



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE
held on Monday, 5 June 2023
in Conference Room 6A, Tower 3, Maison de la Paix
from 11:00 to 12:30 hours

1. Present:

Republic of Iraq – 11MSP President

Ms. Raghad Hasan

Mr. Mohammed Ridha Al-Haidari

Mexico – President-Designate (12MSP)

H.E. Ms. Francisca E. Méndez Escobar

Ms. Mariana Roa

United Kingdom – Immediate Past President
(10MSP)

Ms. Eleonora Sagesse

Bulgaria

Mr. Nikola Yakov

France

Mr. Basile Connan-Boulle

Germany

Ms. Irmgard Adam

Netherlands

Ms. Henriëtte van Gulik

CMC

Ms. Kasia Derlicka-Rosenbauer

ICRC

Ms. Alexandra Keller

UNODA

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano

Ms. Alice Marzi

Implementation Support Unit

Ms. Pamela Moraga

Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi

Ms. Elaine Weiss

Apologies received:

Belgium

Gambia

New Zealand

Spain

Apologies not received:

Austria

Chile

Guyana

Lebanon

Malawi

Norway

2. Opening Remarks and Adoption of the Agenda

Ms. Raghad Hasan, Deputy Permanent Representative for Disarmament, and representative of the 11MSP President, Ambassador Abdul-Karim Hashim Mostafa, welcomed the Coordination Committee to the fourth meeting of 2023 and the sixth under the Iraqi Presidency. She extended a warm welcome to the new ISU Director, Ms. Pamela Moraga, and reiterated that the presidency was confident that Ms. Moraga's skill set and experience were ideally suited to lead the CCM Implementation Support Unit.

Ms. Hasan conveyed the excuses of the 11MSP President who was unable to attend the meeting due to conflicting schedules. The Committee then approved the provisional agenda of the meeting as tabled by the presidency.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Coordination Committee Meeting

The Committee considered and approved, without correction, the Minutes of the Coordination Committee Meeting held on 27 April 2023 as an accurate record of what had been discussed during that meeting.

4. Preparation for the 11MSP

Ms. Hasan indicated that the 11MSP would be taking place on 11-14 September 2023 as planned. She reminded the meeting that UNODA had confirmed that Room XIX of the Palais des Nations had been reserved for the Meeting and that there would be one room available for side events during the lunch break of each day of the Meeting. She pointed out that the ISU had circulated the 11MSP draft provisional agenda along with the invitation to the Coordination Committee meeting that day. She clarified that the 11MSP agenda was similar to that of the 10MSP's, with only technical changes made. She further informed that on 19 May the 11MSP President had circulated a letter to all CCM States Parties to appeal for contributions to the CCM Sponsorship Programme.

Regarding the composition of the Coordination Committee for the following MSP cycle, Ms. Hasan informed that Peru had expressed its interest to become the incoming Coordinator on Universalization, Switzerland on International Cooperation and Assistance, Australia on Transparency Measures, and The Gambia on National Implementation Measures. She indicated that there were still four vacancies and encouraged the remaining Coordination Committee members to look for new Coordinators to work with in the following cycle. She reported that Iraq had reached out to a few States Parties to take up the position of the President-Designate of the 13MSP but had not received any nomination.

5. Preparation of the 11MSP Documentation including the 11MSP CCM Implementation Progress Report to be submitted by the President

The Presidency invited the ISU Director to provide an update on the 11MSP documentation.

Ms. Moraga thanked Ms. Hasan for her warm welcome and kind words. She indicated that the success of the Convention was a collective effort of every member of the CCM community.

She expressed her pleasure of having worked with many members of the Coordination Committee in her previous role and looked forward to strengthening cooperation. She conveyed her appreciation for the work of the previous ISU Director, Ms. Sheila Mweemba, and her hope to enhance the implementation of the CCM.

The ISU Director pointed out that the ISU 2024 work plan and budget had been circulated to the Coordination Committee on 23 May with a deadline of 30 May for comments on the document. She reminded that the 11MSP provisional agenda, that had just been discussed, was circulated to the Committee on 30 May. She pointed out that both these documents needed to be submitted to UNODA by 12 June.

Ms. Moraga indicated that as in the previous year, the Coordinators would have to work on the 11MSP progress report based on the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP). She explained that the ISU had prepared a template for the report to facilitate their work. She outlined that the template included a table with LAP action numbers and indicator results, followed by a few questions to guide States Parties' discussion at the 11MSP. She informed that the Coordinators could review and update these questions and that they should report on their activities up to 30 June 2023. The template would be sent to the Coordinators that week with a deadline of 20 June to submit their input to the ISU. This would allow the ISU to consolidate the final document by its UNODA deadline of 26 June.

6. Update on Implementation of the Workplans of the Thematic Coordinators up to the 11MSP

The Presidency invited the thematic Coordinators to report on the implementation of their workplans up to the 11MSP.

6.1 Stockpile Destruction and Retention (Bulgaria and the Netherlands)

Bulgaria reported that, as was alluded to in the previous meeting, the Coordinators had met virtually with Slovakia on 9 May and that Slovakia's Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs had participated in the meeting along with its representative in Geneva. Bulgaria thanked the ISU for facilitating the meeting and stated that the new ISU Director had participated as well. Slovakia had informed that it was on track in implementing its destruction plan, with most of the remaining cluster munitions destroyed by a foreign contracting company and the rest being demilitarized by its national capacity. Slovakia had further informed that it had yet to prepare its certification and documentation to declare completion under Article 3 of the Convention. A discussion on its possible declaration of completion at the 11MSP also transpired during the virtual meeting.

Regarding the outreach to South Africa, Ms. Hasan briefed that the troika of CCM presidencies had unfortunately been unable to meet with the South African Permanent Representative in Geneva. The presidency reminded that it was agreed upon during the previous meeting that the troika approach their South African counterpart, and assured that this issue was being prioritized by Iraq. The 11MSP presidency had contacted the South African Permanent Mission through various communication channels to request a meeting with the South African Permanent Representative but had not received a response in this regard. In addition to that, the presidency had met with South Africa's disarmament focal point two weeks before to

follow up on its implementation progress. South Africa had verbally notified of its intention to submit its Article 7 report in the near future and that it would not be requesting an extension of its Article 3 deadline. However, the presidency highlighted with concern that no update or report had been provided by South Africa since that meeting. The presidency concluded its update by stating that it was open to any additional suggestions the Committee had to address this situation.

The 12 MSP President-Designate, Ambassador Francisca Méndez, conveyed a warm welcome to the new ISU Director, Ms. Moraga and indicated that she was confident in Ms. Moraga's success in leading the ISU. In contributing to the discussion, Ambassador Méndez reported that the Mexican disarmament focal point had attempted to contact his South African colleague without any success. She communicated that she would personally look for opportunities to approach the South African Permanent Representative informally in the sidelines of meetings. She acknowledged that this was an important matter and that, if unresolved, would come under the purview of the 12MSP presidency. She further informed she would report back to the meeting on whether her attempts were successful.

In response, Bulgaria reminded that if the troika meeting could not take place, there was still the option of delivering a *démarche* in Pretoria. Bulgaria also pointed out that the Coordinators would be reflecting on how to reflect this issue in the progress report. It cautioned that once the report was submitted to UNODA, the information would not be able to be revised.

In adding to the discussion, the Netherlands stressed that no matter if the outreach were to take place in Geneva or in Pretoria, it had to be done swiftly as time was running out. The presidency suggested organizing a meeting with the South African government in Pretoria to be attended by representatives of Bulgaria, Iraq and the Netherlands. In response, the Netherlands affirmed that it was a good idea, but highlighted that it was better to first seek a formal meeting with the South African Permanent Representative in Geneva. The Netherlands emphasized the urgency of the matter and added that it had to be made clear to South Africa that this was a critical situation and how this would affect its reputation.

Mexico reaffirmed that it would first try to approach the South African ambassador informally to brief him of the situation and also to enquire if he agreed to a *démarche* being delivered in Pretoria. Mexico clarified that it would be preferable to have the involvement of the South African Permanent Representative to United Nations Office in Geneva in this matter.

The presidency expressed its agreement with Mexico and brought up that the UK 10MSP presidency had suggested on a *démarche* in Pretoria the previous year. Bulgaria clarified that the *démarche* was not delivered.

The CMC enquired if South Africa had declined to meet in Geneva. In response, the presidency explained that Iraq had requested a meeting with the South African Permanent Representative through its Permanent Mission and disarmament focal point but had not received a response.

In its contribution to the discussion, the United Kingdom pointed out that its outreach to South Africa in Geneva the previous year had yielded some results, and echoed Mexico by stating that it was better to conduct an intervention on an ambassadorial level in Geneva prior to a potential *démarche* in Pretoria.

The ISU Director outlined that in her conversations with the previous ISU Director, Ms. Mweemba conveyed that sending letters to South Africa had not been effective. She reiterated that the troika of presidencies should meet with the Permanent Representative of South Africa in Geneva to deliver a note verbale on the issue. She agreed with Mexico that the Coordination Committee should make every effort to engage with the South African delegation in Geneva. She suggested that the follow up be carried out as soon as possible as the disarmament meeting calendar would be busy in the following weeks. She conveyed that she was, however, not against the idea of delivering a *démarche* in Pretoria.

The presidency enquired if the ISU would be able to travel to South Africa to meet with government officials, as it had done with other States Parties. In response, the ISU Implementation Specialist affirmed that the ISU was ready to provide technical support to South Africa. However, this would only be possible if the ISU was invited to meet with the South African government.

The presidency concluded the discussion by assuring that the troika of presidencies would continue to attempt to meet with the Permanent Representative of South Africa in Geneva.

6.2 International Cooperation and Assistance (Germany and Lebanon)

Germany informed that the Coordinators were considering to hold a meeting with civil society to exchange views on international cooperation and assistance for the CCM and the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC). Germany reported that a time and date for the meeting had not been agreed upon as it was challenging to find a mutually convenient time.

6.4 Transparency Measures (The Gambia)

On behalf of The Gambia, the presidency reported that with regard to Action 45 of the LAP, the Gambia, with the support of the 11MSP presidency and the ISU, had met with civil society to discuss amending the Article 7 reporting forms. Many suggestions had been put forward including an additional form J on gender and diversity of populations. The presidency indicated that some of the suggestions had been incorporated into the draft amended forms that were circulated to all States Parties. States Parties had also provided their feedback and hence the forms had been further amended. The updated version of the reporting forms would be circulated once again to States Parties in the near future. A final draft of these forms would be submitted to UNODA as a working paper of the 11MSP.

The Netherlands enquired if comments and amendments made to the forms was only on gender and diversity of populations. In response, the presidency clarified that amendments were made to various sections of the reporting template and that there was a new Form J specifically on gender and diversity of populations. The presidency then invited the ISU to provide more information on the subject.

The ISU Implementation Specialist informed that one State Party had provided general comments on the reporting forms that needed further clarification. He suggested that the Gambia and the 11MSP presidency meet with that State to enquire on what amendments it wished to include in the reporting forms. The ISU Director added that the feedback provided by several other States Parties were also of a general nature. She highlighted that the main challenge of the process was to make the reporting template more comprehensive without increasing the reporting burden of States Parties. She suggested that the Gambia and the 11MSP presidency meet with all States Parties that commented for further discussion with the goal of finding better solutions.

7. Update of UNODA on CCM financing in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention

UNODA reported that based on the information it received from the finance department, one State had paid its contribution since the last update. This brought the outstanding amount to approximately USD 49,000. However, the recalculations would be done after the submission of documents by the ISU.

8. Update of the Implementation Support Unit

8.1 Financing of the ISU

The ISU Director informed that since the previous meeting, no new contributions had been received by the ISU. She communicated that the audit report for the ISU's 2022 accounts had not yet been finalized but were anticipated to be in the near future. She assured that the report would be circulated to all States Parties as soon as the ISU received it. She pointed out that since the establishment of the ISU, its accounts had been deemed to be compliant with Swiss Law and no irregularities had been found. She added that she did not expect the 2022 accounts to be any different.

8.2 11MSP Sponsorship Programme

The ISU Director brought the meeting's attention to the proposed list of potential 11MSP sponsorship beneficiaries that had been circulated during the meeting. She reminded that the 11MSP President had sent an appeal to States Parties for contribution to the Programme which allowed. She specified that the list of potential beneficiaries was not fixed and encouraged the Coordination Committee to suggest any additional States that could be invited to nominate representatives to be awarded sponsorship.

Referring to its country being on the list of potential beneficiaries, Bulgaria informed that it was not aware that it had requested sponsorship. The ISU Implementation Assistant informed that Bulgaria was included in the list as a result of what was discussed during the informal meeting the Netherlands and the ISU had with Bulgaria in April. During the meeting, the ISU had enquired if Bulgaria required sponsorship for its representative from its capital to attend the 11MSP, and had been informed that Bulgaria would let the ISU know if the need arose.

The ISU Implementation Assistant clarified that while the ISU had listed 30 potential beneficiaries, it only had the funds to sponsor around 20 participants at that time. She explained that the sponsorship was awarded on a first-come, first-served basis. Additionally, she disclosed that in the past not all States that were invited had submitted nominations.

In response, Bulgaria reflected that it was likely that capital-based representatives of Bulgaria and Slovakia would be expected to participate in the 11MSP to either provide an update of their Article 3 implementation or to declare completion of their stockpile destruction.

9. Any Other Business

Updates of the Cluster Munition Coalition

The CMC provided an update on Ukraine’s ongoing appeal for the US to supply it with cluster munitions in light of its conflict with Russia. It informed that at that stage the US had not transferred any cluster munitions to Ukraine. The CMC assured that it would continue to monitor the situation thanks to its networks in both Ukraine and the US. The CMC emphasized that the use of cluster munitions was unacceptable and expressed its utmost concern that these weapons had already been deployed at a large scale in Ukraine by both conflicting parties. It highlighted that it would continue strongly advocating to prevent the US government from transferring these weapons to Ukraine.

The CMC informed that Mr. Hector Guerra had stepped down from his position of ICBL-CMC Director, and that an Acting Director, Ms. Tamar Gabelnick, had been appointed in his place. The CMC added that Ms. Gabelnick had just commenced her new role and would likely be participating in some of the Coordination Committee meetings in the future.

Introduction of new UNODA staff member

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano introduced her colleague, Ms. Alice Marzi, who had joined UNODA a few months before and was attending the Coordination Committee meeting for the first time. She indicated that members of the Committee should feel free to contact Ms. Marzi.

10. Conclusion of the Meeting

In concluding the meeting, Ms. Hasan conveyed her warm welcome to the new appointees. She informed that the date and details of the next meeting would be communicated by the ISU closer to the date.
