MONDAY 21 MAY 2012

OPENING OF THE WEEK OF STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

10:00  Opening of the week of meetings

The week of meetings will be opened by the President of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP), H.E. Prak Sokhonn of Cambodia.

Please note:
(a) Participants are encouraged to participate actively in discussions on specific topics and to refrain from making statements of a general nature;
(b) The principle of flexibility will be applied with respect to time allocation (e.g., if one Standing Committee meeting uses less than its allocated time the subsequent Standing Committee meeting will immediately commence);
(c) States Parties providing updates on implementation are encouraged to provide only new information.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
THE GENERAL STATUS AND OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION

10:15  Opening of the meeting by the Co-Chairs

➢ Introduction by the Co-Chairs (Norway and Peru) on the work of the Standing Committee.

Overview of the general status of implementation: Update on the pursuit of the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan

➢ The President of the 11MSP, H.E. Prak Sokhonn, will provide an overview of the pursuit of the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan.
Overview of the general status of universalisation
(Cartagena Action Plan: #1-#6)

The Cartagena Action Plan recorded the resolve of the States Parties to achieve universal adherence to the Convention and its norms in order to realise the goal of a world free of anti-personnel mines.

- Update by the Coordinator of the Universalisation Contact Group, Belgium.
- Update by the Convention’s Special Envoy, His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein of Jordan.
- Opportunity for States not parties that have taken steps towards ratification of, or accession to, the Convention to provide updates or make announcements regarding the date when they intend to join the Convention.
- Opportunity for States Parties and organisations that have contributed to universalisation efforts to provide updates on their activities.

Transparency and the exchange of information
(Cartagena Action Plan: #11, #12, #14, #17, #28, #54, #55)

At the 10MSP, the States Parties considered a paper presented by Belgium, which highlighted the importance of further discussions on a number of matters concerning the Convention’s transparency provisions and the reporting process. In this paper, Belgium indicated that it would like to “engage all States Parties and stakeholder organisations in a discussion to explore possible means of revitalising the Article 7 reporting process, with an equal focus on the problems of reporting regularity, precision and quality”.

- Presentation by the Coordinator of the Article 7 Contact Group, Belgium.
- Discussion

Article 3: Updates on plans for and use of mines retained for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques
(Cartagena Action Plan: #56-#58)

In the Cartagena Action Plan, the States Parties agreed to three action points regarding mines retained for purposes permitted under Article 3 of the Convention.

- Opportunity for those States Parties that have reported mines retained for the purposes permitted in Article 3 to share information on their plans requiring the retention of mines in accordance with Article 3, the actual use of these mines and the results of this use. These updates have been requested in response to the following three questions:

  1. What are the reasons for changes / no changes in quantity and types of mines retained by your State since the Second Review Conference?
2. What are the purposes for which retained mines have been used and what have been the results of this use, including for example:
   
a. the mine detection, clearance or destruction techniques that have been / are being developed?
b. the mine detection, clearance or destruction training that has been carried out?
c. the number of personnel trained and to what standard?

3. What are your State’s plans for the further development of mine detection, clearance or detection techniques and further training which would result in the use of mines retained under Article 3?

➢ Opportunity for comments, questions and discussion

Compliance
(Cartagena Action Plan: #53)

At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that “all States Parties will, in case of alleged or known non-compliance with the Convention, work together with the States Parties concerned to resolve the matter expeditiously in a manner consistent with Article 8.1”.

➢ Opportunity for updates and an exchange of views on compliance

Implementation Support Unit: update
(Cartagena Action Plan: #64, #66)

In 2010, in endorsing the final report of the ISU Task Force, the 10MSP adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU”. This “Directive” indicates inter alia that the ISU shall “report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate”.

➢ Director of the ISU
➢ Discussion

Implementation Support Unit: financing

At the 11MSP, the President of the 10MSP reported on the work of the open-ended working group tasked to examine new models for the financing of the ISU. The 11MSP encouraged action on the recommendations made by the 10MSP President to preserve the results of the work undertaken by the open-ended working group in 2011 and work to improve the ISU’s current funding model and to ensure that sufficient contributions are provided to the ISU as long as the financing model remains unchanged.

➢ Opportunity for States Parties to share ideas and exchange views on improving the ISU’s current funding model with a view to ensuring that sufficient contributions are provided to the ISU.
13:00 Meeting adjourns until Friday 25 May, afternoon session

STANDING COMMITTEE ON STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION

15:00 Opening of the meeting by the Co-Chairs

➢ The Co-Chairs (Germany and Romania) will set the scene for the work of the Standing Committee through a presentation that recalls salient aspects of the Review and Action Plan adopted in Cartagena and the 11MSP Phnom Penh Progress Report.

Updates from relevant States Parties on the status of implementation
(Cartagena Action Plan: #7-#11)

At the Second Review Conference, it was agreed that “States Parties that have missed their deadlines for Article 4 implementation will comply without delay by destroying all stockpiles and provide a plan to ensure compliance as soon as possible and in strict conformity with relevant safety and environmental standards, including for this purpose relevant legislative measures taken, structures established, committed national resources, assistance needed and committed, and an expected completion date”.

As of the close of the 11MSP, three States Parties – Belarus, Greece and Ukraine – were still in the process of implementing Article 4. In addition two States that recently adhered to the Convention – Finland and South Sudan – have indicated that they have stocks that will need to be destroyed.

➢ Opportunity for States that recently adhered to the Convention to share information about stockpiles (approximately 8 minutes). This information has been requested in response to the following questions:

1. What is your plan to ensure implementation of Article 4 by your deadline?
2. What progress has been achieved in stockpile destruction so far?

➢ Opportunity for updates (approximately 7-8 minutes) by States Parties that are in the process of complying with their Article 4 stockpile destruction obligations. These updates have been requested in response to the following three questions:

1. What is your plan to ensure compliance as soon as possible?
2. What progress has been made in the implementation of Article 4 since the 11MSP?
3. What is your expected completion date?

➢ Opportunity for updates by States Parties and others providing assistance to those States Parties in the process of implementing Article 4.
The destruction of previously unknown stockpiles
(Cartagena Action Plan: #12)

In the Cartagena Action Plan, it was agreed that all States Parties will, when previously unknown stockpiles are discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed, report such discoveries in accordance with their obligations under Article 7, and in addition take advantage of other informal means to share such information as soon as possible and destroy these anti-personnel mines as a matter of urgent priority.

At the 11MSP, two States Parties, Guinea-Bissau and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, indicated that they had discovered previously unknown stockpiled anti-personnel mines after their deadlines had passed.

- Opportunity for updates by States Parties on previously unknown stockpiles of anti-personnel mines
- Opportunity for comments and questions

Stockpiles held by States not parties and plans to destroy them
(Cartagena Action Plan: #3)

In keeping with the commitment States Parties made in the Cartagena Action Plan to “seize every opportunity to promote and encourage adherence to the norms of the Convention”, the Co-Chairs are providing an opportunity for States not parties to share information on stockpiles held and on any plans for their destruction.

- Opportunity for States not parties to provide information

Updates on other developments and initiatives in support of the application of the stockpile destruction aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan

- Opportunity for brief updates on other developments and initiatives in support of the application of the stockpile destruction aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan.

Closing remarks by the Co-Chairs

16:00 (Approximate timing) Meeting ends
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

16:00¹ Opening of the meeting by the Co-Chairs

- The Co-Chairs (Indonesia and Zambia) will open the meeting by providing an overview of the work of the Standing Committee, reporting on initiatives that they have undertaken and delivering a presentation on the status of the implementation of Article 5.

Updates by States Parties that have completed implementation of Article 5 since the 11MSP

Some States Parties may be in a position to report that they have completed implementation of Article 5 of the Convention since the 11MSP.

- Updates by States Parties that have completed implementation of Article 5 since the 11MSP

- Opportunity for comments and questions

Updates by States Parties that have been granted extensions on deadlines for implementing Article 5

At Meetings of the States Parties and at the Second Review Conference, it was agreed that those States Parties that have been granted extensions on their deadlines for implementing Article 5 of the Convention would provide updates at meetings of the Standing Committees relative to the commitments they had made in their extension requests and to the decisions taken on their requests. The following States Parties will therefore be invited to provide such updates: Algeria, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Mauritania, Mozambique, Peru, Senegal, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Yemen.²

In addition to answering some questions specific to each national context, the Co-Chairs have asked these States Parties to provide updates that respond to the following:

1. What has been accomplished in your State’s efforts to implement Article 5, relative to the commitments made in your extension request, since the last report that was provided? How much land has been released through non-technical survey, technical survey or clearance?

2. Does your State have clarity regarding the remaining state of contamination? How many mined areas containing or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and what total amount of area remains to be addressed?

¹ The Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies will begin its work immediately following the close of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction.
² Two of these States Parties will be the focus of more detailed small group discussions on Thursday 24 May. These States Parties, once they have been confirmed, will not need to provide an update in the plenary.
3. Is the demining plan that formed a part of your extension request still being used to guide your clearance activities, and if not, do you have an updated plan that can be shared with States Parties?

4. Does your State have the resources to implement its plan for Article 5 implementation and, if not, what are your State’s needs?

- Updates by States Parties that have been granted extensions on deadlines for implementing Article 5.
- After each set of five presentations, the Co-Chairs will provide an opportunity for comments or questions.

18:00 Meeting adjourns until Tuesday 22 May at 10:00

TUESDAY 22 MAY 2012

STANDING COMMITTEE ON MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

10:00 Updates by States Parties that were granted extensions on deadlines for implementing Article 5

- Continued from the previous day’s session
- After each set of five presentations, the Co-Chairs will provide an opportunity for comments or questions.

Article 5 extension process

In considering the 10MSP President’s report on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, the 11MSP noted that the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests.

In this context, the 11MSP recommended that those States Parties mandated to analyse requests in 2012 reflect on the process to date with a view to identifying efficient methods to ensure that high quality requests and analyses are prepared and with a view to recommendations on this matter being submitted for consideration at the 12MSP.

- The President of the 11MSP
- Discussion
Updates by States Parties that have submitted requests in 2012

By the time of the meeting of the Standing Committee, at least three States Parties – Afghanistan, Angola and Zimbabwe – will have submitted requests for extensions for consideration at the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties (12MSP). In addition, the process of analysing requests, agreed to at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties, will have commenced.

- Presentation by the President of the 11MSP on the status of requests received and the analysis of them.
- Opportunity for States Parties that have submitted requests to share highlights of their requests with the Standing Committee. These States Parties should concisely address the following questions:
  1. What has been accomplished since entry into force in terms of the number of mined areas and total area that has been cleared or released?
  2. What remains to be done? How many mined areas containing or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and what total amount of area remains to be addressed? If your State does not have clarity regarding the remaining state of contamination, what is it doing to acquire such clarity?
  3. What is your State’s plan to address the remaining implementation challenge? What is your State’s proposed time-frame for completion of implementation?
  4. Does your State have the resources to implement the plan in your State’s Article 5 extension request and, if not, what are your State’s needs?

- Following each presentation, there will be an opportunity for comments and questions.

13:00 Meeting adjourns until 15:00

15:00 Updates by States Parties that have submitted requests in 2012

- Continued

The discovery of mined areas after the expiry of Article 5 deadlines

The 11MSP noted that the Convention is silent on how to address situations where States Parties, which have never reported Article 5 obligations, discover previously unknown mined areas. The 11MSP further noted a need to develop a rational response to such situations which is firmly anchored in the object and purpose of the Convention and which does not undermine the legal obligations to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas as soon as possible.

In this context, the 11MSP requested that the 11MSP President, supported by the Coordinating Committee, consult with all relevant stakeholders to prepare a constructive discussion on this matter at the May 2012 meetings of the Standing Committees with a view
to recommendations on this matter being submitted for consideration at the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties.

- The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, on behalf of the President of the 11MSP.
- Discussion.

**Updates by other States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5**

In addition to the States Parties that have been granted extension requests or that have submitted requests for consideration by the 12MSP, as of the close of the 11MSP, the following States Parties were still in the process of implementing Article 5: Bhutan, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Iraq, Serbia, South Sudan, Sudan and Turkey. In addition, at the 11MSP, Germany reported that a former military training area probably still contains, amongst other unexploded ordnance, cluster munitions and anti-personnel mines, and, Hungary reported that during the recent and ongoing demining work in Croatia, patches of land straddling the border of Hungary and Croatia were found suspect of containing mines.

Of particular interest regarding these and other States Parties implementing Article 5 is the emphasis the Second Review Conference placed on the fact that “several States Parties, including some for which the Convention entered into force several years ago, have not yet provided clarity pursuant to their obligation under Article 7, paragraph 1(c), to report on the location of all mined areas that contain or are suspect to contain, anti-personnel mines.”

- Opportunity for updates by those States Parties which have indicated that they are in the process of fulfilling obligations under Article 5 of the Convention. These States Parties should concisely address the following questions:

  1. What has been accomplished in your State’s efforts to implement Article 5 since the last report was provided?
  2. What remains to be done? How many mined areas containing or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and what total amount of area remains to be addressed? If your State does not have clarity regarding the remaining state of contamination, what is it doing to acquire such clarity?
  3. What is your State’s plan to address the remaining implementation challenge? What is the prospective end-date for completion of implementation?
  4. Does your State have the resources to implement its plan for Article 5 implementation and, if not, what are your State’s needs?

- Opportunity for comments and questions

**18:00 Meeting adjourns until Wednesday 23 May at 10:00**

---

WEDNESDAY 23 MAY 2012

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

10:00   Updates from relevant States Parties on the status of implementation of Article 5
(continued, if necessary)

➢ Continued from the previous day’s session.

Updates on other developments and initiatives in support of the application of the mine
clearance aspects of the *Cartagena Action Plan*

➢ The Co-Chairs will provide an opportunity for brief updates on other developments and
initiatives in support of the application of the mine clearance aspects of the *Cartagena
Action Plan*.

12:00   (Approximate timing) Meeting ends

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION

12:00⁴ Opening of the meeting by the Co-Chairs

The Co-Chairs (Algeria and Croatia) will set the scene for the work of the Standing Committee through a presentation that recalls salient aspects of the *Cartagena Action Plan* and the 11MSP Phnom Penh Progress Report.

Updates from relevant States Parties on challenges and work that remains in applying the victim assistance aspects of the *Cartagena Action Plan* at the national level

➢ The Co-Chairs will provide an opportunity for updates (maximum 7-8 minutes) to be provided by those States Parties that have indicated that they hold the responsibility to provide for the well-being of significant numbers of landmine survivors.

The Co-Chairs have asked these States Parties to provide information that would enable the Co-Chairs to prepare a mid-term assessment of the application of the victim assistance aspects of the *Cartagena Action Plan*, particularly by focusing on challenges encountered and objectives that they still aim to meet by the Third Review Conference. These States Parties have been asked to respond to the following two questions:

---

⁴ The Standing Committee on Victim Assistance will begin its work immediately following the close of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies.
1. What are main challenges that your State has encountered in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan? (Please elaborate on up to three main challenges.)

2. What objectives in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan does your State still anticipate meeting between now and the Third Review Conference in 2014?

➢ Opportunity for comments and questions

13:00 Meeting adjourns until 15:00

15:00 Updates from relevant States Parties on challenges and work that remains in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan at the national level

➢ Continued

18:00 Meeting adjourns until Thursday 24 May 2012 at 09:00

THURSDAY 24 MAY 2012

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION

09:00 Updates from relevant States Parties on challenges and work that remains in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan at the national level

➢ Continued

Updates from and views of other States Parties and other actors on efforts to apply the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan

➢ Time permitting, the Co-Chairs will provide an opportunity for other States Parties and other actors to provide updates and share views on the application of the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan.

11:00 Meeting adjourns until 16:00
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

11:15  **A focus on national contexts and other ways to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan**

At the 10MSP, the States Parties requested the Coordinating Committee to allocate time during the week of meetings for Co-Chairs and others to experiment with new ways to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan.

The 11MSP noted the efforts undertaken pursuant to the 10MSP decision and encouraged the Coordinating Committee to consider similar efforts in 2012. Pursuant to this decision, the Co-Chairs of three Standing Committees have decided to convene concurrent small group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine Clearance: Implementing plans in Article 5 extension requests – Bosnia and Herzegovina (Lake Room)</th>
<th>Victim Assistance: Applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan – Iraq (Salle C2)</th>
<th>Cooperation and assistance: Developing a platform for partnerships (Salle C1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Presentation by Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>➢ Presentation by Iraq</td>
<td>➢ While financial support is very much needed and appreciated, other types of non-financial assistance (e.g., material, equipment, expertise, etc.) are also essential. The idea was raised of establishing an information exchange tool including these other types of assistance, together with contact details. The Co-Chairs will seek concrete input on the development of such a tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Discussion on assisting Bosnia and Herzegovina in fulfilling commitments contained in its Article 5 extension request</td>
<td>➢ Discussion on cooperation to assist Iraq in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13:00  **Break**

14:00  **A focus on national contexts and other ways to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine Clearance: Implementing plans in Article 5 extension requests – Chad</th>
<th>Victim Assistance: Applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan – the DRC</th>
<th>Cooperation and assistance: Developing a platform for partnerships (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Presentation by Chad</td>
<td>➢ Presentation by the DRC</td>
<td>➢ What experiences have actors had in accessing information about available funding, technical support, or other forms of cooperation and assistance for implementation? What are the gaps in information about available assistance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Discussion on assisting [INSERT]in fulfilling commitments contained in its Article 5 extension request</td>
<td>➢ Discussion on cooperation to assist the DRC in applying the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
VICTIM ASSISTANCE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REINTEGRATION

16:00 Making a difference on the ground: monitoring progress and evaluating the impact of victim assistance efforts

At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recognised “that the real promise of the Convention is to make a difference on the ground, in the lives of survivors, the families of those killed or injured, and their communities.” While the States Parties have developed a rich set of understandings regarding what “victim assistance” means to them, as recorded at the Cartagena Summit, “a persistent challenge remains in translating increased understanding on victim assistance into tangible improvements in the quality of daily life of mine victims.”

Given the “real promise of the Convention” and the “persistent challenge” recorded in Cartagena, the Co-Chairs invite all interested delegations to engage in a discussion on how the Convention community can fulfil its promise to survivors and victims.

In preparing for this discussion, delegations may wish to consider their experiences and challenges faced in relation to the following issues:

- States Parties:
  1. What tools do you use to measure, monitor and report on the impact of your victim assistance programmes?
  2. How did you establish baselines, methods for measurement and targets against which to measure results?
  3. How do you use the results of your evaluations?
  4. How do you ensure that your efforts actually make a difference in the lives of victims and survivors?

- Survivors or their representative organizations:
  1. Are you included in efforts to monitor and report on the impact of victim assistance programmes?
  2. How can States and non-governmental and international organizations improve their victim assistance efforts to better ensure they translate into a real difference on the ground?
3. Are the efforts of States and non-governmental and international organizations actually making a difference in the lives of victims and survivors?

- All delegations:

1. Given the recognition made by the States Parties in Cartagena that achieving progress in making a tangible difference on the ground "is complicated by the broader set of complex challenges that face most developing countries", what can realistically be expected from the Convention and what is beyond our reach?

**Closing remarks by the Co-Chairs**

18:00 **Meeting ends**

**FRIDAY 25 MAY 2012**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE**

10:00 **Opening of the meeting by the Co-Chairs**

- The Co-Chairs (Albania and Thailand) will open the meeting recalling that the 11MSP took note of and encouraged action on concrete ideas to make the best possible use of this new Standing Committee.

**Developing a platform for partnerships**

- On 24 May in a small ground setting, the Co-Chairs will facilitate a discussion on the possible development of an information exchange tool, principally to contain information on non-financial assistance (e.g., material, equipment, expertise, etc.) and contact details. The Co-Chairs will report to the plenary on this small group discussion.

- Discussion

**Trust funds to support implementation**

- In 2011, it was recalled that the States Parties should consider exploring options to ensure the continuity of resources, such as the establishment of a Trust Fund. The ISU was subsequently requested to prepare a paper framing key issues surrounding trust funds to support implementation. The Co-Chairs hope that this paper will stimulate discussion on this matter.

Delegations may wish to prepare for this discussion by considering the following questions:
1. What experiences have States Parties and other actors had in using various trust funds and other multilateral funding channels in terms of achieving maximum efficiency in international cooperation and assistance?

2. How might such experiences relate to a proposed new trust fund?

➢ Discussion

**The availability of assistance and procedures to obtain it**

➢ The Co-Chairs intend to ask a cross section of actors in a position to provide assistance (e.g., donors, affected States Parties, non-governmental organizations) to explain what assistance is available, for whom and how it may be obtained. All delegations may then wish to discuss the matter of the availability of assistance and procedures to obtain it.

Delegations may wish to prepare for this discussion by considering the following questions:

1. How do those in a position to provide assistance communicate their priorities for assistance and application procedures?

2. What experiences have States Parties and other actors had in providing or accessing mine action funding that has been mainstreamed into development and other budgets?

3. What lessons can be learned from such experiences?

➢ Presentations

➢ Discussion

**Closing remarks by the Co-Chairs**

13:00 Meeting adjourns

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON**

**THE GENERAL STATUS AND OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION**

15:00 Intersessional Work Programme: small group meetings

At the 10MSP, the States Parties requested the Coordinating Committee to organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in June 2011 in such a way that time was allocated for Co-Chairs, individual States Parties and others to experiment with new ways of using the Intersessional Work Programme to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan.
The 11MSP noted the efforts undertaken pursuant to the 10MSP decision and encouraged the Coordinating Committee to consider similar efforts in 2012.

- Updates on small group meetings carried out during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees

**Article 9: The development and adoption of legislative, administrative and other measures (Cartagena Action Plan: #59-#61)**

At the Second Review Conference, the States Parties recorded that while there has been some progress since the Nairobi Summit in implementing Article 9, over 40 percent of the States Parties have not yet reported that they have legislation in place to give effect to the Convention.

- Presentation on the status of implementation of Article 9.

- Opportunity for updates by those States Parties in the process of developing and adopting legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9, and, if relevant, to make their needs for assistance known.

**Preparations for the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties**

At the 11MSP, the States Parties agreed to designate H.E. Matjaž Kovačič, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Slovenia to the United Nations in Geneva, President of the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties (12MSP) and decided that the 12MSP would take place in Geneva from 3 to 7 December 2012. In addition, the 11MSP adopted cost estimates for the 12MSP.

- Presentation by the President-Designate of the 12MSP

- Discussion

- Update provided by the Secretary-General-Designate of the 12MSP and by the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs on 12MSP organizational matters

- Discussion

**Meetings of the States Parties: organisation and functioning**

The 11MSP took note of suggestions to consider whether the interactive character of the annual Meeting of the States Parties could not be enhanced and its duration shortened while improving its overall effectiveness, and decided that the Coordinating Committee brainstorm on this theme in the first half of 2012 and that the May 2012 intersessional meetings discuss and submit, through the President, recommendations to the 12MSP in this regard. The 11MSP further noted that, should any action be taken by the 12MSP on this basis, it would lead to appropriate adjustments to the organisation of the MSP effective as from the Thirteenth Meeting.
➢ President of the 11MSP

➢ Discussion

**Updates on other implementation mechanisms**

➢ Update by the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, Australia

➢ Updates (if desired) by the Coordinators of the Contact Groups

**The practical implementation of the various other provisions of the Convention**

➢ An opportunity for updates or views to be shared on other provisions of the Convention not otherwise covered by this or other Standing Committees.

**Any other business**

**Closing remarks by the Co-Chairs**

**Closing of the week of Standing Committee meetings**

17:45  **Closing remarks**

18:00  **Week of Standing Committee meetings ends**