

**PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAMME**

**AMBASSADOR SUSAN ECKEY OF NORWAY
CHAIR OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE**

3 DECEMBER 2010

In Cartagena, it was agreed that the Coordinating Committee would review the operation of the Intersessional Work Programme, with the Chair of the Coordinating Committee consulting widely on this matter and presenting a report and, if necessary, recommendations to the 10MSP.

The Coordinating Committee took up this matter at each of its meetings this year and the result is the report that I have presented to you on behalf of the Coordinating Committee.

Our overall conclusion was that the Intersessional Work Programme has continued to function well, particularly since 2002 when a clear focus was placed on giving centre-stage to the States Parties that are in the process of fulfilling key obligations.

We observed that this has resulted in greater clarity on the status of the implementation of the Convention and the identification of weaknesses, gaps and opportunities.

We also noted that, with a clear focus on the pursuit of objectives that flow from the provisions of the Convention itself, successive Co-Chairs have truly ensured continuity in their efforts.

Since 2002, meetings of the Standing Committees have not been stand-alone episodes but rather have served as milestones in a process ultimately leading to the realisation of the Convention's promise.

Moreover, Co-Chairs have seen that their responsibilities to facilitate progress in implementation are not limited to simply chairing a single meeting but rather span the entire year of their respective terms and set the ground for a continuation of efforts by their Co-Rapporteurs.

While the Intersessional Work Programme continues to function well, the implementation process has evolved in recent years:

- a. In advance of, during and since the Second Review Conference, several delegations emphasised the ongoing importance of cooperation and assistance in ensuring that the promise of the Convention is realised.
- b. While the States Parties have gained a lot since 2002 by seeing that meetings primarily focus on national contexts, there is a potential to deepen this focus.
- c. The Article 5 extensions process has significantly added to the workload for the Presidency, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs. Moreover, there has been an increase in demands for States to fill a proliferation of tasks related to conventional weapons instruments.
- d. While there are some serious concerns regarding the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, this remains a matter of national implementation for only four States Parties.
- e. There has been increased awareness of the potential for synergy in the work of various conventional weapons instruments.

Given these and other observations, we have put forward a number of recommendations.

First: We believe that the States Parties should reaffirm the ongoing importance of the principles that have been central to the success of the Intersessional Work Programme to date, namely: coherence, flexibility, partnership, informality, continuity, effective preparation, transparency and inclusion.

Second: Given the reasons that were given by many delegations earlier in this week, we embraced the idea first put forward by Zambia and recommend that the States Parties establish a new "Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance".

Third: For the reasons outlined in our report, we recommend that this Standing Committee be presided over in 2011 by the 10MSP President with the leadership of this Standing Committee being regularised as of the 11MSP.

Fourth, in this context, we recommend that the States Parties should examine the possibility of rationalising the numbers of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, request that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Co-Chairs / Co-Rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the 11MSP.

Fifth: Largely on the basis of inspiration provided by the ICRC and keeping with our accepted principle of flexibility, we recommend that the Coordinating Committee in 2011 should organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in such a way that time is 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.

Sixth, we recommend that, on the basis of experimentation carried out during various Intersessional Work Programmes, the States Parties should keep an open mind to how to restructure the week of meetings of the Standing Committees to ensure its ongoing effectiveness.

Seventh, while noting that the implementation of Article 4 continues to be carried out by only four States Parties, we recognised that the small number of country cases was not indicative of the great complexity associated with remaining stockpile destruction challenges.

And we noted that the amount of meeting time consumed by any particular Standing Committee was not indicative of its relative importance.

Therefore, we recommend that the States Parties should acknowledge the ongoing importance of a Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction as long as profound challenges remain in the implementation of Article 4.

Eighth, in recalling that the clearance and assistance to victims are matters dealt with by various international instruments, we recommend that the States Parties, and in particular States Parties that are party to more than one related

instrument, should pursue coherence in the scheduling of meetings of relevant instruments, particularly those meetings that deal with the clearance of explosive hazards and assistance to the victims of conventional weapons.

Finally, we recommend that the States Parties should regularly evaluate the potential for synergy in the work of various related instruments, while acknowledging the distinct legal obligations of each.