

## Norwegian statements during the CCM second preparatory meeting

### General statement

Mr. President,

Congratulations on a very solid draft action plan.

We are grateful for the opportunities you have given to provide input to the drafting process, and are very pleased to see that the resulting draft is very much in line with Norwegian thinking on the matter.

We are very happy to see the links and synergies between the APMBC, the CCM, the Oslo Action Plan and the draft Lausanne Action Plan. The conventions are very similar and the alignment in our opinion serves to strengthen both sets of norms. We have taken note of Cuba's point, but do not think exploiting to the fullest extent possible the synergies between the two sets of norms poses a risk to those who are not party to one or the other convention.

If you can't subscribe to one or the other for national security reasons, be that as it may. But let's not avoid using the best practice, standards, operators and communities that exist out there to ensure that as few people as possible get killed or maimed by such explosives.

The use of short paragraphs and clear indicators throughout the draft action plan is good. The clearer the language, the shorter the sentences, and the more action-oriented it is, the more it will be used. Some paragraphs can maybe be trimmed down a bit, but generally speaking this is a very good draft. In order to keep it short and action-oriented, Norway will show flexibility. We hope that this goes for everybody else too.

On a more specific note: very pleased to see the strong focus on clearance and risk-education – and the fact that these are split into separate chapters, and the cross-cutting focus on gender, which – as we know – is a highly useful and relevant perspective in the context of mine action, risk education, victim assistance, and “victim avoidance” more broadly.

Regarding the comments from the Holy See: It may be so that you cannot define exhaustively the contents of a word like “gender” – or “diversity” for that matter – which, as with all natural language, evolves over time. But, the term has a rather clear core, and the point is that we must have language that reminds us that people are different and therefore have different needs – something we otherwise all too often forget as we charge ahead with our work. That the words are not exhaustively defined is not a good argument to not include a particular focus on gender and diversity. So again, we are very pleased with the strong language on gender in the draft.

We recognise the huge effort it takes for the presidency to push this process forward – especially in these very special times. On Norway's behalf, I would like to underscore that we stand ready to support and assist the presidency in whatever way you need in the runner-up to the Review Conference in November.

### Statement relating to chapter VIII on international cooperation and assistance

Norway appreciated and supports the inclusion of a separate action point on country coalitions. In our opinion the action point could have more action-oriented language, directly suggesting that the state-parties set up such fora. And it should also spell out why such coalitions should be set up, and what elements they should have. The value of the country coalition – as with the Mine Action Fora --

is to promote technical and policy dialogue between the core stakeholders: namely the affected country; the operators; and the donors.

#### Statement relating to the political declaration

Norway joins the chorus of congratulations on a good draft, and agrees with the many statements today that the declaration must have strong language, underscoring the firm and unwavering commitment of States Parties to the norms and obligations of the convention. Norway also agrees with the various other statements today that we must be explicit and emphatic in our condemnation of new and ongoing use of cluster munitions. As member states with the obligation to help universalise the norms of the convention, we must speak out.