

**Coordinating Committee Meeting
14 February 2005**

President's Summary*

Background:

On 14 February 2005 a full-day retreat-style Coordinating Committee meeting was held to develop strategies and initiatives to advance the States Parties' aims, particularly with a view to ensuring the active participation and progress in implementation by mine-affected States Parties and those in the process of destroying stockpiled mines.

In particular, the Coordinating Committee retreat had the following objectives:

- To orient new Coordinating Committee participants to the mechanisms and structures that exist to facilitate implementation (e.g., Meetings of the States Parties, the Intersessional Work Programme, the Coordinating Committee, the Implementation Support Unit, et cetera).
- To freely brainstorm regarding what could be achieved by the time of the 2009 Second Review Conference with respect to the application of the Nairobi Action Plan.
- To identify what can be accomplished in 2005 in a manner consistent with a vision of what the Convention should look like by 2009 and in keeping with the mandates of the 2005 Coordinating Committee and its individual participants.
- To discuss the range of actions possible to meet these 2005 objectives, including – but not limited to – through the best use possible of the June 2005 Standing Committee meetings.

Briefing on implementation mechanisms:

The Coordinating Committee received a briefing on the status of the Convention and the mechanisms which exist to facilitate implementation. As part of this briefing, the Chair reiterated his commitment to see the Coordinating Committee work within its mandate (e.g., the Coordinating Committee is a forum to coordinate, prepare for meetings, ensure coherence and continuity, et cetera) and to be transparent (e.g., President's Summaries will continue to be made available on GICHD web site, updates will be provided at Standing Committee meetings and at the Meeting of the States Parties, et cetera).

A vision for the Convention in 2009:

The Chair noted that while the responsibility accepted by Coordinating Committee participants is in part to develop a "road map" to pursue the aims of the Nairobi Action Plan in 2005, knowing where the map should lead means having a sense of what the destination should look like in 2009. Subsequent to small group discussions which took place to consider this matter, the Chair summarized outcomes as follows:

- The first deadlines for mine clearance, which occur in 2009, will be a necessary major pre-occupation of the States Parties during the next five years.
- Victim assistance remains a complex matter, given that success in this area relates to progress more broadly in the health care, social services and human rights frameworks of the most affected States Parties.
- Stockpile destruction now is relevant for only a small number of States Parties. However, the challenges faced by some of these are great.

- Further progress is still possible with respect to universalization. However, it will require intensive efforts to convince many of the remaining States outside of the Convention to consider joining it.
- It will be essential to give ongoing due attention to matters that drive progress – such as resource mobilisation, transparency, and national implementation measures.
- By 2009, there will be an expectation of quantitative progress. However, in some areas measuring progress in quantitative terms is difficult. As well, in addition to quantitative progress, qualitative progress (e.g., in universalization) will be important.
- In addition to what is achieved, how it is achieved will be important. Partnership amongst the States Parties and between the States Parties and organizations like the ICBL and ICRC has been significant to date and should remain so in the future.

Possible objectives and actions for 2005:

With a vision for 2009 in mind, members of the Coordinating Committee shared ideas pertaining to areas over which they have competence in 2005:

General status and operation of the Convention

It was noted that traditionally the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention has dealt with wide-ranging subject matter, which has included exchanges of information and views on topics such as universalization, resource mobilization, transparency reporting, the Convention's compliance provisions, and implementation and interpretation of various articles of the Convention. The Co-Chairs indicated that they would continue to pursue the successful course taken in previous years, although perhaps emphasizing the implementation rather than the interpretation of various articles.

The Contact Group Coordinators also offered their thoughts on the year ahead. Regarding universalization, it was indicated that a high level of activism would continue in a manner consistent with the Nairobi Action Plan. With respect to Resource Mobilisation, it was noted that three major themes that would be pursued would be cost-efficiency, mainstreaming of mine action into development and ongoing engagement of development banks. With respect to Article 7 reporting, it was suggested that in addition to pursuing a high quantity of reports in 2005, an emphasis could be placed on high quality reports as well.

Stockpile destruction

It was noted that the obligation likely remains relevant for no more than 15 current States Parties. However, given that some of these States Parties possess vast stocks and / or face other challenges regarding destruction, the Co-Chairs will pro-actively encourage all relevant States Parties to communicate the status of their destruction programmes and highlight as soon as possible any requirements for assistance. In addition, the Co-Chairs will seek by the end of the year to reduce to 8 the number of States Parties which will still need to complete destruction programmes. The Co-Chairs will also highlight other matters, such as previously unknown stockpiles discovered after a State Party has completed its destruction programme.

Victim assistance

It was noted the Review Conference recorded that great progress has been made in conceptual terms regarding victim assistance. With this in mind, the Co-Chairs suggested that the logical starting point for action in 2005 is gaining a better understanding of what can be / should be achieved by December 2009, with the 24 States Parties in which the situation is most

profound themselves defining what can be / should be achieved in concrete and measurable terms, and how. The Co-Chairs will also highlight thematic matters related to two of the six areas of victim assistance, leaving it to future Co-Chairs to highlight remaining areas in the period leading to 2009.

Mine clearance

It was noted that the obligations contained in Article 5 remain relevant for 47 States Parties. The Co-Chairs suggested that it may be useful to consider that these 47 States Parties fall within one of three categories, with a main objective attached to each:

- i. With respect to those States Parties which can fulfil their obligations in a relatively short period of time, the objective should be to try to see if many of them can fulfil their obligations by the 2005 Meeting of the States Parties or by a date soon afterwards.
- ii. With respect to States Parties other than those in the first group with deadlines in 2009, the objective should be to try to ensure that they communicate what it will take for them to fulfill their clearance obligations by their deadlines.
- iii. With respect to States Parties other than those in the first group with deadlines after 2009, the objective should be to ensure that as soon as possible they also proceed to fulfill their obligations and communicate their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.

The Co-Chairs also noted that those States Parties which have completed their Article 5 obligations may be able to provide valuable lessons to those which are in the process of doing so. As well, the Co-Chairs noted that thematic topics like mine action technologies and effectiveness and efficiency will continue to be important in 2005.

Mechanisms available to meet 2005 objectives

The Coordinating Committee reviewed the mandate and principles that guide the Intersessional Work Programme the functioning of the Programme to date. There was general agreement that the week of meetings should proceed along the same lines as it has most recently (i.e., with the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention both opening and closing the week of meetings). However, there was no agreement on time allocations for or the sequencing of the four meetings during the week of 13-17 June 2005. The Coordinating Committee did, though, accept that it should work towards a deadline of 15 April 2005 for finalizing a programme for the week and that the Chair should convene a Coordinating Committee meeting sometime between 1 and 8 April to review a near-complete package of background materials for the week of meetings.

In terms of reporting by the Co-Chairs / Co-Rapporteurs in 2005, it was suggested that it made sense to follow past practices with respect to the June meetings but that further discussions were needed with respect to how to record the cumulation of the work of the 2005 intersessional period.

In addition to discussing the functioning of the 2005 Intersessional Work Programme, the Coordinating Committee was presented with initial thoughts of Croatia on the 28 November to 2 December Meeting of the States Parties (MSP). It was noted that efforts are underway to see if the MSP could be held in Dubrovnik and it was suggested that the MSP could learn from some of the experiences of the Nairobi Summit (e.g., saving valuable time by holding an opening ceremony the evening prior to the official start of the meeting).

The Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme also shared thoughts on how the Programme can enhance the work of the Convention in 2005. A wide variety of suggestions were made regarding how sponsorship in general could ensure wide-spread participation. However, Coordinating Committee participants were reminded to consider that resources are finite and that the Programme's primary

objective is to ensure participation by those States Parties which are in the process of fulfilling obligations and which need assistance.

* Since 2002, to ensure transparency the Chair of the Coordinating Committee has issued a “President’s Summary” of Coordinating Committee meetings. These summaries are the President’s informal notes of what transpired at these meetings and should not be considered official minutes of these meetings.