

Coordinating Committee Meeting

Tuesday 29 April 2008

President's Summary

1. Introductory remarks

The President and Chair of the Coordinating Committee welcomed the group and thanked participants for their efforts and participation.

2. Discussions on key implementation challenges and opportunities

The Chair noted that at the first two meetings of the Coordinating Committee since the 8MSP discussions within the group have focused almost exclusively on ensuring the sound organisation of the 2008 Intersessional Work Programme. With great advances having been made in preparing for the June meetings of the Standing Committees, the Chair outlined his intention to take advantage of the energy and expertise of the group by dedicating some time during this meeting to informal discussions on key implementation challenges under the Convention.

The Chair highlighted that the Coordinating Committee, while not a decision making forum except on organisational matters, provides a valuable opportunity for discussions on various pressing implementation challenges and on opportunities that may exist to overcome these challenges. Under the Chatham House Rule the following topics were discussed:

Discussion topic #1: Non-Compliance with Convention Obligations

The Chair recalled that in June the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction will discuss matters concerning failure to comply with Article 4 stockpile destruction obligations and noted that while it is important that attention be given to cases of non-compliance, attention should also be given to preventing such situations from occurring in the future. Members of the Coordinating Committee considered what States Parties and others could do to prevent further instances of States failing to comply by their deadlines, means that could be used to know at an early date if a State Party is at risk of missing its deadline, and, what could be done to ensure that there will be no risk of States Parties failing to comply.

The group expressed the importance of engaging with States Parties that may be unable to meet their deadlines at an early stage so that assistance may be provided. It was suggested that the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of relevant standing Committees could engage in consultations from an early stage. The group noted that it is essential to encourage transparency throughout the process.

Discussion topic #2: Improving the Quality of Reporting

The Chair observed that the Article 5 extensions process has seen several States Parties provide in their requests dramatically more and better information than ever before on both the location of mined areas and programmes for destroying anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 5. The Chair noted that while providing information on both is required according to Article 7 of the Convention, the quality and quantity of information typically provided in Article 7 reports or through other means has not been nearly at the level of what is contained in many extension requests.

The group considered what could be done to see that all States Parties implementing Article 5 provide the quality and quantity of information necessary to ensure a high level of clarity regarding, in accordance with Article 5.2, the identification of all mined areas under a State Party's jurisdiction or control, and, that a national demining programme has been elaborated.

The group acknowledged the importance of engaging with States Parties to ensure that there is an understanding of what information is required under Article 7 and noted the potential value in arranging a short briefing for States Parties on how to produce good quality national reports.

3. Conclusions of the 11 April closed consultations on the destruction of PFM mines

The Chair informed the group that on 11 April the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction held closed consultations on the destruction of PFM mines. The Co-Chairs presented an overview of the key conclusions of these consultations and made a more detailed written document available to the group. (See Annex I)

4. Organisational matters concerning the 2-6 June meetings of the Standing Committees

The Chair recalled that on 16 April, the Director of the Implementation Support Unit wrote to the Coordinating Committee to highlight that the European Commission was no longer in a position to provide interpretation at meetings of the Standing Committees, and, to provide a recommendation that interpretation be provided using the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund on the basis that the Coordinating Committee endorse an amendment to the ISU's 2008 budget to acknowledge that the Trust Fund would be incurring a cost not foreseen when the budget was developed. (See Annex II). The group concurred with this recommendation and the Director of the ISU offered to provide an overview of the financial status of the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund at the next meeting of the Coordinating Committee.

5. Preparations for the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties

The Chair recalled that on 1 February, the President Designate of the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP), Ambassador Jürg Streuli of Switzerland presented key considerations for the 9MSP, including that the 9MSP would need to take decisions on preparations for the Second Review Conference. The Chair recalled that on 10 March, the President-Designate shared an "initial ideas" paper for the 9MSP and distributed a draft programme. On the basis that this was considered generally acceptable to the Coordinating Committee, the President-Designate distributed this paper for discussion at the 6 June meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operations of the Convention.

The President-Designate took the opportunity to seek initial views from the Coordinating Committee on proposed dates for 2009. (See Annex III). The group was in general agreement with the dates proposed, although of the two options proposed for the Second Review Conference there was a preference expressed for the first option (i.e., 30 November – 4 December 2009).

6. Preparations for the 2-6 June meetings of the Standing Committees

- *Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention:* The Co-Chairs informed the group of their intention to write letters to States Parties concerning candidates for new Co-Rapporteurs. These letters will be sent in advance of the Standing Committee meeting and further discussions on this matter will take place during that week.
- *Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction:* The Co-Chairs reiterated the efforts that had undertaken with respect to PFM mines and their intention to follow-up on this matter.
- *Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies:* The Co-Chairs informed the group that they had sent letters to all States Parties with obligations under Article 5 inviting them to make a short presentation at the June meetings of the Standing Committees.

7. Updates on activities of the Contact Group and Sponsorship Programme Coordinators

- *Universalization Contact Group:* The Contact Group Coordinator (Canada) informed the group that a regional workshop took place in Malaysia in early April with support having been provided by Germany.
- *Article 7 Reporting Contact Group:* The Contact Group Coordinator (Belgium) informed the group that annual reports were being received and can be accessed via the United Nations Office Geneva website (www.unog.org). The ICRC indicated that it received information that Ethiopia had submitted its initial Article 7 report at the United Nations in New York.
- *Resource Utilisation Contact Group:* The Contact Group Coordinator (Norway) provided an update on the workshop being convened on 14 May on land release and Article 5. The workshop will bring together a small but representative group to reflect upon recent advances in the rapid release of areas suspected of containing anti-personnel mines. The intended outcome of this meeting is to produce a written paper for distribution during the June meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, and also to hold a side event during these intersessionals.
- *Linking Mine Action and Development Contact Group:* The Contact Group Coordinator (Canada) indicated that the Contact Group will meet in June. The main focus will be on development NGOs as development implementers. A set of draft guidelines for development NGOs are currently being reviewed and will be made available for this meeting, ahead of the official launch of the full set of guidelines which will take place at the 9MSP in November.

8. Any other business

No other business was raised under this agenda item.

9. Next meetings

The Chair indicated that the next meetings of the Coordinating Committee will take place as follows:

- Thursday 15 May, 13:00-15:00
- Tuesday 8 July, 13:00-15:00
- Friday 29 August, 13:00-15:00

Annex I

Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction (SCSD) Informal Closed Consultations on PFM mines

Friday 11 April 2008, Geneva

The work of the Co-Chairs is guided by the *Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009*, adopted by the States Parties at the Convention's First Review Conference in 2004, and the Progress Reports produced by the States Parties since that time. In these key documents, the States Parties have repeatedly underlined the need to support the investigation and further development of technical solutions to overcome the particular challenges faced by some States Parties in destroying PFM mines.

With the aim of better understanding the complexity of these challenges and with a view to expediting the identification of solutions, the Co-Chairs held on 11 April 2008 informal closed consultations with representatives of the States Parties concerned, with the participation of interested donors, experts in the field of stockpile destruction, in particular of PFM mines, and representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with the relevant expertise.

Conclusions:

I. The initiative by the Co-Chairs (Lithuania and Serbia) and the Co-Rapporteur (Italy) on stockpile destruction aimed at ensuring the destruction of all PFM mines by Belarus, whose deadline was 1 March 2008 and by the Ukraine, whose deadline is 1 July 2010, was welcome by participants. Similar consultations using the format (informal, closed) and the working method (under Chatham House rules) of the consultations on PFM mines destruction problem could and should be continued as an effective working tool available to the Ottawa Convention, in particular in the prevention of or addressing compliance related issues, in the future.

II. Specific destruction challenges

1. For the purpose of solving the PFM mines destruction problem within the Ottawa Convention sufficient studies have been undertaken to prove that open burning or open detonation (OBOD) might cause environmental damage. Demolition safety and security of population concerns shall be also taken into account. Moreover, given the scale of destruction, i.e. big quantities of PFM mines and spread of PFM mines storage points over large territories, OBOD could be no less efficient and expensive than industrial demilitarization. Hence, some form of industrial demilitarization is the recommended approach.
2. Turkmenistan has reported in its Article 7 reports the destruction of around 70.000 KSF cassettes containing PFM mines in the period of 1999-2001. Turkmenistan could consider providing information on the used destruction method, location and impact on environment.

III. Technologies available for PFM mine destruction

1. Among around ten available destruction technologies sufficient information exists pointing to the probable solutions to destruction being confined (or contained) incineration or confined (or contained) detonation. Furthermore, given the variety of delivery systems and accordingly different types of PFM mines (KSF-1, KSF-1S, BKF-PFM-1S and 9M27K3), a total solution (e.g., the destruction of all explosive components, consideration given to the abatement of secondary waste, etc.) makes sense. Confined (or contained) detonation could require extra charges and time for initiating the PFM munitions or their part, implementation of a pollution control system, disposal of solid secondary waste and etc. In the case of 9M27K3 destruction, both abovementioned technologies would also require initial dismantling.

2. On top of national environmental and demolition safety regulations in a beneficiary country, as one of financing conditions donors require that additional - in most cases, higher standards are applied in destruction technologies.
3. The technology and capacity that can be applied to the destruction of PFM mines exist. However, the infrastructure necessary to destroy all types of PFM mines does not exist in Belarus or the Ukraine and will not exist until funds and/or technical assistance is provided.
4. Capacity to destroy PFM mines exists in both Belarus and Ukraine – though to a different degree, which may provide opportunities for maximizing the use of local resources in destruction. Investing into and/or building the national capacities which in the future might be employed for the destruction of other conventional weapons and their munitions should be considered by potential donors. National ownership could play an important role in both countries.
5. Number of companies possessing technologies for PFM mines' destruction to a certain extent is limited. National companies that have been actively involved in realization of national programs for destruction of other types of munitions, in particular in Belarus and Ukraine, have never taken part in realization of international projects, however in most cases possess rich experience, good management and necessary qualifications. Thus despite of absence or lack of their international experience such national companies should be given an opportunity to compete and where appropriate participate in implementation of the PFM mines destruction projects in Belarus and the Ukraine.

IV. Stockpile destruction under Article 4 in Belarus

1. Belarus continues to be committed to fulfil its obligation under Article 4, even though missed the deadline of 1 March 2008.
2. Full transparency by the Government of Belarus is being positively noted by the Ottawa Convention community and sets a good example.
3. Belarus and the European Commission continue their cooperation on the PFM mines destruction and are about to start negotiations on the terms of reference of a tender for the PFM destruction project. The terms of reference is a key stage of the project, and both parties shall draw conclusions from their past experience, be as flexible as possible and seek to set up the most realistic and efficient preconditions to the success of the project.
4. The European Commission, the Government of Belarus, the Ottawa Convention community at large and other interested parties should encourage a maximum number of qualified companies to bid on the tender.
5. Belarus is of the opinion that management of the project from the newly opened Delegation of the European Commission in Minsk should be considered.

V. Efforts by Ukraine to fulfil its Article 4 stockpile destruction obligation

1. Ukraine confirmed its determination to comply with her Article 4 obligation.
2. Ukraine, building on the lessons learned, has decided to make a significant national contribution towards the destruction of a portion (about ½) of its PFM mines stockpile. Pavlograd Chemical Plant has been assigned for this purpose. Ukraine has also made its decision as to the destruction technology. Taking into account many ongoing weapons destruction programmes which require existing local capacities, Ukraine's preference with

the view to assistance in PFM mines destruction is technical assistance, in particular in the form of equipment (a rotary kiln).

3. The European Commission is willing to continue its support to the Ukraine's PFM mines destruction programme. In doing so the European Commission would devote special attention to capacity building and such support could be provided in the context of the overall priorities for assistance in favour of Ukraine as part of the overall funding available for Ukraine and in full respect of the relevant implementation rules and procedures of the European Commission External Assistance. Once Ukraine indicates its desire that such funds be used for stockpile destruction, the European Commission requires that it is a party to an assessment to be undertaken of existing destruction facilities in Ukraine in order to clarify the most appropriate facility for enhancements or capacity building necessary to complete PFM mines destruction.
4. Taking into account lessons learned, it is important to look at diversified sources of funding, in particular those under practical procedural arrangements. Ukraine invites other donors to consider supporting its efforts. The European Union is prepared to convene internal consultations and look at other funding instruments. NAMSA expressed certain interest in cooperating with the EU in this regard.
5. Ukraine is called on to intensify its dialogue with donors with the view to fulfilling its Article 4 obligations on time.

VI. General conclusions and recommendations for further steps to be taken

1. Provisions of para 25 (iii) of the Dead Sea Progress Report 2006-2007 has been and is of great relevance, and „all States Parties should place an increased emphasis on the obligation, as it concerns stockpile destruction, of each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of Article 6 to cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs“.
2. The Ottawa Convention community might consider recommending that in the future in the case of projects related to upcoming obligation deadlines diversified funding mechanism would have to be put in place so that to ensure continuity of a project if for one or another reason problems occur in its course.
3. In order to prevent or address compliance related issues, the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction should continue holding the informal consultations on the issue of PFM mines destruction as well as on other arising issues. Preventive measures, such as consultations, shall be taken well in advance so as to have constructive impact.
4. At this stage, the Governments of Belarus and Ukraine have to stay committed and actively pursue assistance for pending PFM mines destruction. In both cases - of Belarus and of Ukraine - more awareness and political support, especially by the EU member states, might stimulate speedier progress in resolving funding issues to ensure that the crucial obligations of Article 4 are met.
5. All parties that have participated in the consultations are called on to reflect and actively participate in the SCSD meeting in June.

Annex II

2008 Budget for the Implementation Support Unit, Revised, 29 April 2008

Background

1. At the September 2001 Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP) the States Parties endorsed the 3MSP President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and mandated the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to establish the ISU. The 3MSP also encouraged States Parties in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the ISU. In addition, the States Parties mandated the President of the 3MSP, in consultation with the Coordination Committee, to finalise an agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU. The Council of Foundation of the GICHD accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.
2. In accordance with the above-mentioned actions taken by the States Parties at the 3MSP, an agreement on the functioning of the ISU was finalised between the States Parties and the GICHD by the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD on 7 November 2001. This agreement indicated that an annual budget for the ISU will be established and that it shall include figures for the forthcoming financial year and, if necessary, a set of priorities that shall be understood as guidelines in order to allocate available resources.

Activities

3. The general duties – hence the general priorities – of the ISU are listed in the 3MSP President's Paper that serves as the mandate for the Unit. These duties include the following:
 - Providing support and executing follow-up with respect to the work of the Coordinating Committee;
 - Providing support across all facets of the current and incoming Presidents' duties;
 - Providing support to the work of the Standing Committees, particularly by providing advice and assistance to the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs;
 - Serving in an important communication and liaison role with respect to the Convention, including by ensuring timely and consistent communication about the implementation process to all interested actors;
 - Providing support to the Sponsorship Programme; and,
 - Maintaining a documentation resource facility on the Convention.
4. In a manner consistent with the 3MSP's President's Paper, the ISU, in the performance of its substantive duties on implementation issues, will continue to receive direction from and support the work of the Coordinating Committee, ensuring ongoing input from States Parties into the work of the ISU. The ISU Manager, on behalf of the GICHD Director, will continue to participate in Coordinating Committee meetings to ensure effective and close communications and coordination. Moreover, clear direction regarding priorities for the ISU continues to be provided by the States Parties through their adoption of the Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009.
5. At the September 2006 Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP), the States Parties agreed to encourage States Parties requesting extensions in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention "as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their requests." In doing so, the States Parties underscored the already increasing workload of the ISU in providing to individual States Parties and to Co-Chairs professional support and advice on matters concerning the implementation of Article 5. This additional workload was taken into account in the 2007 budget and again is reflected in the 2008 budget.

6. In addition at the 7MSP, the States Parties agreed on a process to assist them in considering requests for extensions including: (a) that in preparing “an analysis” of extension requests “the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs, in close consultation with the requesting State, should, where appropriate, draw on expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice, using the ISU to provide support;” and, (b) that all States Parties in a position to do so are encouraged “to provide additional, earmarked funds to the ISU Trust Fund to cover costs related to support the Article 5 extensions process.” This aspect also was taken into account in the 2007 budget and is again reflected in the 2008 budget.

Budget

7. Costs for basic infrastructure and services in support of the ISU (e.g. human resources, information technology, accounting, telecommunications, office space) are covered by the GICHD general budget, as are costs related to the administration of the Sponsorship Programme. Costs that are covered by the ISU budget are the following:
- a) **Personnel:** The staffing of the ISU in 2008 will continue to include a full-time *manager*, a full-time *mine action (Article 5) implementation specialist* and a half-time *administrative assistant*. In addition, the position of *implementation support officer* will be converted from a full-time position to one that is 80 percent of full-time (following maternity leave of the office holder) and an additional half-time *implementation support officer* position will be established (to take into account the heavy work load of the ISU).
 - b) **Operations:** These costs include travel and related costs for ISU staff as support costs for special activities. The increase in 2008 relative to 2007 is related to the fact that the position of *mine action implementation specialist* was staffed for only part of 2007 and hence additional costs associated with this position will be borne in 2008.
 - c) **Article 5 extensions process support:** To take into account costs associated with support to the Article 5 extensions process – that is, to acquire for and at the request of the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs “expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice” and to provide States Parties with a means to earmark funds for this purpose, a distinct line item again appears for this matter as it did in 2007.
 - d) **Interpretation at the meetings of the Standing Committees:** Traditionally interpretation at meetings of the Standing Committees has been provided on a voluntary basis by two donors. In 2008, the leading donor indicated that it was no longer in a position to provide funds to cover the costs of interpretation. On the basis of support expressed by the Coordinating Committee, a new budget line has been added to foresee that these additional costs would be covered by the ISU Trust Fund.

(CHF)	Budget 2008	Budget 2007
Personnel*		
▪ Salaries	611,000	431,000
▪ Social costs	117,000	95,000
Operations		
▪ Travel	85,000	75,000
▪ Support	20,000	20,000
Article 5 extensions process support†		
▪ Expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice	65,000	25,000

* See paragraphs 5 and 7a above for an explanation of the increases in these line items relative to the 2007 budget.

† See paragraphs 6 and 7c above for an explanation for these potential costs.

Interpretation at meetings of the Standing Committees [‡]	45,500	0
Total costs	943,500	646,000

8. In accordance with the 3MSP President's Paper on the Establishment of an Implementation Support Unit, a fund for voluntary contributions to finance the activities of the ISU has been established, with States Parties to endeavour to assure the necessary financial resources. The relevant details of this fund are as follows:

UBS Geneva, P.O. Box 2600, CH-1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland
Account no.: FP 100 627.6
IBAN: CH45 0024 0240 FP10 0627 6
Swift code: UBSWCHZH80A
Account owner: Centre international de déminage humanitaire - Genève

Geneva, 29 April 2008

[‡] In April 2008, this line item was added to the original budget for 2008 presented to the Coordinating Committee in November 2007.

Annex III:

Proposed dates for meetings in 2009

As noted in the 2 April 2008 paper *Initial ideas concerning, and suggested agenda and programme for, the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*, the 9MSP will need to agree to a preparatory process for the Second Review Conference. It was further stated that the precedent set by the First Review Conference may be useful to follow:

- Two preparatory meetings – one being one day in length (perhaps in May or June 2009) and the other two days in length (perhaps in September 2009) may be sufficient, as they were in the lead-up to the First Review Conference. This would also be extremely cost effective.
- One preparatory meeting could take place immediately after meetings of the Standing Committees in 2009. This would enable participation by sponsored delegates.
- As was the case in the lead-up to the First Review Conference, the President-Designate of the Second Review Conference could convene additional informal meetings if deemed necessary.

With this approach deemed generally acceptable to the Coordinating Committee at its meetings on 1 February and 10 March 2008, the President-Designate will proceed in seeking views from all States Parties at the 6 June 2008 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention. In addition, the President-Designate wishes to seek views on specific dates for meetings in 2009 as follows.

Meetings of the Standing Committees

- Monday 25 May to mid-day Friday 29 May

First Preparatory Meeting

- Afternoon of Friday 29 May

Second Preparatory Meeting

- Thursday 3 September to Friday 4 September

Second Review Conference

- Monday 30 November to Friday 4 December
...or...
- Monday 7 December to Friday 11 December

It should be noted that this proposal would foresee the meetings of the Standing Committees and the First Preparatory Meeting being contained within a five-day period.

With effective time management, possibly by using sessions that are longer than traditional three-hour time blocks, it should be possible to fit the work of the Standing Committees into a 4.5 day period. This would allow for half-day Preparatory Meeting which in turn should be sufficient as the First Preparatory Meeting likely would address proposed matters of substance in very general terms and would largely be focused on dealing with procedural matters (e.g. draft programme, cost estimates, et cetera).

Containing meetings of the Standing Committees and the First Preparatory Meeting within a five-day period is a near-necessity given the disarmament calendar in May 2009 and the number of holidays between the weeks of 27 April to 1 June that limit the number of weeks that include five full working days. However, doing so would also be efficient and cost-effective for the Sponsorship Programme.