

Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention

Monday 21 June 2010

Preliminary status report on the evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit

Ambassador Susan Eckey, President of the Second Review Conference and Chair of the ISU Task Force

- Thank you for this opportunity to present a short status report on the on-going evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit.
- First, I would like to emphasise that all relevant information regarding the evaluation has been circulated to all States Parties as soon as it has been available. In addition, all agreed documents, including the summaries from the Task Force meetings, have been posted to a designated web-site at the Convention's home page, as we all agreed at the very first meeting of the Task Force. It is therefore my hope that you have all had a chance to look at the documents, and I encourage all, both States Parties and other stakeholders, to engage actively in the evaluation in the time ahead.
- As you remember, the Second Review Conference in Cartagena last year endorsed the President's Paper on an Evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit of the Mine Ban Convention. This included mandating a Task Force to develop Terms of Reference on the basis of which an independent evaluation of the present situation of the ISU would take place. The Task Force should also present the evaluation and its recommendations on the future of the ISU to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties. This Task Force, just to remind us all, is composed of the present, outgoing and incoming Presidencies of the Convention, the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees, the Contact Group Coordinators, the Sponsorship Programme Coordinator as well as other interested States Parties. In short, the Task Force consists of all States Parties interested in participating. The Task Force is chaired by me as the current President.
- Based on the endorsement in Cartagena of the President's Paper, I prepared draft Working Methods for the Task Force, and draft Terms of Reference for an independent consultant to conduct the evaluation. These were agreed at the first meeting of the Task Force on 10 February, and thereafter distributed to all States Parties. At this meeting, I also introduced the proposed independent consultant Mr. Tim Caughley. The

meeting agreed that the Chair should proceed to contract Mr. Caughley, based on the Terms of Reference, the draft cost estimate, and the common understandings developed during the meeting and reflected in the summary.

- The contract with the independent consultant is administered by the ISU in consultation with the Chair of the Task Force and funded by earmarked contributions to the Voluntary Trust Fund.
- Mr. Tim Caughley is responsible for conducting the evaluation itself, and presenting options for the future to the Task Force. The Task Force, as agreed in its Working Methods, is responsible for making a final report, based on the evaluation and other relevant input, and making recommendations to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties – which will of course be responsible for making any decisions needed.
- Mr. Caughley first introduced himself at the second meeting of the Task Force on 10 March and gave an oral presentation of his work plan, including information about consultations done so far, plans for consultations in the time ahead, contact information and thoughts about the possibility of travelling to affected States Parties. Mr. Caughley highlighted that both the GICHD and the ISU had been very receptive and welcoming towards the evaluation in his meeting with the respective Directors.
- A preliminary report prepared by Mr Caughley was submitted on 15 April, as per the Terms of Reference, and distributed to all States Parties and posted on the web-site. At the third meeting of the Task Force on 2 June, Mr. Caughley presented his preliminary report. The members of the Task Force were then invited to present their views on issues related to securing the ISU's future support to the States Parties, including, but not limited to, the issues identified in our Working Methods.
- The discussion was structured according to the issues mentioned in the mandate of the Task Force, that is, first, the tasks and responsibilities of the ISU, second, the financing of the ISU, and third, the institutional framework for the ISU. However, as noted by several participants, the three issues were interlinked and several interventions therefore related to more than one issue. A range of views were presented by the members of the Task Force, and questions asked to and answered by the independent consultant. A summary of the third meeting of the Task Force will be circulated shortly.

- At the third meeting of the Task Force, I also presented and got agreement on a proposed meeting schedule and process towards the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties.
- As the consultant's final report will be submitted on 1 September, and given the calendar of other related meetings, I plan to schedule the fourth meeting of the Task Force on 7 or 8 September. At this meeting, we would need to set aside more time for our discussions. Our agenda should include a presentation of the final report and its options by the independent consultant, followed by a session with questions and answers. At this meeting it could also be useful to invite other relevant stakeholders to hear their views directly. Finally, the Task Force should hold a session with only its members present, to discuss the options presented in the final report of the independent consultant.
- Following our discussions in early September, I intend to consult widely with States Parties during the rest of September and October, in order to prepare draft recommendations for discussion at a fifth meeting of the Task Force, which I suggest to hold during the first week of November. In this regard, let me emphasise that the meeting schedule for related conventions and activities this autumn is very tight, and that the most likely days to have such a fifth meeting would seem to be Wednesday 3 or Thursday 4 November.
- Finally, I would like to emphasise the importance of this evaluation. The Implementation Support Unit has now been in existence for a decade, and we all benefit from their excellent services – not only for conducting meetings such as this week, but also through direct implementation support to States Parties with obligations to assist victims and clear mined areas in particular. The task at hand is to secure the best possible implementation support to States Parties in the future, given both financial constraints and other challenges relating to various questions, including capacity issues and the institutional framework.
- I therefore encourage you all, States Parties and other stakeholders, again, to engage actively in the evaluation, to share your views and experiences with the ISU to ensure that the decisions we make at the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties are based on the best possible information and take all views into consideration. I thank all those who have taken part in this work so far, including States Parties, various organisations as well as the GICHD and the ISU itself. Being evaluated is an added burden to an already heavy workload, and we appreciate the ISU's forthcoming approach to this process.

- Our independent consultant Mr. Tim Caughley is present throughout this week to continue his consultations. In addition, I and my team are available for any comments or questions that you might have regarding the process.
- Thank you.