



UK Mission  
Geneva



10<sup>TH</sup> MEETING  
OF STATES PARTIES  
30 AUG - 2 SEPT  
GENEVA 2022

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE

held on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2022

in Conference Room 6, Tower 3, Maison de la Paix

from 13:15 to 14:15 hours

### 1. Present:

United Kingdom – 10MSP President

H.E. Mr. Aidan Liddle

Ms. Eleonora Saggese

Ms. Sylvia Osoba

Iraq – President-Designate (11MSP)

Mr. Mohammed Ridha Al-Haidari

Australia

Ms. Thea Gellerfy

Bulgaria

Mr. Iassen Tomov

Chile

Mr. Douia Burley

France

Ms. Inès Mensah

Germany

Ms. Anna Mikeska

Guyana

Mr. Colin Luckie

Mexico

Ms. Mariana Olivera

Montenegro

Mr. Nikola Ražnatović

New Zealand

Mr. Nicholas Clutterbuck

Spain

Mr. Juan Manglano

CMC

Mr. Hector Guerra

ICRC

Ms. Stephanie Mutasa

Implementation Support Unit

Ms. Sheila N. Mweemba

Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi

Apologies received

Sweden

## **2. Opening Remarks and Adoption of the Agenda**

President of the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions (10MSP), Ambassador Aidan Liddle, cordially welcomed members of the Coordination Committee to the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting under the Presidency of the United Kingdom in 2022 and the last one before the 10MSP.

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

The Committee approved the Minutes of the Coordination Committee Meeting held on 24 June 2022, without correction, as an accurate record of what had been discussed during that meeting.

## **4. Preparations for the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties**

The President gave a brief overview of the provisional Agenda of the Meeting and expressed his happiness that the 4-day 10MSP had been preserved. He highlighted that the 10MSP Agenda and Programme of Work documents were rather straightforward and had been finalized and then made available online.

He outlined that the 10MSP official opening would be on Tuesday, 30 August, and would start with the procedural matters. Thereafter, there would be a general exchange of views to allow States Parties, Signatories, States not Parties, international organisations and civil society to provide their views on the Convention including on their political commitments. That would be followed by the presentation of the extension requests submitted under Articles 3 and 4. He clarified that the rest of the time would focus on substantive issues such as decisions to be taken on the extension requests, the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the CCM Gender Focal Points, the recruitment of the next ISU Director, the financial status of the Convention, and the election of the office holders to serve up to the 12MSP. In this regard, he pointed out that the incoming office holder for Victim Assistance still needed to be identified. The President also notified that there was a possible candidate to preside over the 12MSP but that was yet to be confirmed.

The President informed that the United Kingdom would host a reception for all delegations at the ICRC museum at the end of the first day of the 10MSP. He thanked the Swiss Federation, the Canton of Geneva and the City of Geneva for their support in hosting the reception.

With regard to some of the decisions to be taken at the 10MSP, the President highlighted that the ToR of the CCM Gender Focal Points would need further consultation due to additional comments received from one delegation. He further noted that there had not been any adverse reactions to the revised ToR and draft decision on the hiring of the next ISU Director. With regard to the inclusion of a 15% contingency plan in the Convention's budget, he reported that this proposal would not be pursued further as there had been no consensus and the presidency was trying to explore other options such as reducing the percentage of the contingency amount. He then opened the floor to the Committee members to debate on the 10MSP programme of work.

In the ensuing discussion, Spain asked whether there would be a time limit for statements made during the general exchange of views. It further asked if there was a template developed for the presentation of extension requests under Articles 3 and 4.

In response, the President expressed his preference not to have a time limit for the general exchange of views. On the matter of an extension request presentation template, the ISU Director noted that it would be challenging to develop a template because the circumstances of States Parties were usually very different. Therefore, considering a time limit for presentations would be more practical. Moreover, States were always advised to provide a brief presentation of their request and avoid repeating all the information that was already available online.

The President informed the meeting that the informal consultations in preparation for the 10MSP would take place on Thursday, 28 July 2022, from 08:45 to 10:00 hours in Room XXVII at the Palais des Nations.

## **5. Updates by Thematic Coordinators on the Implementation of their Mandates**

### **5.1 Stockpile Destruction and Retention (Australia and Bulgaria)**

Bulgaria informed that the Coordinators had had a phone call with South Africa which had assured that the submission of its outstanding Article 7 report was imminent. Bulgaria proposed that South Africa be given a few more days before any additional follow-up was made to find out if there was further development in this regard. It indicated that based on that outreach a decision could be taken on how to move forward on the joint demarche in Pretoria.

### **5.2 Victim Assistance (Chile and Mexico)**

Mexico reported that the Coordinators would continue working to update the *Guidance on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance* and that they would organize a side event on VA in the margins of the 10MSP.

The President thanked the Coordinators for the update and expressed his regret that side events would have to be held virtually during the 10MSP, which was not ideal. He, however, concluded that it was good to at least have some online side events.

### **5.1 General Status and Operation of the Convention (France and Namibia)**

France reported that the Coordinators had circulated the first revision of the draft ToR for the CCM Gender Focal Points and that they had made major changes based on the feedback sent after the deadline by one delegation. It clarified that the Coordinators tried to utilise the language agreed at the 2RC to bring everyone on board. France thanked the presidency for its support in including the discussion on the ToR in the informal consultation to be held later that week and asked for the support of the Coordination Committee for the new version so that the draft could be finalized. France agreed to present a summary of the changes at the consultations.

The President thanked the Coordinators for their hard work and expressed his readiness to continue to support them in this regard.

## **6. Contingency line in the Convention's budget**

The President reported that he had raised the issue of the inclusion of a 15% contingency line in the Convention's budget during the Intersessional Meeting, but unfortunately, it was clear that there was no consensus on the proposal. He enquired if he should report to the 10MSP that there was no agreement, or whether he should continue to explore other options such as proposing a more modest figure, like 7% instead. He indicated that UNODA would be keen on having a contingency fund as it would provide it with more flexibility and liquidity in organizing the meetings. Thereafter, the President invited the Committee to provide its views on that matter.

Montenegro wondered whether lowering the contingency would make a significant change for the Convention and acknowledged that UNODA would probably appreciate any contingency amount. In response, the President affirmed that UNODA had informed that any proposal to increase the financial liquidity would be appreciated.

In its contribution to the discussion, Spain reiterated that its position was one based on the principle that it would not subsidize the states that were habitually not paying their contributions. It pointed out that such a proposal would set a bad precedent and send the wrong message. Therefore, Spain would not support any proposal to include a contingency amount and further noted that this would not be a solution but would rather aggravate the situation. In concluding its intervention, Spain noted that the adoption of the same proposal in other conventions had proven to be unhelpful.

The CMC pointed out the desirability to take into account such measures and the reality of the effect of the financial deficit from one meeting to the next, such that finances became an issue. The CMC indicated that it would be useful to find a way to address that and added that it was worthwhile to have such a discussion and explore alternatives.

Bulgaria reported no change in its position to reject such a proposal because it was a matter of principle for it. It advised that some states should approach the ones that had not paid their contributions and remind them about their obligations. It reaffirmed the importance of setting a good precedent and reminded that there were rules that should be obeyed by all.

The presidency clarified that the United Kingdom did not have a national position on the proposal but just wanted to better understand the views of others. It further noted that since the 2RC financial decision had not yet been implemented it was hard to tell if it would work or not. It also wanted to know whether it was best to just drop the proposal from the final report or keep the discussion going and include it in the mandate of the 11MSP presidency to continue deliberations in this regard.

Spain reiterated that it preferred that the presidency drop the proposal as consensus could not be achieved during the 2RC and at the intersessional meeting. It suggested creating a contingency fund for states that would like to pay more on a voluntary basis.

In concluding the discussion, the President conceded that the situation was clear and that he would provide an update on that issue during the informal consultation. Additionally, he would propose language in the final report of the 10MSP that would reflect the consultations that had taken place and the lack of consensus on the proposal.

## **7. Update of the Implementation Support Unit**

### **7.1 Financing of the ISU**

a) The Director reported that since the last ISU update, 8 more States had made contributions to its budget bringing the number of States Parties that have done so thus far to 41. This brought the total amount received to CHF 222,655 which was only sufficient to cover approximately 45% of the 2022 ISU budget.

### **b) The 2021 Audit reports**

The Director informed that the 2021 audit reports of the ISU financial accounts were circulated to all States Parties on 19 July 2022, which was much later than usual. As had been the case since the establishment of the ISU, its financial reports showed no irregularities and were deemed to be compliant with Swiss Law by the independent external auditors, Mazars SA.

### **7.2 10MSP Documentation**

The Director reported that all the forecasted documents of the 10MSP had been submitted for processing, except for the one on the ToR of the Gender Focal Points. The Director further reported that the provisional agenda and the ISU 2023 workplan and budget had been made available online for almost a month while the analyses of the extension requests of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria and Chile had been added to the UNODA website earlier that day.

### **7.3 ISU Support to CCM Implementation by States Parties**

#### **a) Iraq**

The Director reported that in mid-June the ISU had travelled to Basra, Iraq, for a week to lend support to the preparation of Iraq's draft Article 4 extension request. The ISU also had the opportunity to visit one of the operational sites where local farmers were using land alongside clearance operations. She reported that Iraq had in place a good database and information management system. The Director further informed that as one of the countries most heavily contaminated with cluster munitions, it was expected that Iraq would require a deadline extension, which should be submitted by 1 December 2022. She encouraged donors to extend more support to Iraq.

#### **b) Bosnia & Herzegovina**

The Director reported that following the feedback of the Analysis Group on the extension request of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was submitted on 7 July 2022, the latter had submitted an updated Article 4 extension request with a detailed work plan. This was well ahead of the 22 August deadline that it had been given. The ISU had circulated the updated

request to other States Parties and uploaded it onto the CCM website. She informed that the Analysis Group would meet the following day to consider the updated submission.

c) Guinea-Bissau

The Director informed that the ISU would be travelling to Bissau the following week to meet with the Minister of Defence and the mine action authority with the expectation that the outstanding status of Guinea-Bissau's implementation of Article 3 would finally be clarified. She hoped that the ISU would come back with a signed declaration of compliance. She further informed that the Director of the National Mine Action Coordination Centre of Guinea Bissau (CAMMI) would also be participating in the 10MSP and that she hoped that he would make the official declaration at that time.

d) South Africa

The Director reported that the ISU had been getting updates from the South African team in Geneva and during the last update, it was informed that the team in the capital had acknowledged the requirement to move forward and was working on it. To that end, the report due to the APMBC which had been worked on first had since been submitted. The ISU had also informed South Africa of its availability to work directly with the relevant officials in Pretoria to get the report submitted ahead of the 10MSP.

4. 10MSP Sponsorship Programme

The Director informed that the letters of invitation to request sponsorship to the 10MSP were sent out on 28 June to the identified 30 States on the list that was approved by the Coordination Committee at the previous meeting. However, only 15 had so far responded and of these, 2 informed that they would not be requesting sponsorship. However, 2 other states - Bosnia and Herzegovina and Vietnam - had requested for 2 delegates to be sponsored. To utilise the available funds the ISU proposed that it sent invitations to the 8 States Parties that had still not yet submitted their initial transparency reports - some from as far back as 2011.

5. 10MSP Side Events

The Director noted that as there were no rooms available at the Palais des Nations for side events, all such events would have to be held virtually. However, no confirmations from states or organizations to host side events had yet been received.

The President thanked the ISU Director for the update and asked her to go ahead with the proposal to extend the sponsorship for the two states that requested to have 2 delegates sponsored as well as to the States Parties with outstanding initial Article 7 reporting obligations. He pointed out that it would be good to see States not Parties participating in the 10MSP as well as to see more Signatories participating again in the meeting.

In concluding the meeting, the President informed that the meeting was the last one before the 10MSP and thanked all Coordination Committee members for their hard work during the year.