

## **Convention on Cluster Munitions.**

**Intersessional meetings, April, 2012, Geneva**

**Norwegian statement on the financing of an ISU**

**Thursday 19 April**

Mr Coordinator,

We have listened with care and interest to the discussions and the various views expressed during this week on possible financing models for a future ISU of the Convention. We do think it is necessary and timely to remind ourselves about some fundamental elements that cannot be ignored in these elaborations and the future decisions.

Let me first of all make the observation that our obligations as States Parties and the implementation of the Convention are not dependent on the existence of an ISU. All our obligations and the action on the ground will have to be fulfilled regardless of the existence of this unit. But, an ISU could certainly be of significant assistance to, in particular states, missions and delegations with capacity challenges and improve their possibility to be active participants in the life of the Convention. In other words, we see an ISU as one tool to put States Parties on a more equal footing in this respect. It is, in this perspective, quite encouraging to see the large number of developing countries, including affected states, that express their wish to contribute financially to an ISU, and equally regrettable that some states signal that they are not willing to share this relatively small financial burden through an assessed model in order to secure the important elements of partnership and continued cross regional representation in all aspects of the Convention.

Secondly, I would underline and support what has been said by others about the experience from the ISU of the Mine Ban Convention. This experience tells us clearly that it is extremely difficult to mobilise resources on a voluntary basis. It is an annual struggle, and by no means getting easier.

Thirdly, as you will recall from the discussions and decision from the 2MSP in Beirut it was a shared understanding that a future ISU must be founded and funded on the principles of independence, predictability, sustainability, responsibility and shared ownership. I have not yet heard how a voluntary model would meet those requirements in a satisfactory way. We fail to see how it can do so in a realistic manner and would welcome concrete proposals to this end.

This leads me to the fourth element that simply cannot be ignored. Any decision on establishing an ISU will not be implemented without secure funding. It is quite obvious that it is not possible to start the recruitment of personnel without secured and predictable multi-year funding.

Finally, we as Norway would have preferred an ISU fully financed by assessed contributions, but I would suggest that in order to reach agreement on a proposal in Oslo on the establishment of an ISU, we should rather focus on the practical realities and exploring what is feasible based on the suggested hybrid model. This model offers a way forward and provides a flexible basis for discussion. We think the hybrid model and the illustrative figures presented by the Presidency represent a useful point of departure that takes into account the necessary principles we need to build a future ISU on. We are ready to continue to work on this basis in a flexible and constructive way. But what is clear, is that the decision we made in Beirut last year on establishing an ISU cannot be realised if we are not prepared to take the necessary responsibility and recognise that there are certain costs involved that cannot, should not and will not be covered by a few states. This is a collective responsibility for a common good and should be undertaken in a spirit of cooperation and solidarity.

Thank you.