

Presentation of Germany and Montenegro

I am taking the floor on behalf of the co-coordinators for international cooperation and assistance, Germany and Montenegro. I will provide a brief overview of the most pertinent issues of cooperation and assistance and reflect on the corresponding actions set out in the Lausanne Action Plan.

Despite the pandemic and the complex security situation, the wheel of international cooperation and assistance must continue to turn, and States Parties of the Convention must uphold this commitment.

We thank the Presidency for the efforts to explore ways of innovative financing, which, in addition to the existing institutional funding, could enhance the implementation of the Convention.

I would like to start by reminding delegations that the Lausanne action plan dedicated its actions 38 to 42 to international cooperation and assistance, which often play a crucial role in enabling the completion of time bound obligations under the Convention.

Let me briefly reflect on some key issues of cooperation and assistance, in their correlation with the LAP.

To start, Action 40 of the LAP outlines, that States parties when in a position to do so, provide timely responses to requests for assistance for the implementation of the Convention.

However, in practice, international assistance comes only when some preconditions are previously fulfilled. Some key challenges identified by donor states to respond positively to requests for assistance are the absence or lack of political commitment, absence of appropriate national ownership as well as the absence of national legislation, and

adequate strategic framework or planning related to the implementation of the Convention.

Recognition of the importance of the strong commitment of the States parties to provide resources for the completion of obligations under the Convention and their strong national ownership is part of Actions 38 and 41 of the LAP.

To clarify national ownership means that the state with obligations under the Convention must have the leading role in their completion. All other stakeholders can only support this process.

We would like to single out the Action 41 of the LAP, which instructs states seeking assistance on how they should act. It clearly sets out that these states should develop coherent and comprehensive national plans aimed at developing national ownership, based on appropriate surveys, needs assessments and analysis of national capacity.

Promoting sharing experiences and best practices, establishing partnerships at all levels, and also developing capacity building and national expertise is defined in Action 39.

In our opinion establishing partnerships and good coordination are inseparable elements for the successful completion of time-bound obligations under the Convention. The civil sector also has a very important role in this process.

Action 42 promotes, inter-alia, further detailing the modalities of platforms and modalities to enhance targeted regular dialogue between affected States Parties, donors and operators, and exploring synergies with similar forums, as appropriate.

An exemplary and effective mechanism for cooperation and assistance is the concept of „Country coalition“, introduced in 2017.

The main aim of the Country Coalition is to enhance in-country coordination between the affected State Party with donors and operators for the fulfilment of its obligations that have specified deadlines under the Convention. It is an institutionalized national platform for dialogue and coordination, which regularly brings together all stakeholders to coordinate their efforts, discuss priorities and needs, and exchange information.

The set-up of Country Coalitions in Botswana and Montenegro has enabled these States' Parties to achieve their time-bound obligations under the Convention, even before their initial deadlines. In a similar vein, Lebanon, through its Mine Action Forum, has made great strides towards fulfilling its obligations.

Let me remind you on the brochure on Country Coalition available on the website of the implementation support unit, it is a valuable asset for a better understanding of this concept.

As thematic coordinators we would like to underline the importance of the exchange of experience and good practices and strengthening synergies among similar instruments, such as CCM and APMBC. In this vein we organized in December an informal meeting with members of the relevant committees for extension requests and for cooperation and assistance under both Conventions, as well as representatives of the CCM and APMBC Presidency, both ISUs and Civil Society.

I will conclude our presentation with a few recommendations for states currently seeking partners for cooperation and assistance.

It is recommendable that states seeking assistance do more than indicate their needs in their Article 7 reports. They should not be shy to proactively ask for international support and announce their needs and plans, publicly, formally or informally - an active approach is very important in order to obtain the attention of potential partners and donors.

Our experience has shown that states seeking assistance are quite hesitant to approach the thematic coordinators for Article 6 to present their needs and ask for support. We would like to encourage delegations to do so in the future.

Practice shows that requests for cooperation and assistance which are evidence-based and which set out concrete needs, a national action plan and funding overview very often meet positive reactions from donors.

We would be interested to hear the views of both donor states and states with outstanding time-bound obligations under the Convention. We look forward to hear you present your views and experiences.

Thank you.