



UK Mission
Geneva



10TH MEETING
OF STATES PARTIES
30 AUG - 2 SEPT
GENEVA 2022

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE

held on Thursday 1st June 2022

at the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom

from 10:00 to 11:30 hours

1. Present:

United Kingdom – 10MSP President

H.E. Mr. Aidan Liddle
Ms. Eleonora Saggese
Ms. Sylvia Osoba

Iraq – President-Designate (11MSP)

Mr. Mohammed Ridha Al-Haidari

Switzerland – Immediate Past President (2RC)

Mr. Boris Ganty

Australia

Ms. Michelle Carr

Bulgaria

Mr. Iassen Tomov

Chile

Ms. Pamela Moraga

France

Ms. Inès Mensah

Germany

Ms. Anna Mikeska
Mr. Vincent Köpp

Mexico

Mr. Alonso Martínez

Montenegro

Mr. Nikola Ražnatović

New Zealand

Mr. Nicholas Clutterbuck

Philippines

Mr. Jonelle John Domingo

Spain

Mr. Juan Manglano

Sweden

Mr. Niklas Nilsson

CMC

Mr. Hector Guerra

ICRC

Ms. Florentina Pircher

UNODA

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano

Implementation Support Unit

Ms. Sheila N. Mweemba
Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi
Ms. Elaine Weiss

Apologies received

Namibia

2. Opening Remarks by the Presidency

Ambassador Aidan Liddle, President of the 10th Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions (10MSP), warmly welcomed the Committee members to the ninth Coordination Committee Meeting under the Presidency of the United Kingdom. The President then tabled the provisional Agenda of the Meeting which was adopted by the Committee as presented.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Coordination Committee Meeting

The Coordination Committee (CC) approved, without correction, the Minutes of its Meeting held on 28 April 2022 as an accurate record of what had been discussed during that Meeting.

The President gave a brief overview of the Agenda of the Meeting and informed that the focus of the Meeting would be on the CC's feedback on the intersessional meeting and on preparations for the 10MSP which were agenda items 2 and 3 respectively. He elaborated that he wanted to hear back from the Committee which elements of the intersessional meeting had worked or not worked, had added value and what could be recommended to the 10MSP for 2023. He also reminded that due to the continued lack of sufficient funds for the 10MSP, he would present various cost-saving options for initial discussion without a decision having to be taken that day.

4. Reflections on the 2022 Intersessional Meeting

Ambassador Liddle reminded that the 2022 Intersessional Meeting (ISM) had been the first for the Convention since 2015 and that it had been a test event to evaluate the value of restarting the meetings. He further recalled that it was revived to ensure several things including adequate preparation by the CCM community for the 10MSP, maintain momentum between Meetings of States Parties, evaluate progress on the mandates agreed on at the Second Review Conference (2RC), and consider possible decisions to be taken at the 10MSP. The President was of the view that the meeting had achieved all its objectives as he was pleased with the attendance, the level of engagement at the meeting and, therefore, felt more confident on the preparations for the upcoming 10MSP. He, nonetheless, wanted to hear the views of the other members of the Coordination Committee whether the investment that went into the 2-day meeting was justified. Furthermore, this would give the 11MSP President-Designate, Iraq, a clearer picture on whether or not to hold an Intersessional Meeting in 2023.

In contributing to the discussion, the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) expressed that it was pleased with how the ISM had gone and that its expectations were met. The CMC Director emphasised that the meeting was useful for the young Convention and contributed to the Convention's sense of community. He highlighted that with financial restrictions having led to MSPs occasionally being shortened, the ISM would serve as a useful platform for discussions

on CCM implementation including the analysis of extension requests. The CMC Director concluded his comments by congratulating the UK Presidency on the successful ISM and expressed that he saw meaningful value in keeping the option for the ISM to be held again the following year.

The President thanked the CMC and reiterated that the congratulations were due to everyone as the success of the ISM was a collective effort as the Coordinators had also played an important role in the event.

In its contribution to the discussion, the representative of New Zealand noted that the ISM had been timely and valuable as it had come in the year after a disruptive two-year period caused by the pandemic and when cluster munitions had been used. He further noted that cluster munitions were on the forefront of many minds due to the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. However, while New Zealand considered the ISM as a useful opportunity for States that were not in the Coordination Committee to discuss matters related to the Convention, it cautioned against the ISM being automatically scheduled each year. New Zealand indicated that the busy disarmament meeting calendar made it a burden especially for small or underrepresented States to participate in yet another meeting.

Mexico expressed its views that the evaluation of the ISM depended on weighing the benefits it brought to furthering the fulfilment of CCM obligations with the effort, time and cost involved in its organization. While there were certainly positive aspects of this ISM, particularly on the presentation of extension requests by State Parties, there were also clear limitations and work that could be done during the MSP. Mexico recognized that the amount of time and resources required to organize such a meeting was significant. Nonetheless, Mexico found the hybrid format of the meeting useful. Mexico expressed that it would prefer an ongoing process of evaluation of the ISM procedure, rather than a decision to establish it as regular or automatic practice.

Spain, in contributing to the discussion, conceded that there was value in bringing the CCM community together in one room, especially after the pandemic. However, Spain was less optimistic about the content and other aspects of the ISM with few high-level delegates participating. It noted that most States with extension requests were not well-prepared when presenting their requests. Spain was also dissatisfied with the lower level of attendance on the second day of the meeting with the room almost empty. Furthermore, it noted that the ISM was like a mini-MSP which seemed like a duplication of efforts. Spain proposed that a different format be adopted for the 2023 ISM if it was decided to have one to ensure that there was more value in hosting it. Spain agreed with New Zealand that there was need to be cautious with regard to having an ISM in 2023. In conclusion, Spain expressed the importance of allowing Iraq as 11MSP President-Designate to decide whether it would rather focus on the MSP than organize an ISM.

In reacting to the feedback of Spain, Ambassador Liddle agreed that meeting attendance on the second day of the ISM had been lower than he would have liked but that the presidency was still of the view that the engagement had been productive.

In sharing its reflections, the Philippines echoed New Zealand, Mexico and Spain in that while it thought that the meeting may have been productive, it was unclear to it if the ISM had added any value to the work of the Convention. It further wondered if an informal online meeting could have sufficed. While the preliminary consideration of extension requests was useful, it was of the view that the exercise could have been done at the Coordination Committee level. The Philippines noted that even though the GICHD had financially supported the Meeting, smaller delegations had still not been able to fully participate. As a State that was unaffected by cluster munitions and had no outstanding obligations, the Philippines emphasised that the burden of attending meetings was an obstacle for other similar States to join the CCM, especially those with small delegations in Geneva. The Philippines stated that the format of the ISM was too formal which made States feel obliged to send their ambassadors to participate in the meeting.

In his response, the President agreed that perhaps a different format for the 2023 ISM would be useful and considered whether to recommend to the 10MSP to have another meeting.

In its contribution to the discussion, Chile indicated that the ISM was a success in terms of bringing the CCM community together after not having in-person meetings for a considerable period but felt that it was premature to make the meetings institutionalized. However, Chile noted that holding the ISM back-to-back with that of the APMBC would make more economic sense for its representatives in capital who had to travel to Geneva and participate in both meetings. Speaking as a requesting State, Chile informed that it had not seen any value in the discussions on extension requests, as there was no significant amount of engagement by other delegates on its request during the meeting. As Co-Coordinator on Victim Assistance, Chile reported that the level of engagement on the thematic area was low during the ISM and that the VA Coordinators had not received many replies to letters sent to States Parties with Article 5 obligations prior to the meeting. Chile further informed that one positive outcome for the VA Coordinators was getting connected with representatives of the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) at the ISM. In conclusion, Chile proposed that steps were taken slowly and future presidencies carefully consider if it was worthwhile to hold an ISM due to the amount of time and resources that go into its organization.

Bulgaria, in sharing its reflections, indicated that it shared some of the views already expressed and concurred that the 2022 ISM was good for the CCM community to meet physically again. It also provided a useful space for discussion. While Bulgaria welcomed the holding of an ISM the following year, it noted that it was important for the CCM community to consider if it had the necessary resources and possibly change the format of the meeting. Bulgaria informed that it was in favour of holding an in-person ISM in 2023 as virtual meetings were less

conducive for interaction between donor and affected states. Bulgaria pondered whether the 2023 meeting would be better attended with increased momentum.

In response to one of Chile's comments, the President reminded that the presidency team had considered holding the ISM back-to-back with the APMBC ISM, but the timing would not have been favourable to the CCM. He indicated that if that were to happen in the future, the presidency would have to engage the APMBC at an earlier stage to organize that cooperatively. The presidency added that in order to align the dates of the CCM ISM with the APMBC ISM, the CCM MSP would have to be held later in the year. The presidency stated that holding the MSP later in the year was also beneficial in terms of liquidity of funds.

Iraq, in its capacity as 11MSP President-Designate, informed the Meeting that with regard to holding an ISM in 2023 it would prioritize three considerations: 1) the views of States Parties on the holding of an ISM the following year, 2) the number of topics to be discussed considering that the 2022 ISM had a lot of issues to discuss and 3) the availability of funding for the 2023 ISM.

In its contribution to the discussion, Sweden commented on the format of the ISM especially with regard to the sessions on extension requests which it considered as to have been too lengthy and would likely be the same at the 10MSP. Sweden suggested that these sessions could be held informally with only interested stakeholders, to avoid duplication of the process held during the ISM at the MSP. Sweden indicated that it echoed Chile on the need to be cautious and not to prematurely decide on holding an ISM the following year.

Ambassador Liddle thanked the members that had shared their views and encouraged the committee to continue the reflection and evaluation of the ISM and to provide any additional feedback bilaterally. He highlighted that no decision on holding an ISM in 2023 would be taken until the 10MSP and that Iraq would come to a decision prior to it. He concluded discussion on the agenda item with an expression of his heartfelt gratitude to the contribution of the Coordination Committee to the success of the 2022 ISM.

5. Preparations for the 10th Meeting of States Parties

The President introduced the agenda item with an explanation that the intention was to discuss the format of the 10MSP rather than the decisions to be taken at that Meeting. He reminded that the Convention still did not have enough funds to cover a four-day hybrid 10MSP, with interpretation in all the agreed languages. He further explained that this was because not all States that were invoiced for the 10MSP had made their contributions and therefore the decision would have to be made based on the actual liquidity of the Convention at the end of June. The President informed that the shortfall was approximately USD 86,000, and that even if contributions did come in later, the UN would not be able to utilize those funds at that time. One State billed USD 60,000 had confirmed that it would not participate in

the 10MSP therefore that amount of the shortfall would not be covered and constituted a large portion of the deficit in financing.

Ambassador Liddle then presented four options to adapt the meeting format to the available funds based on the information provided by UNODA as possible cost-cutting measures for the 10MSP:

1. Reduce the meeting to 3 days with interpretation in 6 languages to cut costs by USD 19,000
2. Keep a 4-day meeting with interpretation in four languages only to reduce costs by USD 25,000
3. Delay the translation of documentation into Chinese and Russian until funds become available to lower costs by USD 75,000
4. Remove the hybrid element of the meeting to decrease costs by USD 21,800

The President further informed that these options were not mutually exclusive. He then invited UNODA to provide additional input on the options presented.

UNODA clarified that reducing the translation of documents into four languages did not exclude the possibility of translation into the remaining languages when additional funds were available later.

The President reminded of the Rules of Procedure that stipulated that interpretation services and translation of documents for CCM MSPs had to be done in all six UN languages. He assured that the UK Presidency was committed to that requirement and was considering the matter seriously. He outlined that reducing the meeting to 3 days as well as removing the hybrid element of the meeting would not generate enough savings, making this a difficult decision for the presidency. He reiterated that the final decision on cost-cutting measures would be taken later that month. The presidency pointed out that the estimated costs for the meeting were not final figures and that costs were expected to increase as there would be more documents than initially forecasted. Ambassador Liddle noted that translations could be sequenced and that it was the biggest portion of the budget. He then welcomed the views of the Committee on how to proceed though a decision would not be taken.

In its contribution to the discussion, Sweden asked if four days was actually needed for the 10MSP given the ISM held in May. Sweden informed that it was in favour of sequencing the translation of documents to save costs but warned to be careful not to set a precedent. In response, the President stated that the presidency would be willing to work with whatever amount of time was available for the 10MSP. He explained that unlike the ISM, which was more technical in nature, the MSP allowed for political statements to be made. A four-day MSP would allow for more general exchange of views to be shared which the President believed was important for States Parties to do. With a three-day MSP, time limits on

extension request presentations and oral statements would have to be imposed, and written statements encouraged.

In furthering the discussion, Spain informed that it supported reducing the MSP from four to three days and setting a time limitation on interventions. In this regard, Spain suggested providing States Parties with extension requests with a fixed template for their presentations so that they would be more homogenous. Spain added that it was, nonetheless, in favour of including an agenda item for general exchange of views, so that States would not make general interventions under the universalisation agenda item. Spain questioned the need for the hybrid element for the 10MSP, other than for the participation of countries with extension requests.

In response to Spain, the President agreed that there might not be a need for a hybrid format meeting as the 10MSP meeting room was larger and this format risked the loss of the already limited time. Additionally, holding the meeting in hybrid format at the Palais des Nations would limit each session to only two hours, rather than the normal, preferred practice of three-hour sessions.

In its contribution, the CMC agreed with Spain on standardizing extension request presentations, which would be similar to the practice during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the UN Human Rights Council. The UPR also limited the delivery time of statements with a clock and suggested the same could be used at the MSP. Delegates could then provide extended written versions of their statements. However, the CMC was of the view that it was too early to remove the hybrid element which had been useful in the previous two years as it allowed for greater inclusion. The CMC Director pointed out that there could be unforeseeable circumstances arising later in the year due to the pandemic that could prevent representatives of certain countries to travel to the 10MSP. Nonetheless, he acknowledged that the hybrid element incurred additional costs and technical complexities.

In its contribution, Germany wondered if there could be a template even for countries already granted deadline extensions to present their implementation progress. This would help the German representative advise her colleagues in capital on how to structure or condense Germany's update presentation.

The 10MSP presidency asked UNODA if the UN Web TV was part of the hybrid format package and UNODA explained that it was an additional service independent of the hybrid element and that the costs would be different and lower for the webcast. UNODA noted that eliminating the hybrid element would only produce savings of approximately USD 21,800. UNODA further indicated that the cost for UN Web TV would vary according to the requirement for interpretation into all six UN languages or only in English.

Spain enquired if it was possible for the broadcast to be made with only the floor language, that is, without interpretation. In response, UNODA recommended against that option, noting that delegates might not all understand the floor language. In contributing to the discussion, France indicated that it would not support options 2 and 3 and emphasised that multilingualism was important and that it was difficult to pick and choose which languages the documents would be translated into. France suggested the reduction of meeting days and the removal of the hybrid element to cut costs. To ensure more inclusivity, France proposed using the Sponsorship Programme to support delegates that were usually under-represented. In response to its question on the availability of such an opportunity, the ISU Director reminded that, as was reported at the ISM, the CCM Sponsorship Programme had at that time funds sufficient to only sponsor 17 delegates.

In response to France, Ambassador Liddle reiterated the need to combine a few of the proposed cost-cutting measures as each single option would be insufficient to overcome the deficit. He explained that the documents would be translated into all six languages as specified by the Rules of Procedure, but there might be a need to prioritize the four languages of the delegations that usually attend the meeting while delaying the translation into Chinese and Russian until the funds were available. He added that there might also be the need to prioritize the translation of certain documents over others, until the funds for the translation of all documents had been received.

Regarding the presentation of extension requests, Chile shared its view that the requests were negotiated throughout the year and that limiting the time for their presentation was reasonable as the terms of the requests would have been agreed upon with the Analysis Group by the time of the MSP. Chile stated that the presentation was merely a summary and done for the sake of transparency. Chile recommended against having a fixed template for extension request presentations as each request had unique circumstances and suggested to only limit the time allowed for each presentation. Chile also suggested that since the MSP was a formal meeting, unlike the ISM, more time could be allocated to extension request presentations.

In sharing its views, New Zealand noted that it was good to have these discussions as there were a lot of elements to consider. It informed that it was in favour of delaying the translation of documents as a cost-cutting measure. However, it was opposed to dropping the hybrid element because this could translate to less participation. It also argued that States should have the opportunity to provide general statements as the exchange of views was important to these meetings. In addition, New Zealand wanted to know the consequences of deficits in the payments for future years. In response to New Zealand's query, the President specified that the Convention's budget was done yearly and therefore if the money never came through some documents would never get translated which was not an ideal situation. He, however, acknowledged that this possibility needed to be considered.

The presidency queried if the 10MSP shortfall would be permanently recorded as an arrear to which UNODA responded that this would not be the case.

UNODA clarified that given the shortage of funds, translation of documents could be prioritized in Arabic, French, English and Spanish while the remaining languages could be translated at a later stage when funds became available. This option would reduce costs by around USD 75,000 but would still be insufficient to cover the shortfall of USD 86,000. UNODA stressed that the translation machinery was on hold waiting a decision on the translation of documentation and a calculation of the relevant costs.

In conclusion, the President reminded that although there would not be a decision taken that day, it was useful to get the opinion of the Coordination Committee on the possible cost-saving measures for the 10MSP. He asked UNODA to advise on the cost of UN Web TV services, which would allow delegates to follow the meeting remotely to compensate for removing the hybrid element if it became necessary to do so. He tasked the Coordinators of Articles 3 and 4 to streamline, structure or shorten the time for the presentation of extension requests. The President added that documents related to extension requests needed to be concise to reduce costs. On this point, the ISU Director clarified that a decision had already been taken in preparing for the 9MSP to not translate the extension requests submitted by States Parties but to only translate the report of the Analysis Group which contained the draft decision and recommendations. The President highlighted that translation of documents was the largest cost of the 10MSP and therefore priority had to be given to the four languages of participating delegations. He indicated that the presidency would attempt to maintain the interpretation of the meeting into the six languages of the UN, while considerations for a three-day meeting would be made.

In conclusion, the President requested UNODA to advise UN translation services to prioritise translation of 10MSP documents into four languages (Arabic, French and Spanish with the original English version) and informed the Committee that this consideration would be put into a decision at a later stage.

6. Preparation of 10MSP Documentation including the 10MSP Progress Report

Ambassador Liddle informed the thematic Coordinators that as was done previously, they would need to work on the 10MSP Progress Report and reminded them to keep the document brief. He then invited the ISU Director to provide more information on the preparation of the Progress Report.

The ISU Director outlined that the ISU were preparing the template for the report which would now be based on the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP), with a “actions and indicators table, similar to what was done with the Dubrovnik Action Plan (DAP) in the past. She pointed out that the 10MSP Progress Report was expected to be longer than previous ones, as the DAP only had

32 actions whereas the LAP had 50 actions with accompanying indicators. It would probably not fit into the 10,000-word limit forecasted. The ISU had previously consulted with States Parties on the Progress Report and had received feedback that it should be brief and easy to read, which was why the actions were presented in a table and with a summary provided. The summary table was usually included in the MSP participant welcome pack. The ISU Director further informed that the Report normally included three to four questions under each thematic area to guide States parties during the thematic discussions of the MSP. To save costs, the Director suggested just naming the actions, while stating only the relevant indicators in summary form. She reported that the templates would be sent to the coordinators the following day and that the Coordinators would be given the deadline of 24 June to submit their sections, so that the ISU would have the time to merge the individual thematic submission. This would allow the ISU to share the consolidated draft report with the Committee on 28 June for any final comments. She informed that the cut-off date for submission of the 10MSP Progress Report to the UN was 30 June.

The Director highlighted that while the normal practice for CCM MSP Progress Reports was to report on one-year implementation between 1 July to 30 June, the 10MSP Progress Report would cover a longer period because it would begin from where the 2RC Review document ended its reporting. Therefore, the Progress Report would cover the period from 3 October 2020 to 30 June 2022.

In commenting on other 10MSP official documents, the ISU Director reported that while the Progress Report was expected to be lengthy, the analysis reports of the extension requests and the draft terms of reference (TOR) for the CCM Gender Focal Points had been kept relatively concise.

The President reminded the thematic Coordinators to respect the deadline of 24 June in submitting their sections of the Progress Report to the ISU.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 10MSP Presidency Universalisation Visit to Thailand

Ambassador Liddle reported that the UK Presidency and the ISU were planning a universalisation visit to Thailand, in the following weeks. This was based on the recommendation of the Universalisation Coordinators that Thailand could be a good strategic partner in opening up consultations on the CCM with other States not Party in the region. The President added that the visit had not yet been confirmed, and if it were to take place, it would be a short one.

7.2 Article 3 Implementation Follow-Up

Australia, as Co-Coordinator on Stockpile Destruction, noted that South Africa had not provided an update on its Article 3 implementation during the ISM. The coordinator suggested that the Coordinators, together with the President might follow up on this matter through their missions in Pretoria.

The President informed that from previous discussions on this matter, it appeared that an intervention in Pretoria would be more useful than one in Geneva. In response, Article 3 Co-Coordinator, Bulgaria, expressed its agreement with the President and reported that the Coordinators had already approached the South Africa representatives in Geneva numerous times to discuss its CCM implementation without much success.

The President concluded that since the UK, Australia and Bulgaria all had representation in Pretoria, that would facilitate their plans in holding a joint intervention there.

8. Next Coordination Committee Meeting

Ambassador Liddle announced that the next meeting of the Coordination Committee would be held on Thursday, 23 June 2022, at the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom. Additional details of the meeting would be provided closer to the date.

The President emphasised that the Coordination Committee would have to decide on the format of the 10MSP during that meeting. He informed that following consultations with States Parties, certain decisions to be taken at the 10MSP were clear, such as those concerning the TOR for the Gender Focal Points and the recruitment of the future ISU Director. The only outstanding issue related to the inclusion of a 15% contingency line in the Convention's budget, therefore consultations on the matter might continue or the proposal be dropped altogether.

Spain pointed out that 23 June coincided with the 25th International Meeting of National Mine Action Programme Directors and United Nations Advisers (NDM-UN25) and therefore some of the Coordinators might not be able to attend the Committee meeting. The President clarified that the presidency had avoided holding the Coordination Committee Meeting during the APMBC ISM, which preceded the NDM-UN25 that week. The presidency added that it was crucial for the Committee to meet that week in order to decide on financial measures to be taken with regard to the 10MSP. Ambassador Liddle pointed out that most preparations for the 10MSP had to be finalized by the end of June as the Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) would take up almost all of August in New York. He concluded that there might be room for further consultations on the CCM at the end of July in the margins of the 2022 second session of the CCW Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS).