

Santiago Global Conference on the Cluster Munitions Convention – Summary of Proceedings

“The Oslo Convention on Cluster Munitions Universal Meeting in advance of the First Meeting of State Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, Cooperation and International Assistance”. 7-9 June 2010

MONDAY, 07 JUNE 2010

2. Inaugural statements

- Chile – Minister of Defense
- H.E. Mr. Bounkeut Sangsomsak, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Lao PDR
- Ms. Mine Gerhardsen, State Secretary of Norway
- Mr. Enrique Ganuza, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative in Chile
- Mr. Thomas Nash, Coordinator & Mr. Soraj Ghulam Habib, Ban Advocate and Representatives of the Cluster Munition Coalition

4.- Process and timeline to the First Meeting of State Parties in Lao PDR

Chair: Chile – Mr. Alfredo Labbe, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- **Berlin Conference on the Destruction of Cluster Munitions**, June 2009, Mr. Jörg-Alexander Albrecht
- **Santiago Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean**, September 2009, Mr. Camilo Sanhueza
- **Bali Regional Conference for Asia and Pacific**, November 2009, Ms. Rofita Djamawar
- **Pretoria Regional Conference for Africa**, March 2010, Mr. Ofthan Sengan
- **Film "The Ban Advocates: From Victims to Champions"**, introduced by Ms. Lynn Bradach, Ban Advocate, Cluster Munition Coalition.

5.- Universalisation of the Convention and preparations for its Entry Into Force

Chair: Japan - Mr. Tomosaburo ESAKI, Principal Deputy Director of the Conventional Arms Division, Disarmament, Non-Proliferation and Science Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- Presentation by Japan (Ms. Chisa Sato, Conventional Arms division, MFA Japan):
Universalisation focus
- Presentation by the UN MAS Mr. Gustavo Laurie
- Presentation by the ICRC Mr. Lou Maresca
- Presentation by the CMC Ms. Laura Cheeseman, Campaign Manager
- Interventions from the floor

Guinea Bissau: said it expects to send its instrument of ratification no later than 1 August 2010.

Guatemala: hopes to ratify by the 1MSP.

France: supports Japan's universalisation efforts and announced it mobilized its diplomatic network and conducted many demarches in 2010 in order to promote CCM universalisation, including joint demarches with Handicap International in several countries around the world. It described the CCM as a humanitarian norm.

Togo: the CCM text will be submitted for ratification by the National Assembly shortly.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: announced that ratification will be completed in the nearest future so that BiH can take part in the 1MSP as a full State Party.

United Kingdom: deposited its instrument of ratification on 4 May 2010, promoted the CCM via the Commonwealth and announced the new UK government is committed to the CCM.

Mexico: promotes the CCM both bilaterally and multilaterally.

Lao PDR: echoed and supported Japan's comments. A special advisor of the 1MSP President will visit several countries that intent to join the CCM.

Croatia: organized in February 2010 a meeting entitled "After Oslo" and looks forward to promote the CCM.

CMC: On behalf of the CMC, a cluster munition survivor explained why cluster munitions cannot be justified from a military perspective. He said that other highly accurate weapons could be used instead, that describing cluster munitions as defensive weapons is "a non-sense". He stressed that cluster munitions are reaching the end of their shelf life anyway and that maintaining them is expensive. He concluded by calling on all states to join the CCM.

Benin: described its ratification process as very advanced and ensured it would be completed in the coming weeks and thanked Japan for contributing \$2 million to the Benin training center.

Norway: stated that Article 6 could be used to promote the CCM and called on all states to sign and/or ratify the CCM as soon as possible.

Guinea: referred to its “situation of exception” to justify the delayed ratification and said that ratification would be completed shortly.

Chad: described itself as “very polluted” and indicated that 58 ERW casualties had been reported this year, including those from cluster sub-munitions.

Botswana: indicated that ratification was being finalised and that it hoped it could go to Laos as a State Party.

New Zealand: stated that it was already taking steps to implement Article 21, in particular in their near Asia- Pacific region.

Australia: welcomed the initiatives taken by the Lao PDR and said that with the entry into force, efforts should refocus on ratification.

DRC: described itself as “a country victim of cluster munitions,” mentioned a meeting between DRC and Congo held on 18 May 2010, and said that the ratification could be submitted next week.

Moldova: said that the CCM was not explicitly distinguishing jurisdiction and control over a territory and said that it was very proud of having deposited its instrument of ratification, thereby triggering the entry into force of the CCM, adding that that several non signatory states were sharing the objectives of the CCM.

Seychelles: said it was committed to get other states to join the CCM.

6.- Roadmap to the First Meeting of States Parties in Lao PDR on Administrative and Logistic Preparations

Chair: Norway - Deputy Director-General Mr. Jostein Leiro, Deputy Head of Department for UN, Peace and Humanitarian Affairs

- Presentation by the Lao PDR on **status of national preparations**
Mr. Saleumxay Kommasith, Director General of Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Presentation by the UNDP on **status of preparations, including the Multi-Donor Trust Fund**
Ms. Sara Sekkenes and Ms. Julie Mehigan
- Presentations by the CMC
Ms. Alexandra Hiniker, CMC's Lao PDR Project Manager and
Mr. Bounmy Vijak, CMC's Ban Advocate on **status of preparations**
- Presentation by Ireland on **Procedural Matters**
Ms. Alison Kelly, Director for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, Department of Foreign Affairs
- Interventions from the floor:

France: said it was contributing 50,000 Euro to the 1MSP preparations.

Australia: announced that it has provided 650,000 USD to the multi-donor trust fund for Lao PDR, to help establish the international treaty support unit within the Lao National Regulatory Authority as well as other UXO related activities.

Ireland: announced a 500,000 USD funding contribution to the MDTF

CMC: spoke on how the 1MSP is key to establishing the CCM's long-term success, not only by laying the groundwork for implementation, but also through further establishing the culture of community and commitment that has been a hallmark of the CCM and the Oslo Process.

France: enquired about the process towards the 1MSP, on the role of the Santiago Conference and the development of the background documents by the President and Friends of the President and underlined the importance of an inclusive process.

Lao PDR: responded that the process of 'announcing' the friends to be assisting in the preparations of the conference had been undertaken through the Lao Support Group and a meeting called by Lao PDR on 18 March 2010 in Geneva at which all states had been requested to volunteer as friends. The Lao Support Group Meeting is open-ended, for all interested states and that all consultations had been open-ended, transparent and inclusive and would continue to be so.

7.- Roadmap to the First Meeting of States Parties in Lao PDR on Substantive aspects of the Convention

Chair: Lao PDR – Deputy Minister Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mr. Bounkeut Sangsomsak

- Presentation by Lao of main **Outcome documents of the First Meeting of States Parties: Political Declaration, Action Plan, Friends of the Chair**
Mr. Saleumxay Kommasith, Director General of Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Presentation by Norway of **Vientiane Action Plan**
Senior Advisor Ms Ingunn Vatne
- meeting adjourned in advance of substantive presentations next morning

TUESDAY, 8 JUNE 2010

- Presentation by Austria on **Victim Assistance**
Dr. Wolfgang Angerholzer, Austrian Ambassador to Chile
- Interventions from the floor

Croatia: made the point that a lot remains to be done to ensure that all victims are assisted, the fundamental humanitarian aspect of the Convention. Furthermore, for Croatia, situation analyses and databases are crucial. One of the greatest innovations of the CCM is the expansion of the definition of victims: families and communities included. For Croatia, assistance should aim at reintegration and rehabilitation. Croatia Centre for Reintegration and Rehabilitation will be opened by the end of the year and its aims to educate, and sensitize workers to ensure spread of human rights for all.

Laos PDR: commended Austria on the victim assistance paper, in particular the suggestion of having a comprehensive pilot project aimed at including best practices and lessons learned in the Vientiane Action Plan (VAP). Laos went on to stress the importance of victim assistance but highlighted the fact that effective victim assistance may be beyond the capacity of many affected countries.

Belgium: insisted on giving more of a voice to victims.

Turkey: mentioned its victim assistance programmes, notably the fact that mine victims and civilians are treated at military hospitals, with 30% of the quota reserved for civilians.

Chile: emphasized that victims are victims regardless of the origin of their injuries. They cannot be divided into categories. People with disabilities are people with human rights. Chile's suggestion for the 1MSP is to build synergies between the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). Civil society can play a crucial role in this.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: victim assistance is especially important. Bosnia and Herzegovina is a Friend of the Chair on CCW protocol 6. Bosnia and Herzegovina commends Austria on preparatory paper and added that from their experience, one of the most effective approaches to victim assistance has been peer support. Peer support involves support from a person who has experienced a similar trauma and is aimed at building the confidence of the victim through understanding their trauma, demonstrating that they are not alone and their problems are not insurmountable. Bosnia and Herzegovina suggested trying to include this in the draft of the Vientiane Action Plan (VAP).

Australia: highlighted victim assistance as an essential component of the Convention and that the CCM was the high water mark of victim assistance. Australia expressed their agreement with Laos on the need to draw upon experience from Cartagena Action Plan and lessons

learned from the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT). For instance, MBT interessionals will include linkages between the CRPD and MBT in relation to victim assistance.

Colombia: took the floor to announce their intention to submit a 6-point proposal.

United Kingdom: stressed the need for a strong emphasis on victim assistance as self-evident. United Kingdom announced that the new coalition government is committed to assisting people with disabilities, but would point out that the most effective way of doing this is through the National Health System of affected States. UK also pointed out that through DfID, the UK has donated £3.5 million to Cambodia, with funding having been directed towards rural areas. By the same token, DfID has been promoting free health care in 4 provinces of the Democratic Republic of Congo, aiming to reach 2.5 million people between 2008 and 2011. As part of this programme the very poorest are treated free of charge.

Switzerland: victim assistance is central to ending the suffering caused by cluster munitions. Along with GICHD, Switzerland will keep working to ensure effective victim assistance provisions. Switzerland encourages constant focus on victim assistance, highlighting that victim assistance should be included in the social services of affected states and be dealt with from a human rights perspective.

Botswana: reaffirmed Australia's appeal for linkages and synergies between different existing instruments.

France: emphasized that the focus on victim assistance was crucial, adding that the Cartagena Plan of Action (CPoA) is a good basis for work on CCM. Indeed, for France, maximizing synergies between international instruments is critical.

Ireland: identified victim assistance as a key area of the Convention and reiterated the value and importance to have synergies between international instruments. Furthermore, Ireland pointed out that the CCM is in a good position to build on experience of MBT. Finally, Ireland reminded the audience to bear in mind for the VAP that Article 5 of the CCM already includes a lot of detail.

ICRC: reminded participants while it was important to build synergies, cutting and pasting from action plans was not always appropriate and recommended that the Vientiane Action Plan look at concrete actions with a shorter, 1-2 year timeline, and that affected States with victims should present a situation analysis to allow a more tailored approach.

CMC: highlighted victim assistance as a human rights issue and that plans should be based on the needs of the victims. The Vientiane Action Plan should help affected countries by providing time-bound obligations and provide measurable steps. Also, focal points should have expertise and adequate resources. Furthermore, the Vientiane Action Plan should include Economic/Social/Health and Education needs. The rights, needs and priorities of victims are crucial and States parties should continuously consult with victims. Lao PDR should begin applying Article 5 as soon as possible in the lead up to the 1MSP.

Lebanon: stressed that victim assistance is not just a legal but a moral and ethical obligation.

- Presentation by Australia on **Clearance**
Mr. Philip Kimpton
- Interventions from the floor.

Norway: echoed the importance of making an early start on clearance and of using appropriate survey and clearance methodologies to assist prioritization. For Norway, national ownership will play a crucial role in this process and added that strategies for land release should be given particular attention. Also, Norway pointed out that the argument portraying cluster munitions as more dangerous than landmines was dubious and that such debate could entail much time wasted on definitions which should be avoided.

Lao PDR: pointed out that clearance will only be possible with international cooperation and that clearance and risk education must be viewed in the context of poverty eradication. Therefore these aspects should be included in the discussion paper. Furthermore, Lao PDR questioned how to ensure clearance could be considered alongside development in practice.

GICHD: referred to the first point which it considers important: proper contamination and needs assessment. It stressed that it is important to understand what remains to be done and how this can be carried out effectively. VAP should include research and development on improving clearance and how to deal with contamination. GICHD wished to remind the importance to improve priority settings and links with development and poverty eradication and that the applicability of survey methods will play a key role in improving accountability adding that IMSMA could provide a good basis for this and that IMSMA is used in most affected countries.

CMC: shared some key points –

- Clearance efforts are ongoing in many countries, for instance Albania has cleared all cluster munitions.
- Deadline extension should not be used except in cases of heavily affected countries.
- New systems and structures are not necessarily always required and can drain resources.
- Clearance must have an impact on people's lives within 5 years.
- Lessons learned to be shared and used to ensure efficient adherence to obligations.
- Emergency response should be limited to immediate post-conflict contexts.
- Imperative to understand the extent to which areas are contaminated.
- Enough data, knowledge and capacity exist to ensure effective adherence to the CCM.
- Responsibility for clearance lies with State parties but other states must also assist with financial and data resources.
- State parties should provide information to all states, both not party and parties to the CCM.

Albania: cluster munitions in Albania were from the Kosovo conflict in 1999. Humanitarian organizations have been clearing since 2002 under the coordination of the Albanian Mine

Action Executive. In 2009, Albania was declared free of cluster munitions and the Government of Albania will report as required. Albania signed the CRPD in 2009 and is committed to the universalisation of the CCM.

Canada: stressed that they support an early start on clearance and that cluster munitions clearance and landmines clearance are different. There are many unknowns, including size, duration of time in the ground and so on.

UNMAS: reminded the audience of the expertise in the UN (UNDP/UNICEF/UNMAS) and they would be glad to add expertise where necessary. One lesson learned among affected countries is that South to South cooperation could work.

Australia: (Panelist) congratulated Albania for their successful work. Australia reminded the audience that detailed inputs were welcomed in writing and that they were aiming for one round of comments and inputs to the circulated discussion paper. Australia also emphasized that State parties should clear within 10 years and that international cooperation was essential to achieving this.

- Presentation by Germany on **Stockpile Destruction**
Mr. Jörg-Alexander Albrecht
- Interventions from the floor:

Philippines: pointed out that remnants of munitions should be raised as an issue. They must not be recycled and used as other munitions.

Afghanistan: announced that in the last year they have destroyed almost all cluster munitions and currently have no cluster munitions stockpiled. Afghanistan reminded the audience that victim assistance is important and that Afghanistan is one of the most affected States. Furthermore, Afghanistan declared that ratification was in process and will hopefully be completed by November.

Norway: stockpile destruction is an imperative as it is a preventive, non-proliferation measure. Norway emphasized the importance of an early start and encouraged State parties to focus on this issue now rather than when approaching deadline. Norway pointed out the importance not to inflate the complexity of stockpile destruction and supported international cooperation.

Angola: has begun the process of stockpile destruction and aim to have destroyed all stockpiles by the end of 2010. Angola emphasized the need to train teams to minimize risks. Angola will provide assistance to victims and aims to ratify the CCM as it has done with the MBT.

Lebanon: reminded that it suffers from the presence of approximately 4 million cluster munitions, 40% of those dropped have not yet been found. 30 villages and towns are contaminated. Stockpile destruction needs political will as this is not a technical problem. Countries may not always have an interest in stockpile destruction, political and economic will is not always there. The important question to ask is how to convince countries to destroy their

stockpiles. Furthermore, there is a need to find an instrument to stop the aggressor from inflicting harm.

Tajikistan: is an affected country, with ERW still posing a problem. 499 cluster munitions have been destroyed since 1999 and 200 people have fallen victim to cluster munitions. In terms of victim assistance, Tajikistan insisted that victims require rehabilitation and also social protection. CCM is crucial to disarmament policy. Tajikistan does not use or stockpile cluster munitions. Furthermore, Tajikistan informed the audience that ratification was under discussion.

CMC: stockpile destruction must start now, political will is central to achieve this. Within one year, State Parties must have a plan, timeline and budget. Physical destruction must have begun within 2 years. CMC reminded the audience that often the complexities of stockpile destruction are exaggerated and that resource recovery and recycling can help savings. CMC advocated for donor policy to include stockpile destruction and insisted that no extension should be granted except in exceptional circumstances. As for retention of cluster munitions, CMC opposed this from the start and felt that states did not adequately demonstrate the necessity for retention. CMC hopes that few if any, states will retain cluster munitions for training purposes. Only 12 signatory states have provided information on their destruction of stockpiles, 23 states have not disclosed any information. There is a crucial need for more information and transparency.

Montenegro: has ratified CCM and begun stockpile destruction on remaining stocks. Some 273 pieces will be disposed of soon. Montenegro aims to have completed its stockpile destruction by end 2010 and has also identified a new demolition ground.

Ecuador: has never used or transferred cluster munitions and reminded the plenary that bombs have a shelf life after which they present a risk, therefore stockpiling itself presents a risk. Ecuador has experience in clearance and is fully aware of the humanitarian impact.

Kenya: stockpile destruction is crucial. In this field, states must work together, share technical knowledge, experience and international assistance.

Senegal: civil society plays a role in advancing the process. Senegal is in the process of submitting a document to parliament for ratification. This document is important and Senegal wants to see risk education included. Lessons on this can be drawn from the MBT.

Bulgaria: is trying to ensure ratification by November. Stockpile destruction is of particular interest. Institutional mechanisms of financing technical assistance will prove crucial. Bulgaria asked an opened question to the plenary on how can we provide incentives for large stockpilers (either State Parties or States not Party) to clear and destroy stockpiles?

Germany: response emphasized that stockpile destruction is connected to victim assistance and that political will is key to ensure that destruction occurs. It is possible. Germany concluded in reminding the audience they will be pleased to receive comments on presentation and the issue in general.

- Presentation by New Zealand on **National Implementation Measures**
Ms. Lucy Richardson
- Interventions from the floor

CMC: States can supplement legislation with regulations and policies that provide more details but national legislation is crucial to the effectiveness of the convention because it lays out binding, enduring, and unequivocal rules that leave less room for interpretation. Penal sanctions should be established. State Parties should provide directives to police and military. Stockpiling by states not party on State Parties territory must also be specifically prohibited. National legislation should set deadlines at no more than 8 years. In relation to article 4, clearance must take place within the shortest time period. National assistance plans should be drawn up in conjunction with victims. All states must contribute to international assistance and cooperation. State Parties are obligated to promote universalisation. For the Vientiane Action Plan, State Parties must commit to national legislation. Furthermore, State Parties must agree on implementation measures by 2nd Meeting of State Parties.

Norway: State Parties may take legal measures but they are not a requirement of the CCM. Legislation needed likely to be similar to that required by MBT. CCM requires State Parties to take action to implement the Convention. Within the framework of annual reporting State Parties should take action to implement the CCM.

Ireland: argued that there are a number of ways to implement the CCM. These can include legal, administrative and policy decisions. Discussion on national legislation by the CMC goes beyond Ireland's view of the obligations on State Parties under the CCM. It is not necessary to include positive obligations in national legislation; this can over complicate the implementation and delay progress.

New Zealand (panelist): responded that issues of unwieldy legislation were raised at side event, a debate on this issue ensued and added that the discussion paper focused on common law but civil law jurisdiction views welcomed.

- Presentation by Canada on **Work Plan 2011 and institutional dimension of the Convention**
Mr. John MacBride, Senior Defense Advisor (Mines/ERW), Non-Proliferation & Disarmament Division, Department of Foreign Affairs & International Trade Canada
- Interventions from the floor

Lao PDR: agreed there was a need for an informal meeting between 1st and 2nd MSP and put forward the suggestion to establish a coordinating committee. For Lao PDR, the structure of a ISU needs to be discussed. Lao PDR agrees on the need to learn from experience of MBT but not to replicate structures. In that regard an informal meeting to schedule 2MSP would be useful. Lao PDR suggested considering having this in Geneva to minimize costs.

Belgium: was pleased that the debate has been launched and ideas presented and wondered how to implement/operate. Belgium expressed the need to seek a structure that permits an advance of the CCM as quickly as possible and reminded the audience it was essential to synergize with other Conventions. Belgium emphasized that overlapping topics (i.e. environmental issues) were key and victim assistance crucial.

DRC: their experience shows that national commissions could be useful/ necessary and agrees that synergies are necessary to advance the CCM.

France: agreed with Canada that durable decision is key. France argued that the work of an implementation support unit should be included and that intersessionals would be useful, preferably by 2011. GICHD could play a role in the preparations of an intersessionals and benefit from their expertise. Certain thematic areas should be included, such as victim assistance and international assistance and cooperation.

Switzerland: argued that CCM and APMBC features will enable synergies and minimize costs and that effective use of resources will be key; e.g. GICHD could be an implementing partner. 1MSP should focus on the architecture of the Convention and subsequently this architecture would be established at 2MSP.

CMC: State parties can learn lessons from MBT: structures are inclusive, transparent and cooperative. These have helped to ensure excellent standards of compliance. 3 key areas: full compliance; transparency; structures to promote universalisation. Early years are crucial: State Parties must meet obligations as soon as possible – extensions should not be acceptable. Interpretations of the Convention will not be an excuse for loopholes. There must be openness to frank discussions. There is a need for creative and innovative diplomacy and flexible structures that can evolve with time. Canada's paper could be strengthened by including early action. Thematic committees could help advance Convention. 1MSP should identify areas which require friends (such as universalisation; stockpile destruction; victim assistance; national implementation measures; compliance; and interpretation issues). Switzerland highlighted the need to address challenges at both a national and international level and agreed that Intersessionals were a good idea. State Parties should agree on a list of states to be approached in relation to universalisation. CCM meetings should be organized around the same time as meetings for other treaties. Switzerland argued that an ISU must have been established by 2MSP.

Norway: building on the experience from the MBT does not mean copying all its structures as we must ensure that CCM architecture is appropriate. Time is needed and processes are

ongoing. State parties should take as many decisions at 1MSP as possible. 2011 intersessionals are a good idea but they do not have to be long as 2-4 days would suffice pending discussions at the MSP. In terms of organization, continuity is key. An excellent option already exists and UNDP could act as facilitator.

Australia: principles of intersessionals can be drawn from MBT: cooperation; transparency; information; implementation; and universalisation. Intersessionals could be 3 – 4 days. Flexibility as well as contiguity is key. Identifying thematic areas is a good idea. Affected states and all State parties can work well together on these thematic areas. For Australia, a coordinating mechanism would be useful and an ISU is essential. Sponsorship programme has an essential role to play; details should be decided at 1MSP.

ICRC: argued that intersessionals are important particularly in the early phase of Convention. In terms of architecture, ICRC is open and flexible. The point raised by Canada regarding the number of State parties attending the 1MSP is not a major concern as it will be attended by signatories which will prove very useful in relation to decision-making. ICRC is in line with CMC in that it also supports a flexible approach. Innovation will be based on the needs of the CCM that will vary by country and region. ICRC argued for the need of regional support networks. With regards to synergies, it will be important to be as efficient in intersessionals work as possible, bearing in mind other intersessionals work and exploiting synergies that already exist.

Ireland: agrees with ICRC; important to maximize synergies with MBT and CCW (protocol 5). Experience will prove useful and aid in improving efficiency. Ireland reminded the audience to bear in mind that the cluster munitions problem is smaller than the landmines problem and this should be reflected in the architecture; for instance there are fewer affected states. It is not necessary to copy past actions. Ireland expressed the need to await first reports on cluster munitions (due January 2011) and use these as a guide for decisions.

Canada (panelist) responded they were pleased by the support demonstrated for the concepts proposed and that details need to be resolved by the Prep Com. Canada agreed on the need to resolve to synergize with MBT. Canada highlighted the consensus on the fact that Intersessionals will play a crucial role in the implementation of the CCM and that coordinating committee could be relevant; notwithstanding the issues a coordinating mechanism is definitely needed. Finally, general support for an implementation support mechanism was noted it said.

8.- Reporting and monitoring: Article 7

Chair: Belgium - Mr. Philippe Bronchain

- Presentations by Belgium on **Reporting formats** for the various obligations of the Convention
Major Dewaegheneire, Ministry of Defense
- Presentation by UN ODA on **Reporting**
Mr. Peter Kolarov
- Presentation by CMC on **monitoring compliance**
Ms. Jacqueline Hansen, Programme Manager, Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor
- Presentation by GICHD on **information management challenges**
Mr. Daniel Eriksson, Programme manager, Information Management
- Interventions from the floor

Australia: on reporting on clearance, argued for the need to provide space to report on contamination from one state party to another. Furthermore, Australia reminded the audience on the need to leave free space under each items.

Austria (on reporting on victim assistance): pointed out the importance of timeline, as requests for reporting will involve several national agencies.

Germany (on reporting on stockpile destruction): highlighted the need to use the work done for the MBT reporting format.

New Zealand (on national implementation measures): promoted the idea to bring transparency through an electronic web-based system. Furthermore, New Zealand argued for reporting mechanism on legislation and regulations.

Chile: reporting is a confidence-building measure but it should be user-friendly to facilitate the process.

Croatia: reporting can be used nationally to push for inter-governmental coordination.

France: suggested that the CCM and MBT reporting formats might share some common forms.

Botswana: reminded the audience on the need to take in account the constraint capacity and the reporting fatigue amongst ministries.

WEDNESDAY, 9 JUNE 2010

9.- Cooperation and assistance: Article 6

Chair: Colombia - Mr. Carlos Valencia, Disarmament office, MFA

- Presentation by Lebanon on **Partnership for implementation between states, international organizations and civil society**
Ambassador Ms. Najla Riachi Assaker, Permanent Representative of Lebanon in Geneva
- Presentation by Lao on **Key thematic and humanitarian elements of bilateral cooperation and assistance**
Mr. Maythong Thammavongsa, Director of UN Political and Security Division, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Presentation by Norway on **Cooperation among States Parties**
Deputy Director-General Mr. Jostein Leiro, Deputy Head of Department for UN, Peace and Humanitarian Affairs
- Interventions from the floor:

Vietnam: implementation is the main challenge for Vietnam, about 1 million tons unexploded munitions remained in Vietnam, obstructing the life of the people. Vietnam reminded the audience that it is not a State party but is carrying out activities relating to the humanitarian aspects of the CCM. Indeed, a vast budget had already been spent for clearance and VA. Vietnam “fully supports the humanitarian goals of the CCM,” that it shares the view that CCM signature is a start. Furthermore, Vietnam suggested that international cooperation and assistance be extended to countries that were still studying the Convention.

Zambia: never produced, used or stockpiled cluster munitions. For Zambia, cooperation and assistance can be done in a number of ways and all State parties are in a position to assist in some way.

Jordan: State parties should work on transparency: financial institutions should be prevented from investing in cluster munitions. Political will is crucial; State parties must comply with obligations.

United Kingdom: reminded the audience DfID gave £10 million per year to ERW including cluster munitions and support the clearance of 6.5 millions square miles in Laos in 2009.

Mozambique: some aspects will contribute to the implementation of the CCM. State parties must take national ownership. ICRC and UN support will be key for strategic implementation but also advocating in support of State parties. Victim assistance organizations are important in terms of access to healthcare; development projects; education; and public awareness.

Mozambique was pleased to announce that it is in the final stage of the ratification process.

Philippines: humanitarian assistance is the cornerstone of implementing the CCM. Relief and rehabilitation are key. In the Philippines, a national implementation mechanism has been passed.

Madagascar: transparent reporting and victim assistance are the two main focuses.

DRC: cooperation between government, civil society and international organizations is key. Capacity of NGOs varies across DRC and depends on their members. This is an area which may need more attention in DRC.

Australia: argued that the primary responsibility rests with affected states and those crucial pillars are: capacity building; national ownership; and political will. Australia referred to its 100 million dollar commitment to mine action over the next 5 years, which includes action to address the problem of cluster munitions.

Austria: outlined the need to exchange expertise and experiences.

Lao PDR: highlighted their exchange of experiences ongoing with Cambodia.

Burundi: is committed to clearance.

- Presentation by CMC on **Cooperation with States Parties**
Mr. Khaled Yamout, Norwegian People's Aid, Cluster Munition Coalition
- Presentation by the UN Mine Action Team on **Cooperation & Assistance**
Ms. Judy Grayson, UNICEF
- Presentation by ICRC on **Cooperation & Assistance**
Mr. Lou Maresca
- Presentation by GICHD on **Cooperation & Assistance**
Mr. Erik Tollefsen & Ms. Vera Bohle

10.- Conclusions and Chair's summary

Chair: Chile – Mr. Alfredo Labbe, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- **Concluding remarks** by Chair; Mr. Alfredo Labbe, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chile followed by
- **Closure Statement** by H.E. Mr. Alfredo Moreno, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chile