

**Third Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions  
Oslo, 11-14 September 2012**

**Lebanon's Proposal on the ISU Mandate**

**Delivered by: Ambassador Najla RIACHI ASSAKER, Permanent Representative of Lebanon to  
the United Nations in Geneva**

Thank you Ambassador Kongstad, Mr. President,

Dear colleagues, ladies, gentlemen,

You will recall that the 2MSP provided us with your trust in presiding over the Meeting which we hosted in Beirut as well as the intersessional work programme through the last 12 months. You also provided us with valuable guidance in this endeavor, more specifically with the Mandate you gave us, and I quote - "to negotiate, in consultation with the States parties, an agreement with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining on the hosting of an Implementation Support Unit as well as a funding model, and present these proposals to the States parties for their approval."

Since then, the work of the Lebanese Presidency has been based on this guidance which included the general outline for the work of the Coordination Committee; a Committee to which I chose to follow practice established already at the early stage of our collaborative work in inviting the former as well as the future Presidencies and representatives from the UN, the ICRC and the CMC in addition to our executive coordination team at UNDP. And so we embarked on the work of our mandate.

Within this process we have viewed it imperative that the views of States parties are adequately reflected in all work we do and in all associated documents, starting with the approach and principles agreed upon in Beirut. Consequently we developed the work and subsequent recommendations and proposals in a manner that aimed to ensure that - irrespective of the final shape that it takes - the ISU would be directly accountable to the States parties, independent of any other institutions and conduct its work based on the principles of: independence, inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness.

Informed through the course of this year's Coordination Committee meetings, in addition to three informal open-ended consultations with States, and numerous bilateral consultations, the Presidency has drafted a working paper outlining the proposed structure and functions of an ISU, in addition to various associated background documents detailing financing modalities. In advance of the last informal open-ended consultation on 31 August in Geneva, States were presented with a draft working paper which incorporated these various elements into a single document outlining the description of a proposed ISU together with the suggested funding model that would best combine predictability with the flexibility needed as well as underpin the principals of independence and inclusive ownership. You will have found this document presented on the website as well as circulated to your missions in Geneva and it is also available at the documentation centre for your reference.

I believe that we, with your help, have advanced quite a lot on the ISU front. I will assume that delegations have had the chance to examine this paper and will therefore not go through it in detail albeit mention a few brief points of the most recent amendments which included, as presented at the last open-ended consultations:

- A reminder of the SPs decisions at the 2 MSP, as a guiding framework and principles in this regard.
- A decrease in the number of staff envisioned to accommodate requests for lower costs.
- The suggested proposal for the financial platform to support the establishment of the ISU based on a mix of mandatory annual contributions by States Parties and appeals for support to certain project based activities from States in a position to provide additional voluntary funding beyond that needed for core costs.

As detailed in the paper, the annual contributions, which would be requested from States parties on behalf of future Presidents, would be based according to the same principals of calculations presented in the General Assembly resolution on the apportionment of Member States contributions to the costs rendered by the UN<sup>1</sup>.

To assist the discussions, an indicative budget based on the presented financial model and containing real figures obtained from GICHD was also presented. This budget would naturally need adjustment in relation to anticipated activity level and associated final staffing numbers and should therefore be regarded as indicative.

This paper represents what the Presidency believes to be the best balanced proposal possible based on all views expressed.

Despite these efforts, I must report that ensuing deliberations have revealed the disparities that still exist between the various perspectives held by States parties, in particular as it regards the financial model to underpin the establishment of an ISU.

In addition to the financial platform which I maintain would be indispensable, both for the establishment of and to support the ISU in the future, there is also the eventuality of the level of support that such an ISU is expected to provide to States parties. In other terms, while we have seen divergent views on how best to address the finances of an ISU, we also see that the terms of reference of this ISU is an issue that could warrant more detailed discussion.

Against this backdrop, in a circulation last week, I wished to draw your attention to the conclusions of the last open-ended informal consultations held in Geneva, 31 August 2012, as well as the ensuing conclusions drawn by the Coordination Committee subsequent to the informal consultations which summarized the views shared by States in that *"despite the progress achieved in the efforts to find a financing model to support the establishment of an ISU acceptable to all, there continues to be a gap between the many and various positions expressed"* and further that, this conclusion simply depicted the situation as it is, at this time.

Having overseen this course of discussions, it is our view that a final agreement will rest largely on the conclusion of the financing issue. In this respect, many States have pointed to the heavy financial constraints currently felt on national budgets at this time, as the current economic climate has in some cases impeded a State's ability to make any new pledges with regards to funding. We recognise the difficulties faced by many within this context, and that this in no way signifies a lesser commitment

---

<sup>1</sup> UNGA decides on the apportionment of the UN expenses among member states on a triennial basis. UNGA resolution A/RES/64/248 Dated 5 February is valid for 2010, 2011 and 2012.

towards the shared humanitarian goals of this Convention nor does it question the need for implementation support.

I remain confident that a compromise can be found with respect to these elements, and that we can collectively adopt a model that reflects the needs and concerns of all States whilst ensuring the sustainability and broad ownership of the ISU, which I am sure that all would agree, is paramount to the successful and effective implementation of this Convention.

At the same time, we wish to provide the space for a realistic discussion in Oslo which, that transparently display also alternatives to the approach suggested should such a compromise not be reached and in line with this and in view of State party preparations for the 3MSP we presented to you

- 1- The working paper submitted by the President entitled "Description of a possible Implementation Support Unit",
- 2- The set of draft decisions related to the President's recommendations for an Implementation Support Unit contained in the above mentioned working paper, and
- 3- A set of draft decisions related to a President's mandate to further the negotiations on an Implementation Support Unit for the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

The second alternative set of draft decisions, should they come to use, are suggested in line with the mandate provided to the Lebanese Presidency last year and recommends that further negotiations would build on the work conducted to date with the aim of finding a financial platform acceptable to all at a time appropriate with regards to financial viability for its initial set-up as well as sustainability over time.

The alternative draft decisions therefore suggest requesting the President of the 3rd MSP to further negotiate, in consultation with the States parties, an agreement on the hosting of an Implementation Support Unit, as well as its establishment and a funding model, and present these proposals to States parties for approval.

Thank you,