

**Coordinating Committee Meeting
Tuesday 30 June 2005**

President's Summary

1. Reflections on the week of Standing Committee meetings

The Chair opened the meeting with his reflections on the 13-17 June 2005 meetings of the Standing Committees, noting that it was a very intensive and fruitful week of meetings, it allowed parties to comprehensively report on their progress and it helped to identify problem areas. The chair stated that the main challenge remains to clear mined areas within States Parties' respective deadlines. Victim assistance also remains a priority. Stockpile destruction will also continue to require efforts. Resources and capacity building remain crucial.

A number of Coordinating Committee participants also offered their reflections, with some key observations being:

- The week was extremely productive, with a high level of participation in particular by relevant States Parties in the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies.
- While several donors participated in the cooperation and assistance discussion during the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, few did so during the meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration.
- The schedule for the week largely reflected each Standing Committee's need for time. However, the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance was pressed for time. Due to the flexibility of the Co-Chairs and the fact that the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction needed less than a day, Mine Clearance was able to complete its proceedings.
- The length of some presentations and statements was excessive. Steps should be taken – in advance of the meetings – to ensure shorter presentations.
- The use of expert respondents during two meetings worked well, particularly when respondents offered specific constructive critiques.
- The focused nature of the President's introductory presentation was well received.
- The presentations on Article 3 was a good response to the call made in Action #54 of the Nairobi Action Plan.
- While fewer States Parties participated in Contact Group meetings, the meetings were generally more productive than they have been in the past.
- The emphasis on full compliance with Article 5 was noticed and appreciated.
- It was welcomed that States Parties agreed that work under the Convention should not be politicized.

2. Zagreb Progress Report

The Chair remarked that during the 17 June meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention a very productive discussion was held on a proposed *Zagreb Progress Report* and that there was a general understanding that efforts should proceed with respect to the preparation of such a document. In this context and keeping in mind important points made by States Parties on 17 June, the Chair and Croatia proposed a way forwards as follows:

(a) Key principles:

- The document should cover the period between formal meetings (i.e., from the Review Conference to the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties). Hence the baseline from which progress would be determined would be what is contained the Final Report of the First Review Conference.
- The document should be both retrospective and forward-looking. It should assess progress made so far, principally to clearly highlight priority areas for the work of the States Parties, the Co-Chairs and the Convention's President in 2006.
- The document would be grounded in and organized along the lines of the Nairobi Action Plan. By extension – given that the Nairobi Action Plan itself is simply a means to facilitate the pursuit of the Convention's aims – the document would and should reinforce the supremacy of the Convention itself.

(b) Form / organization of the document

- The document should follow the structure of the Nairobi Action Plan. Hence, it should contain the same categories as are indicated in the Nairobi Action Plan. While it should attempt to comment in some way on the application of the totality of the Action Plan, this should be done thematically and not on the basis of an action-by-action review.
- At this stage, those drafting various sections should not be constrained by a predefined length. As many have remarked in discussing the concept of the document, at this stage flexibility is required. That is, it may be beneficial to, at this stage, proceed in developing a relatively detailed assessment of progress and then, if necessary, make adjustments to ensure that all pieces fit together.
- In a manner similar to the Review of the Convention adopted in Nairobi, annexes to the document could be considered to contain tables or more detailed, State-specific, overviews of implementation.

(c) Suggested assignments

The following actors would take the lead with respect to preparing draft content:

- Introduction: President of the First Review Conference / President-Designate of the 6MSP
- Universalizing the Convention: Universalization Contact Group Coordinator
- Destroying stockpiled mines: Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, although working closely with the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group Coordinator with respect to any comment that may pertain to Action #13
- Clearing mined areas: Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, although working closely with the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group Coordinator with respect to any comment that may pertain to Action #23

- Assisting the victims: Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, although working closely with the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group Coordinator with respect to any comment that may pertain to Action #36
- Cooperation and assistance: Resource Mobilisation Contact Group Coordinator, although working closely with relevant Co-Chairs – particularly the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies – with respect to any overlapping subject matter.
- Transparency and the exchange of information: Article 7 Contact Group Coordinator with respect to Actions #51-#53 and #57; Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention with respect to other actions
- Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities, and facilitating compliance: Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention
- Implementation Support: Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention with the exception of Action #70; Sponsorship Programme Coordinator with respect to Action #70

(d) Suggested direction for those proceeding in preparing draft content

It may be useful to think about each section addressing the following five questions, with responses to the last three questions resulting in the greatest amount of content:

- What was the status as of the end of the First Review Conference?
- What commitments did the States Parties undertake to advance this status?
- What efforts have been undertaken since the First Review Conference in accordance with these commitments?
- What progress has been made?
- Given the nature of efforts undertaken and the progress made, what does this suggest regarding priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties?

(e) Proposed work plan

- June 28 – July 31: Those charged with generating text for various sections proceed in doing so, providing their inputs by July 31 to the ISU, which will produce a compilation of inputs.
- August 5: An early draft is distributed to the Coordinating Committee for discussion the following week.

- August 8-12: A lunch-time Coordinating Committee to discuss progress in the preparation of the document.
- August: Those charged with generating text for various sections proceed in further developing their sections, providing revised text to the ISU by 31 August.
- September 2: A second draft, which should be in a state that sees the document close to ready for widespread distribution, is distributed to the Coordinating Committee for discussion the following week.
- September 5-8: Coordinating Committee meeting.
- September 9: A draft is distributed to all States Parties and relevant organizations.
- September 23: Informal meeting at which time States Parties and relevant organizations offer their comments on the draft.

The Coordinating Committee was in general support of the proposed work plan, with the following comments made regarding the application of this plan:

- The nature and form of the Zagreb Progress Report vis-à-vis the Final Report of the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties needs to be clearly communicated.
- The document needs to clearly spell out what remains to be done and in this context highlight the priorities for the President in 2006.
- If the States Parties are satisfied with the concept of one-year progress reports, this should be the pattern used at future Meetings of the States Parties in advance of the Second Review Conference.

The Chair also advised that in keeping with his commitment to be inclusive and transparent in the preparation of a draft Zagreb Progress Report, he had sent a letter, co-signed by Croatia, to all States Parties and interested organizations soliciting input.

3. Any other business

(a) Implementation Support Unit (ISU) financial statement

The Manager of the ISU recalled that the agreement between the GICHD and the States Parties states that “an annual financial report shall be submitted to the President/Coordinating Committee and to all donors,” that “the (ISU Trust) Fund shall be included in the GICHD accounting system and be audited by an independent auditing company on an annual basis,” and, that “the auditing report shall be forwarded to the President, the Coordinating Committee and to donors.” In accordance with this agreement, the Manager of the ISU provided to the Coordinating Committee the 2004 ISU Trust Fund financial report and auditor’s statement, highlighting that any overspending resulted principally from three reasons:

- The number of regional conferences held in advance of the Convention's First Review Conference greatly exceeded what one could have reasonably predicted when the budget was established. Of the eight regional conferences held in the

context of informal preparations for the Review Conference, the ISU was called upon to provide organizational and / or substantive support for seven.

- The President of the First Review Conference placed a high priority on the execution of a communications strategy in advance of the Conference. The ISU responded accordingly by making communications support a top priority, which from time to time had an impact on travel and the purchase of goods and services.
- The magnitude of support required for preparations in Nairobi for the First Review Conference could not have reasonably been predicted when the budget was established. For example, the budget was established prior to the Review Conference having been elevated to a "summit" on a mine-free world. The subsequent enhanced interest in the Review Conference meant that ISU personnel were required to travel on numerous occasions to Nairobi in advance of the event itself.

The President and a number of delegates commended the ISU for the amount and quality of work carried out with a relatively small number of staff and comparatively scarce funds.

(b) Booklet on Nairobi Summit documents

Canada reminded the Coordinating Committee that it had provided a grant to the ISU to produce a hand-book containing key documents from the Nairobi Summit and that additional copies are available from the ISU.

(c) Departures

The Chair remarked that it was the last Coordinating Committee meeting for Kenji Shinoda of Japan and Merete Lundemo of Norway. He thanked both for their service in support of the Convention.