

FINANCE

First I would like to take the opportunity to thank the coordinators for their work, and the Netherlands for their innovative and thought-provoking paper. Many have noted that our future plans will depend on the availability of sufficient funding to realize what we want to achieve.

The United Kingdom would like to share some initial reactions. We recognize and appreciate the Netherlands' efforts to find a compromise solution, however, the paper as drafted still leaves some ambiguities.

We echo Norway's question over how the shortfall in funding will be addressed, if the level of assessed contributions by States Parties is not met by voluntary contributions.

With regards to point 2 in the paper, we would suggest that the budget for activities of the ISU be presented in advance of the Meeting of States Parties to allow States Parties time to raise any concerns.

We support France's suggestion that States Parties explore synergies with the ISU of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. Of course, the list of States Parties for both conventions is not the same, it may be possible to create a set-up in which each ISU formally lends support to the other at certain points. We hope that this would represent a more cost-efficient and sustainable model.

The United Kingdom supports the need for stable and sustainable funding for the activities of the ISU. In line with these comments, we continue to support a model based on voluntary contributions. We note the point made by many that this is not a predictable model, but an element of predictability could be introduced eg by advance pledging of contributions for the coming year or other period.

Thank you.