

**Coordinating Committee Meeting
Friday 11 November 2005**

President's Summary

1. Update on the Zagreb Progress Report

Croatia reported that, since 23 September, written comments on the draft Zagreb Progress Report had been provided by 11 States Parties and the ICBL, ICRC, UN and GICHD. Relevant comments were forwarded to Co-Chairs and Contact Group Coordinators for their consideration. Croatia expressed its gratitude for those Co-Chairs and Contact Group Coordinators who, in the midst of a busy October, gave their sections a great deal of attention. Croatia noted that it did not want a text submitted to the 6MSP Executive Secretary until at least one relevant Co-Chair had signed off on the section for which it had taken the lead.

Croatia highlighted that one annex was not included in the 3 November draft – the annex containing an compilation of victim assistance objectives, indicating that the Co-Chairs are in the process of consulting the relevant 24 States Parties on their first draft and that they will present this annex as an amendment to the Zagreb Progress Report at the 6MSP.

Croatia reminded the Coordinating Committee that the 3 November draft Zagreb Progress Report will now serve as the basis for discussions in Zagreb. It informed the Coordinating Committee; (a) that an effort is underway to compile a set of factual corrections which will be proposed as a set of amendments at the beginning of the 6MSP, (b) that during the meeting itself, Co-Chairs would continue to take the lead on their respective sections of the Zagreb Progress Report in terms of discussing pertinent points raised during the 6MSP with concerned delegations as soon as possible after each thematic discussion with a view, if necessary, to developing revised text that would be acceptable to the States Parties; and, (c) that a compilation acceptable enhancements would be put forward in a single document to be distributed at end of the day on Thursday 1 December.

Croatia concluded that if all works as planned, all interested actors will be able to make their views known during the course of the 6MSP, requests for changes will be handled in an orderly manner, and the end result will be an even better document than the already good product put forward on November 3.

2. Making the 6MSP Programme operational

The Coordinating Committee was apprised of a number of matters that should be taken into consideration in making the 6MSP programme operational. Key points that were highlighted included the following:

- The 6MSP is a formal diplomatic meeting with all sessions being formal plenary sessions. While there are no undue constraints regarding how to proceed with thematic discussions, there is a need to take into account the rules of procedure. For instance, when the President is not presiding, a Vice President shall preside.

- There is nothing to suggest that any particular Vice President would be prevented from requesting that another assist him or her at the front of the room. For example, if Bangladesh as Vice President is called upon to preside over the thematic session on stockpile destruction, the Bangladeshi representative presiding over the 6MSP could call upon his or her Canadian counterpart to assist him or her.
- The programme is only a tentative allocation of time. The great unknown at the 6MSP is how much time will be consumed by a general exchange of views. If States Parties and organizations do not heed the call to minimize or refrain from giving general statements, there will be less time for thematic discussions. Conversely, if the entire first day of the 6MSP is not entirely consumed by general statements, then Co-Chairs must be ready sooner than is suggested in the programme to proceed with thematic discussions.
- Those presiding over each session need to be cognizant of various expectations: (a) Many delegations will expect to provide comments on the relevant sections of the draft Zagreb Progress Report; (b) Many delegations will want to provide updates on what they have done over the past year in pursuing relevant aims of the Nairobi Action Plan; (c) Current Co-Chairs will have expectations regarding highlighting various thematic matters that are important to them; and, (d) Incoming Co-Chairs may wish to speak to how they intend to proceed in 2006 in advancing relevant aims of the Nairobi Action Plan.

In the discussion that ensued, it was suggested that a letter be sent to all States and organizations advising them of various matters concerning the programme and that this letter should discourage the delivery of general statements, note the firm time limit for such statements, clarify matters concerning speakers' lists, and discourage the use of PowerPoint.

3. Update on organizations seeking 6MSP observer status under Rule 1.4

The Coordinating Committee was reminded that at the last meeting it was agreed that all organizations that previously had received Official Observer status at Meetings of the States Parties and at the First Review Conference in accordance with Rule 1.4 should again have this status recommended for them for the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties if they so wish to have this status. The Coordinating Committee was informed that since the last meeting five such organizations had requested observer status:

- International Peace Research Institute (PRIO)
- International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF)
- Mine Action Information Center (James Madison University)
- Swiss Foundation for Demining (SFD)
- World Association for Disaster and Emergency Medicine (WADEM)

In addition, the Coordinating Committee was advised that four additional organizations have requested observer status. The Coordinating Committee agreed that all four should be provided with observer status at the 6MSP, subject to the concurrence of the meeting itself:

- Association de Solidarité des Handicapés et Victimes de Mines
- French National Commission for the Elimination of Landmine (CNEMA)
- Regional Arms Control Verification and Implementation Assistance Centre (RACVIAC)
- South Eastern Europe Clearing House for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC)

The Coordinating Committee also agreed to deal with any additional requests by email.

4. Update on 6MSP organizational matters

Croatia made a presentation on efforts being undertaken within Croatia to raise awareness of the 6MSP. In addition, the Manager of the Implementation Support Unit reported on prospective side events. These events include a field visit on 26 November, an opening ceremony and reception on 27 November, a reception hosted by the Director of the GICHD on 29 November, and series of lunch-time activities, many of which are sponsored by the ICBL or its member organizations.

5. Consultations on proposed Co-Rapporteurs for 2006

The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention reported that they are close to finalizing a proposed list of new Co-Rapporteurs for consideration by the States Parties at the 6MSP.

6. Updates from Contact Groups

a. Universalization

The Contact Group Coordinator, Canada, indicated that a Contact Group meeting will be held on Thursday 1 December on the margins of the 6MSP. Canada also reported that a number of universalization activities are being undertaken in advance of the 6MSP, including visits to States not parties in Northern Africa, the Middle East and South East Asia.

b. Resource Mobilisation

The Contact Group Coordinator, Norway indicated that the Contact Group will meet on 17 November in Geneva to discuss the *cooperation and assistance* subsection of the draft Zagreb Progress Report and that another meeting of the Contact Group would be held on 29 November on the margins of the 6MSP.

Canada advised the Coordinating Committee that on 5-6 December in Geneva it, along with the GICHD, will hold a second dialogue with development practitioners mainstreaming mine action into development programming.

c. Article 7 Reporting

The Contact Group Coordinator, Belgium, indicated that there was no new information to share at this point. In addition, Algeria highlighted that it indeed had submitted an Article 7 report in 2005 and that this point would have to be taken into account in a correction to the Zagreb Progress Report.

7. Update on the Sponsorship Programme

The Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, the United Kingdom, informed the Coordinating Committee that the programme's donors group had targeted approximately 80 delegates for sponsorship and that the process was underway to make arrangements for about 65.

8. Update on the UNGA First Committee resolution on the Convention

Austria reported that on 28 October the annual UN General Assembly First Committee resolution on the universalization and implementation of the Convention passed by a vote of 147 in favour, 0 against, and 15 abstentions. It was noted that the resolution was co-sponsored by 173 States and that this year five States not parties – Azerbaijan, China, Kuwait, Lebanon and Micronesia – voted "yes" for the first time.

9. ISU 2006 Budget

It was recalled that the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU indicates that an annual budget for the ISU will be established and that it shall include figures for the forthcoming financial year and, if necessary, indicate a set of priorities that shall be understood as guidelines in order to allocate available resources. In this context, the Manager of the ISU presented the draft 2006 ISU budget to the Coordinating Committee and advised the Coordinating Committee that the intention, in keeping with past practice, was to have the Convention's President distribute this budget to all States Parties.

10. Any other business

- Jordan informed the Coordinating Committee of its intention to offer to host the 8MSP in 2007.
- The ICBL informed the Coordinating Committee that the documentary film *Disarm* will be screened in Geneva on 22 November, that the 2005 Landmine Monitor will be launched the same day in three locations around the world, and that in Geneva on 24 November Nobel Peace Prize laureate Jody Williams would participate at a briefing on Landmine Monitor findings.

11. Closure of the meeting

The Chair noted that this would be the last Coordinating Committee meeting prior to the 6MSP and the last of his presidency. He emphasized that the progress made during the past year would not have been possible without the widespread participation and support of a wide range of actors, including those represented on the Coordinating Committee. He expressed that the Nairobi Action Plan truly provides meaningful guidance for the period leading to the Second Review Conference.

Finally, he noted his appreciation for the support provided by his closest collaborators over the past two years, Alexander Kmentt and Markus Reiterer, and for the assistance provided by Kerry Brinkert, Sophie Delfolie and Catherine Borrero of the GICHD.