks would be to reach out to States Parties with victim assistance obligations while also continuing to promote the work done by its predecessors, especially regarding the dissemination of the *Guidance on an integrated approach to Victim Assistance*. Finally, Italy thanked the ISU-CCM for its support and advice.

In its capacity as former Victim Assistance Coordinator, Australia informed the meeting that the guidance document would be launched during a side event on the second day of the APMBC 15th Meeting of States Parties in Santiago, Chile. Australia added that it would receive hardcopies of the document on Monday 6 November. The Coordinator highlighted that the publication would provide guidance across Conventions to assist States in taking forward their obligations.

With regards to country prioritization, the ICRC Representative asked the Coordinators on Victim Assistance, Italy and Chile, if they could explain the rationale behind the choice of countries. Italy clarified that the priorities were based on an analysis of Article 7 reports and the identification of States Parties that had not yet reported having a focal point and or having developed a national action plan for victim assistance. The ISU-CCM Director reminded the Committee that based on the Dubrovnik Action Plan States Parties should designate a focal point within their government to coordinate victim assistance by the end of 2016. Also, that States Parties should develop a national action plan on victim assistance by no later than the end of 2018.

While acknowledging the very ambitious objectives of this thematic area, the President invited all Coordinators to translate their concept notes into operational action plans by the next meeting.

5.2 Universalization (France and Zambia)

Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Coordinators, explained that its concept note was based on the Dubrovnik Action Plan and that the objectives and goals established thereof would be threefold: to increase the number of States Parties by the 7MSP and thereby move towards the 2020 target of 130 States Parties; to increase stigmatization of the use of cluster munitions, and finally to increase awareness of the Convention. Regarding outcomes, Zambia stressed that by focusing on countries that had shown interest in the Convention, it would hope to have eight (8) new States Parties by the 7MSP. Zambia also highlighted the importance of the need for all States to speak up and promote the Convention. With regards to concrete activities, Zambia informed the meeting that, funds permitting, the Coordinators and the Presidency together with the support of other partners, hoped to organize a workshop on universalization in South East Asia.

In contributing to the discussion, France emphasized that both Coordinators would work in close coordination with the Presidency to start a constructive dialogue with major cluster munitions producers and possessors of the weapons in a bid to address the security concerns raised by potential new States Parties.

After thanking the Coordinators for their presentation, the President shared the view that States not yet party generally fell into two categories: States that did not join the Convention because of administrative reasons and States that were reluctant to join the Convention because of political and/or security concerns. The President further explained that the main producers of cluster munitions fell into the second category. He further proposed his intention to engage these States in a constructive dialogue even though the chances of convincing them to join the Convention were currently slim. However, these States needed to be engaged to get them on board eventually and the President gave the example of the case of the United States participating in the APMBBC meetings as an observer State.

Zambia welcomed the President's analysis and emphasized that the eight (8) States that Coordinators would focus on up to the 7MSP belong to the first category.

On the same thematic, the Presidency informed that, with the support of the ISU-CCM, it had identified States not Parties that had voted in favor of the new CCM Resolution. The Presidency suggested that the Coordination Committee also focused its efforts on these States.

In contributing to the discussion, New Zealand informed the meeting that it was scheduled to host an Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Inter-Sessional Meeting on Non-Proliferation and Disarmament in early 2017. In this regard, New Zealand highlighted the possibility to coordinate efforts with the Presidency and the Coordinators on universalization to optimize resources and efforts. New Zealand further explained that most Pacific States belonged to the first category described earlier by the President and that it would be happy to support the Coordinators with any universalization activities to be undertaken in that region. On developments in Africa, New Zealand also shared with the meeting that Cameroon had expressed interest in organizing a similar event to the Addis Ababa workshop

on universalization organized in August 2016. New Zealand elaborated that Cameroon would confirm once new national legislation had been approved.

In this context, the President reported that it had approached the European Union for funding to implement the *Country Coalitions* strategy through two workshops, possibly in Africa and South-East Asia.

The Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) representative warmly welcomed the concept notes elaborated by all Coordinators and reiterated the availability of the CMC to support Coordinators in their work, including with data from the Cluster Munition Monitor.

The ICRC thanked the Coordinators for their papers. ICRC explained that it agreed on the grouping of States mentioned earlier by the President and informed the meeting that ICRC had already done a lot of bilateral work in South East Asia. In elaborating on this issue, ICRC welcomed the particular focus on producers but also encouraged the Coordination Committee to target possessors as both categories would benefit from a structured dialogue.

In this context, the Presidency offered its support to Coordinators by traveling and/or writing letters to engage in a dialogue with target States. In summing up the discussion thus far, the President reiterated that the Presidency and Coordinators for universalization would meet before the next Coordination Committee meeting to fine-tune the approach.

5.3 Stockpile Destruction (Croatia and Mexico)

Croatia speaking on behalf of the two Coordinators told the meeting that their concept note had been drafted based on the Dubrovnik Action Plan. Croatia explained that the Coordinators' primary objectives would be to focus on States Parties with upcoming deadlines as well as States Parties that had retained cluster munitions. Croatia then described the different strategies it would implement to reach the expected outcomes. Such strategies included the facilitation of partnerships and exchanges of good practices and the identification of obstacles to stockpile destruction through bilateral contacts or formal correspondence with States Parties. Croatia clarified that it did not foresee any specific budget as it would rely mainly on diplomacy. Finally, regarding the timeline and sequence of activities, Croatia invited the meeting to read section 5 of the concept note.

As there were no comments on the concept note presented, the President concluded by congratulating the Coordinators for their work and reminded all Coordinators to turn their concept papers into operational plans by the next meeting.

5.4 Clearance and Risk Reduction Education (Norway and Netherlands)

Norway, speaking on behalf of the Coordinators on Clearance and Risk Reduction Education, apologized for not having sent its concept note prior to the Coordination Committee meeting. Norway explained that the concept note was also based on the Dubrovnik Action Plan and that its main objective would be to support States Parties to meet their Article 4 deadlines, thereby avoiding extensions requests. Norway informed the meeting that the primary strategy of the Coordinators would be to establish a dialogue with selected States

Parties through the organization of workshops aimed at addressing the specific concerns of States with regards to meeting their deadlines; such as, for example, better targeting of resources. By way of trial, Norway reported that Coordinators on Clearance and Risk Reduction Education would organize a workshop in Lebanon in November. The workshop would bring together representatives of the Lebanon Mine Action Centre, donors, and operators to discuss efficiency in clearance of cluster munitions. Norway further explained that it would sum up lessons learned through the workshop and consider the possibility of using the workshop as a model for further dialogue with other States with obligations under Article 4, or for States that have not joined the Convention. Norway concluded by stressing that this would be the first workshop of the kind and that Coordinators would be happy to further elaborate on the concept with the ISU-CCM.

The Netherlands added that both Coordinators would also look at cluster munition-affected States having difficulties to join the Convention because of the clearance deadline and would hope to reach out to these States in coordination with other Committee members.

In his concluding remarks, the President welcomed the approach outlined by Norway and the Netherlands and looked forward to receiving feedback on the workshop in Lebanon.

5.5 International Cooperation and Assistance (Iraq and Australia)

Australia speaking on behalf of the two Coordinators informed the meeting that its main focus would be to strengthen partnerships at all levels and facilitate evidence-based cooperation and assistance. Australia further explained that as Coordinators, they wanted to look for innovative ways to better match evidence-based requests for support from affected States with the priorities of donors. To this end, Coordinators would like to host a side event in the margins of the 2017 Mine Action Directors meeting. Australia highlighted the importance of meeting with other Coordinators, particularly on stockpile destruction, clearance and victim assistance, in preparation for this workshop to identify target States and define common objectives. Australia concluded by saying that this workshop would be a good platform for affected States to present evidence-based needs and for donors to expose their priorities.

In contributing to the discussion, the CMC highlighted the importance of inviting all relevant actors to the workshop in order to ensure a successful outcome.

The President thanked the Coordinators and welcomed the initiative which fell in line with Germany's *Country Coalitions* strategy.

On the thematic area of Victim Assistance, Australia reassured that together with Iraq they would continue to work with the Coordinators on Victim Assistance to promote a *Guidance on an integrated approach to Victim Assistance* that would be launched in the margins of the APMBBC 15MSP to be held in Chile from 28 November to 1 December 2016. To conclude, Australia thanked the ISU-CCM for its support in the development of the concept note.

The President asked the meeting if they had any questions before moving on to the next agenda item.

5.6 Transparency Measures (Costa Rica)

In presenting its concept note, the Coordinator for Transparency Measures, Costa Rica, informed the meeting that one of its main objectives during the year would be to increase the submission rate of initial and annual transparency reports. Costa Rica explained that to date there were still 22 States Parties with overdue initial transparency reports and 20 States Parties with overdue 2015 annual reports. Costa Rica underscored the fact that there would be overlaps in the scopes of work of the various Coordinators and offered to collaborate as appropriate.

New Zealand welcomed Costa Rica's comment and further highlighted that there was some cross-over in the measures elaborated in the concept notes for national implementation measures and transparency measures, and indicated a willingness to work closely with Costa Rica on follow-up measures.

The Netherlands then asked if Costa Rica could present its list of target countries so that other coordinators could reach out to the same States at the same time. Costa Rica replied that with the support of the ISU-CCM it was in the process of defining a target list of countries in different regions.

The President thanked Costa Rica and stressed once more the pivotal role that transparency reporting played in holding States Parties accountable. The President concluded by reminding Coordinators to operationalize their concept notes by the next meeting.

5.7 National Implementation Measures (New Zealand)

The Coordinator on National Implementation Measures, New Zealand, apologized for the late submission of its concept note. New Zealand explained to the meeting that to date the number of States Parties that had enacted national legislation to implement the CCM was still low. New Zealand also highlighted that the discrepancies in figures between the Cluster Munition Monitor and the ISU-CCM was mostly due to the different sources of information used. The Coordinator further conveyed to the Meeting that, with the support of the ISU, it was in the process of developing a consolidated target list of States Parties that had either reported being in the process of developing new legislation or that had not provided any information on their national implementation legislation. New Zealand then shared a general overview of some of its key objectives and strategies with the Coordination Committee and elaborated as follows: that by the 7MSP a guidance document with best practices on how to ensure that all relevant national actors were informed of their obligations under the Convention and of national implementation measures be produced with the support of the ICRC and ISU-CCM and circulated; that a mechanism through which States Parties could report on their national dissemination of information on their obligations be developed with support from ICRC and CMC; and that a guidance document for States on how to address the

financing of cluster munitions be produced with the help of civil society, and in particular PAX Netherlands.

The President thanked New Zealand for its detailed presentation and looked forward to the operational plan to be shared at the next meeting.

In concluding discussion on that Agenda item, the President informed the meeting that the objectives of Coordinators on General Status and Operation of the Convention; Bosnia and Herzegovina and Switzerland, would not be discussed at that time.

5.8 Country Coalitions Non paper (Presidency)

Ambassador Biontino gave an overview of the Presidency's non-paper on Country Coalitions aimed at promoting the implementation of the CCM. The President explained to the meeting that the main objective of the Country Coalitions would be to assist affected States Parties with their obligations but also to assist States not Party in order to be in a better position to accede to the Convention. The President added that through this approach they would hope to focus on specific countries, be they States Parties or non-States Parties, and address their needs and challenges. The President further highlighted that the Country Coalitions would be coordinated by the affected country or target country together with a donor country or lead country to promote a more comprehensive approach to the country's specific challenges. The President elaborated that the relevant players for such a coalition would include representatives of the affected country, donor States, international organizations, operators and civil society. Together all relevant stakeholders would identify the problems or challenges and define answers. In concluding his presentation, the President acknowledged that the approach would only work with the target country's full support.

When asked to comment on the strategy, Norway welcomed the initiative and highlighted that it was in line with the approach Coordinators on Clearance had adopted for their upcoming workshop in Beirut. In elaborating on the Country Coalitions non-paper, Norway shared the following comments: a preference for a focus on States Parties before States not Parties; in order for such an approach to be effective it will be crucial to establish trust, build a constructive dialogue and make sure the target State is fully on board; that it wasn't sure how these targeted workshops based on the Country Coalitions approach would be financed.

While agreeing to Norway's comments, the President reiterated that it would be up to the lead country to identify target countries and lead the process.

In the ensuing discussion, Australia highlighted that it would also be key to ensuring that those States with low profiles get the necessary support.

In contributing to the discussion, the Netherlands stressed the importance of reinforcing a coordinated approach with specific countries but also between CCM Coordinators.

In its contribution, Switzerland welcomed the initiative and highlighted that there was value in looking at similar processes in Conventions which have similarities with the CCM.

The CMC expressed its support to Norway and the Netherlands for the upcoming workshop in Lebanon, as well as to the Presidency's Country Coalitions. The CMC reiterated the importance of deepening dialogue and trust with target countries.

The President informed the meeting that with the support of the ISU-CCM it would turn its Country Coalitions non-paper into an operational plan by the next meeting and maybe already identify lead countries. The President added that it had already approached the European Union to promote this approach and requested funding for future workshops in South East Asia, the Caucasus and Africa. The President then acknowledged that this document should be considered a work in progress to be improved upon, as a series of stakeholders such as UNMAS still needed to be consulted. With regards to Norway's question about funding, the President mentioned the idea of setting up a specific trust fund aimed at financing the Country Coalitions' strategy. To conclude, the President suggested that showcasing the country-specific approach could be a concrete deliverable for the 7MSP.

ICRC went back to Agenda item 5.7 on National Implementation Measures and confirmed it would support New Zealand in the implementation of its concept note. ICRC also reiterated its engagement regarding continued support to Coordinators both through its field offices and at headquarters.

6. Implementation of the ISU-CCM Financial Decision

The President then gave the floor to the ISU-CCM Director to provide an update on the financial situation of the Implementation Support Unit.

The ISU-CCM Director informed the meeting that since the last update, only 2 States Parties had made contributions to the ISU Trust Fund amounting to a total amount of CHF 43'650. A third State Party had reported having paid its contribution, but the ISU-CCM had not received it yet. The Director explained that at that date only 24 out of 100 States Parties had contributed towards the ISU-CCM Trust Fund. The Director further explained that these States Parties had contributed CHF 96'433 towards 7a; CHF 110'922 towards 7b and CHF 170'481 towards 7c. The Director emphasized that as such, the ISU-CCM had a financing deficit amounting to just over CHF 100'000 of its 2016 budget.

Italy informed the meeting that its contribution was being processed and apologized for the delay due to its governmental restructuring. The Coordinator further highlighted that contributions would be at the same level as in the past.

In contributing to the discussion, Zambia asked what impact this funding shortfall would have on the ISU-CCM annual plan and activities. ISU-CCM Director explained that the ISU-CCM had some funds carried over from the previous year but that would it not be adequate to take the Secretariat through the first trimester of 2017.

The Netherlands asked how much of the ISU funding was not voluntary. The ISU-CCM Director replied, explaining that the ISU-CCM had calculated the indicative schedule of contributions

based on the current UN rate of assessed contributions. While the agreement made at the 1st review Conference treated only 40% of the annual budget relating to the preparations of Meetings of States Parties as not voluntary, several States Parties had indicated that their understanding of the procedures were that the whole budget was 100% voluntary. She highlighted that the varying interpretations of the procedures by States presented a challenge in following up on outstanding contributions.

In its contribution to the discussion, New Zealand reported that, while it had some downsides, “naming and shaming” had proven to be an effective strategy in the case of the APMBC shortfall for the organization of the 15MSP.

The President thanked the ISU-CCM Director for the update and stressed that the UNOG document on the current status of contributions of States for each treaty presented at the First Committee in New York had raised concerns among States. Following up on the proposal to look again into the possibility of having one bill sent to States and negotiating with the UN to waive the 13% administrative fee applied by the UN for such transactions, the President confirmed it had discussed the issue UN Officials whilst in New York. In this regard, the President reported to the Meeting that if the UN were to collect the ISU budget, there would be no margin for negotiation and the 13% administrative fee would apply.

The President suggested that perhaps one of the ways to increase contributions by States Parties would be to apply the same level of transparency regarding ISU-CCM contributions. The President explained he supported replicating UNOG's methodology but asked Coordinators to seek advice from their capitals and provide an answer by the next meeting in December. He further encouraged Coordinators to also consider financing models implemented under other Conventions and see how States could be best approached on this important issue.

In the ensuing debate, the Netherlands asked at what stage invoices were sent to States and stressed the need to eventually focus on States with longstanding arrears in order to solve the problem in the long term. In providing clarification, the ISU-CCM Director conveyed to the Meeting that three reminders had already been sent to States in 2016. To that effect, one letter had been sent in January, one in June and one just before the 6MSP. The ISU-CCM Director reiterated that States often did not understand the difference between the UN invoice related to Conference Services and the invoice relating to the ISU-CCM contribution.

In its submission, Bosnia and Herzegovina asked the Meeting what it thought would be best: to pay the 13% administrative fee and have the UN bill States on behalf of the ISU or to risk having the ISU-CCM underfinanced. The President indicated that this would be viable based on the assumptions that the UN was better at getting contributions and that States understood clearly the difference between the two invoices.

In response to concerns expressed regarding the timing of the United Nations billing system, UNODA indicated that UNOG finances were currently working on the issue.

The ISU-CCM Director reminded the Meeting that, as agreed at the First Review Conference, the current financial model would have to be reviewed at the 7MSP. She further indicated that there were different schools of thought on the subject as some States Parties had made it clear that they considered the only mandatory contributions under the CCM to be those provided for in Article 14 of the Convention. In this context, the ISU-CCM had been dealing with continuous and varying requests from States requiring clarifications on the matter of ISU contributions.

To conclude this segment, the President informed the Meeting that he would, through the ISU-CCM, be sending out individual letters to remind all the States Parties that had still not sent their contributions to the ISU-CCM Trust Fund to do so without delay. He further asked Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention to assist the presidency in identifying ways to address this important issue. The President again encouraged the Coordinators to look at models implemented under other Conventions and re-examine the issue with UNOG at the beginning of 2017.

7. Update from the ISU-CCM

The ISU-CCM Director notified the Coordinators that the ISU had created webpages on the Convention's website on which to showcase their work and upload the final versions of their concept notes. The ISU-CCM Director also informed the Meeting that all previous activities implemented by some of the Coordinators had already been uploaded on the Convention's website.

8. Date of the Next CC Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Coordination Committee would be held on Wednesday, 7 December 2016 from 10:00h to 11:30h in the conference room of the Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In his final remarks, the President reminded the meeting to come prepared to the next Coordination Committee meeting with operational plans on the concrete implementation of the Concept notes.
