REPORT ON THE FUNCTIONING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT UNIT, NOVEMBER 2005 – SEPTEMBER 2006

Prepared by the Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining

BACKGROUND

1. At the Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP) in September 2001, the States Parties endorsed the 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 Coordinating Committee, to finalise an agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU. The GICHD’s Foundation Council accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.

2. An agreement on the functioning of the ISU was finalised between the States Parties and the GICHD on 7 November 2001. This agreement indicates i.a. that the Director of the GICHD shall submit a written report on the functioning of the ISU to the States Parties and that this report shall cover the period between two Meetings of the States Parties. This report has been prepared to cover the period between the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties (6MSP) and the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP).

ACTIVITIES

3. The Nairobi Action Plan, adopted by the States Parties at the First Review Conference on 3 December 2004, complemented by the Zagreb Progress Report, continued to provide the ISU
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with clear and comprehensive direction regarding the States Parties’ priorities. Following the
6MSP, the ISU provided the President, the Co-Chairs, the Contact Group Coordinators and the
Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme with thematic food-for-thought to assist them in
their pursuit of the priorities identified by the 6MSP. This helped enable the Coordinating
Committee to hold a successful day-long retreat on 30 January 2006 at which time the general
framework for intersessional work in 2006 was elaborated.

4. The ISU provided ongoing support to the President, the Co-Chairs, the Contact Group
Coordinators and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme in the achievement of the
objectives they set for 2006. This involved the provision of advice and support, assisting with
preparations for and follow-up from the May 2006 meetings of the Standing Committees, and
making recommendations to the Sponsorship Programme’s Donors’ Group on drawing a closer
link between administering sponsorship (enabling attendance) and supporting effective
substantive contributions (enabling participation).

5. Certain Co-Chairs and Contact Group Coordinators again launched ambitious initiatives
and the ISU responded accordingly. This was particularly the case with respect to the Co-Chairs
of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance who sought to build upon the efforts of their
predecessors by assisting the 24 most relevant States Parties in inter-ministerial efforts to
enhance victim assistance objective setting and planning. Through project funding provided by
Switzerland, the ISU established the temporary position of victim assistance specialist in order to
provide process support to these 24 States Parties.

6. In 2006, victim assistance process support involved one-on-one meetings with officials
from relevant ministries to raise awareness of the matter and to stimulate inter-ministerial
coordination, outreach to relevant international and other organizations, and, inter-ministerial
workshops to bring together all relevant actors to discuss and consolidate improvements on
objectives and the development of plans. In 2006, the ISU undertook process support visits to
Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Serbia, Tajikistan and
Yemen, and, provided some form of advice to all 24 relevant States Parties.

7. The ISU’s mandate states in part that the rationale for the unit is based on the support
provided by the ISU being “critical to ensure that all States Parties could continue to have direct
responsibility and involvement in the management and direction of the implementation process.”
On this basis, the ISU continually examines how it can support implementation and participation
needs of States Parties that have special needs. In 2006, one group of States Parties with special
needs which was identified was small States. Many of these States Parties face unique
implementation challenges related to their size and limited resources as well as challenges in
ensuring a practical level of participation in the overall operations of the Convention. In
response, the ISU drafted a Small States Strategy which sees the ISU working to enable small
States Parties to identify and put in place practical, common-sense and cost-effective ways to
support implementation and participation. Phase I of the application of the Small States Strategy
involved the ISU supporting Trinidad and Tobago in convening a 29-30 June 2006 workshop on
the role of the Caribbean Community in the pursuit of the aims of the Convention.1

8. Providing advice and information to individual States Parties on implementation matters
continued to be a central feature of the work of the ISU. In particular, perhaps due to the priority

1 See www.apminebanconvention.org/smallstates.
States Parties have placed on the implementation of Article 5 during the period 2005 to 2009, the ISU received an increasing number of requests for advice or support with respect to the mine clearance obligations contained within this Article. Responses by the ISU included support to one State Party in convening technical workshop on the implementation of Article 5 and preparations for a support visit to another State Party which is scheduled to take place in October 2006. The ISU also responded to numerous other requests for implementation support each month in addition to responding to requests for information from States not parties, the media, and interested organizations and individuals.

9. The ISU provided its traditional substantive and organizational support to the President-Designate of the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties, working closely with the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs (UNDDA). In addition, the ISU provided support to the presumed host and presidency of the Eighth Meeting of the States Parties, in part by hosting for a one-week period in June 2006 an expert from the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

10. The ISU continued to collect a large number of pertinent documents for the Convention’s Documentation Centre, which is maintained by the ISU as part of its mandate. The Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Documentation Centre currently contains over 5,000 records and continues to be used by States Parties and other interested actors as an important source of information on the Convention. In addition, in 2006 the ISU continued to expand the content on the GICHD’s web site concerning the Convention and its implementation.2

11. In 2006, the ISU was requested by those with an interest in other issue areas to learn from the experience of implementation support in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. This has included inquiries made and information provided or presentations given to those interested in the Small Arms and Light Weapons Programme of Action, the Biological Weapons Convention, Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and the draft Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

12. As indicated in the President’s Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit and the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the GICHD created a Voluntary Trust Fund for activities of the ISU in late 2001. The purpose of this fund is to finance the on-going activities of the ISU, with the States Parties endeavouring to assure the necessary financial resources.

13. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the Coordinating Committee was consulted on the 2006 ISU budget.3 The 2006 ISU budget was distributed to all States Parties by the 6MSP Presidency along with an appeal for voluntary contributions.

14. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the Voluntary Trust Fund’s 2005 financial statement was independently audited by

---

2 See www.apminebanconvention.org.
3 Basic infrastructure costs (e.g. general services, human resources, accounting, conference management) for the ISU are covered by the GICHD and therefore not included in the ISU budget.
PriceWaterhouseCoopers. The audit indicated that the financial statement of the Voluntary Trust Fund had been properly prepared in accordance with relevant accounting policies and the applicable Swiss legislation. The audited financial statement, which indicated that the 2005 expenditures of the ISU totalled CHF 434,925, was forwarded to the Presidency, the Coordinating Committee and donors.

### Contributions to the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund
#### 1 January 2005 to 31 July 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributions received in 2005 (CHF)</th>
<th>Contributions received in 2006(^4) (CHF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>38,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>70,840</td>
<td>[TO BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>23,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>57,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>[COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>38,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>[DURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>[THE 7MSP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>108,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contributions</td>
<td>CHF 544,380</td>
<td>CHF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) All amounts in CHF.
\(^5\) As of 31 July 2006.