



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE**  
**held on Monday, 24 April 2024**  
**in Conference Room 6A, Tower 3, Maison de la Paix**  
**from 14:00 to 15:30 hours**

**1. Present:**

Mexico – 12MSP President

H.E. Mrs. Francisca E. Méndez Escobar

Ms. Mariana Roa

Philippines – President-Designate (13MSP)

Ms. Christian Hope Reyes

Austria

Mr. Helmut Brandtner

Australia

Mr. Gordon Burns

Ms. Thuy Brunnemer

Belgium

Mr. Vincent Bodson

Ms. Yaëlle Mbouopda

Germany

Ms. Irmgard Adam

Ms. Fanny Oppermann

Iraq

Ms. Raghad Hasan

Italy

Ms. Elena Gai

Malawi

Ms. Tiyamike Banda

Norway

Ms. Ingrid Schøyen

Panama

Ms. Grisselle Rodriguez

Peru

Mr. Angel Horna

Switzerland

Ms. Silvia Greve

Zambia

Ms. Chileshe Nkole

CMC

Ms. Tamar Gabelnick

ICRC

Ms. Maya Brehm

Ms. Sahar Haroon

UNODA

Mr. Peter Kolarov

Ms. Alice Marzi

ISU

Ms. Pamela Moraga

Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi

Ms. Elaine Weiss

Apologies received:

Netherlands

Absent:

Lebanon

## **2. Opening Remarks and Adoption of the Agenda**

Ambassador Francisca Méndez Escobar, President of the 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties (12MSP) to the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), warmly welcomed the Coordination Committee to its fourth meeting under the Mexican Presidency. She expressed her appreciation to the Committee members for their attendance despite the busy disarmament calendar. Emphasizing the importance of regular Coordination Committee meetings, she highlighted their role in ensuring the continuous advancement of work plans leading up to the 12MSP.

The Committee proceeded to approve the provisional agenda of the meeting as presented by the Presidency.

## **3. Approval of Minutes of Previous Coordination Committee Meeting**

The Committee approved the minutes of the Coordination Committee Meeting held on 11 March 2024.

## **4. Update on Activities Undertaken by the Mexican Presidency up to the 12MSP**

### **4.1 Engagement with Lithuania**

The President reported that she and Ms. Mélanie Régimbal, Chief of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) in Geneva, met with the Permanent Representative of Lithuania in Geneva on 11 April to discuss the country's potential withdrawal from the Convention. She emphasized that the meeting was productive. The Lithuanian Ambassador reiterated that discussions remained at the parliamentary level, and the then-government had no intention to withdraw. Consequently, no further action could be taken at that time. Ambassador Méndez mentioned that due to upcoming presidential elections in May, governmental deliberations on the matter had been postponed.

The President informed that her team, in collaboration with UNODA, analyzed strategic CCM States Parties in Europe that could serve as valuable partners in engaging Lithuania on this issue. She underscored the serious issue that even States Parties fully compliant with their CCM commitments, such as Lithuania, could contemplate withdrawal. Ambassador Méndez emphasized that such a withdrawal would significantly impact the norms of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and the Convention. She noted that discussions on this matter might resume after Lithuania's parliamentary elections in October, when the new government would be formed. In the interim, the Presidency would continue to monitor the situation.

### **4.2 Universalization of the Convention**

Ambassador Méndez announced that the universalization workshop for Caribbean and African countries in New York was scheduled for 8-9 May. Notably, the meeting would facilitate online participation, enabling the engagement of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) Director and Coordination Committee members. She emphasized that their presence would strengthen the impact of the workshop. The President planned to seize the opportunity

to hold bilateral meetings with States not Parties in New York, particularly those lacking Permanent Missions in Geneva.

Additionally, the President disclosed the Presidency's intention to arrange bilateral meetings with the Russian Federation, China and the United States in Geneva. The objective of these meetings would not be to persuade them to join the Convention, but rather to showcase the developments achieved since its entry into force. Specifically, the Presidency aimed to underscore the importance of preventing further civilian casualties from these weapons, particularly among children and youth. She committed to providing the Committee with updates following these meetings.

#### 4.3 Transfer of Cluster Munitions

Ambassador Méndez noted that during the first transfer of cluster munitions by the US to Ukraine in July 2023, Mexico held the position of President-Designate to the Convention. She indicated that at that time, she had worked with her government to determine the most appropriate way to address the issue publicly. In light of renewed transfers of cluster munitions, the Presidency had been deliberating the necessity of issuing such a statement. The President expressed concerns about the difficulty of monitoring each transfer and noted the absence of provisions in the Convention to do so. While the CCM community awaited reports from the Monitor on this issue, the President anticipated potential challenges in using information provided by a non-governmental source. She invited discussion on this matter.

In response, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) expressed gratitude to the President for bringing the matter to the attention of the Committee. The ICRC highlighted the importance of public statements from States in maintaining these norms, particularly in light of the context of widely reported incidents of recent cluster munition use and transfers. The ICRC respectfully suggested that all States Parties consider publicly opposing or increasing the stigma surrounding cluster munitions to counter the perception of their military value. Furthermore, the ICRC noted that all States Parties had reaffirmed their commitment to promoting the norms of the Convention in the Lausanne Declaration. In light of this, it was suggested that States Parties consider utilising all available channels to fulfil this commitment.

The Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) Director recalled that when the US announced the first transfer of cluster munitions to Ukraine in July 2023, there was significant media interest, with good coverage of the harm that cluster munitions cause to civilians. She also noted that US President Biden had made an effort to provide a detailed rationale for that decision at that time given the critical response to his decision. Yet after the subsequent three transfers, the CMC Director noted that media interest had significantly declined and President Biden no longer seemed to feel the same level of pressure to justify the transfers. She argued that the general silence around the transfers could create a real threat to the norm against cluster munitions. The CMC Director therefore respectfully encouraged all parties, including the Presidency of the Convention, to counter this trend by publicly voicing concern over such transfers.

The President stressed the difficulty of obtaining sufficient evidence for States to make public statements on cluster munition transfers. While acknowledging the importance of reactions from States, she underscored the need for clear guidelines on how the Presidency of the Convention should address this matter. Additionally, the President highlighted the lack of transparency in global cluster munition production and transfers due to national security concerns. She reiterated the need for greater clarity on the circumstances under which public statements should be issued, suggesting that this might be achieved by considering the timing, coherence and consistency of such statements.

In response, Norway proposed that the President consider issuing general statements. It highlighted that States Parties could rely on agreed-upon language from formal Convention meetings, avoiding the need to name specific parties. Norway emphasized that it was the responsibility of States Parties to uphold Convention norms and noted the importance of reaffirming their commitment to condemn any use of cluster munitions by any actor.

Ambassador Méndez expressed her appreciation for the fruitful discussion.

#### 4.4 NDM-UN27

The Mexican Ambassador reported that the ISU Director had requested the presidency to chair a CCM meeting in the sidelines of the 27<sup>th</sup> International Meeting of Mine Action National Programme Directors and United Nations Advisors (NDM-UN27), which would take place the following week in Geneva. The President indicated that she would coordinate with her team on this matter and prioritize it in her schedule.

#### 4.5 Youth Contest

The President informed that the youth contest had been receiving a positive reception, and that the presidency team had received several submissions. She mentioned that the promotion of the contest was progressing smoothly and stated that the presidency would provide further updates on it in the following meeting.

#### 4.6 Financing of the CCM

Ambassador Méndez conveyed that financing the 12MSP posed challenges, noting that the presidency had convened meetings with the ODA and ISU the previous week to deliberate on the best way to approach States with outstanding obligations. The President reminded the Committee of the paramount importance of this issue, emphasizing that adequate funds were imperative to facilitate the organization of the upcoming Meeting of States Parties.

#### 4.7 Review of the Hosting Agreement

The President expressed her gratitude to Australia for highlighting the obligation of the hosting agreement's periodic review. She noted that an informal meeting had convened to address the topic and that the ISU would provide further details later in the meeting. During the informal discussions, one proposed option was for the incumbent presidency to lead the

review process, despite time constraints leading up to the 12MSP. Alternatively, the Mexican Presidency could hand over the mandate of the review to the incoming Philippine Presidency. While this was not Mexico's preferred option, it would allow more time for the process. Another possibility was extending the review until the Review Conference in 2026 and adjusting the periodicity to every five years to align with the Review Conferences.

Ambassador Méndez then invited the floor for discussion on the topic.

Belgium sought clarification from the President regarding the modification of the review process's periodicity. In response, the President clarified that the process scheduled for every three years could be extended to occur once every five years to coincide with the Review Conferences. Belgium expressed the need to consult with its capital on the matter, emphasizing the value of reviewing the hosting agreement. Belgium echoed the Mexican Presidency's acknowledgment of the limited time remaining before the 12MSP. It noted that since the first review in 2017, States Parties appeared to have overlooked this exercise, expressing gratitude to Australia for the reminder.

Belgium emphasized the importance of a deliberate, unhurried process, suggesting extending the periodicity to five years to allow ample time for thorough review. However, it cautioned that incorporating the review into the Review Conference's agenda might divert attention from the practice amidst other deliberations. Additionally, waiting until the Review Conference in two years could delay necessary adjustments to the agreement. Belgium proposed concluding the review one year before the Review Conference, at the 13MSP in 2025, to provide adequate time for formulating solutions. This approach would ensure sufficient discussion and assessment of potential amendments, fostering consensus among States Parties. Therefore, Belgium suggested preliminary discussions with the Coordination Committee and interested delegations leading up to the 13MSP.

Similarly, Germany thanked Australia for raising this important issue and emphasized the necessity of reviewing the agreement. Germany concurred with Belgium on the importance of deliberating on pertinent issues for the review. It suggested initiating the review process promptly and reminded of the ongoing transition of the Geneva Centres. Like Belgium, Germany encouraged the CCM community to assess the topics available for discussion leading up to the 13MSP.

Germany reflected that meetings involving both ISUs might provide valuable insights for future discussions on enhancing the hosting agreement.

Zambia supported the sentiments expressed and aligned with Germany in emphasizing the urgency of commencing the review process. Zambia pointed out that the Coordination Committee would benefit from the update by the ISU Director, which would inform discussions and facilitate the Committee in formulating initial conclusions and suggestions on the matter.

Peru aligned with previous interventions, expressing its desire for input from the GICHD regarding the agreement. It echoed Belgium's caution against rushing the review process, advocating for thoughtful deliberation and including the GICHD in the discussion.

Regarding the US transfer of cluster munitions to Ukraine, Peru observed that the United Nations Secretary-General had not made an official statement himself. Instead, it was the Deputy Spokesman who conveyed that the Secretary-General supported the Convention on Cluster Munitions and opposed the continued use of cluster munitions on the battlefield.

Australia thanked the Mexican Presidency for initiating discussions on the hosting agreement review within the Coordination Committee and reaffirmed its commitment to engagement in this matter, noting the broad consensus it seemed to garner. It also highlighted the impending change in GICHD directorship, which could potentially impact the process, and expressed interest in hearing the ISU's perspective.

Ambassador Méndez expressed her gratitude for all the valuable contributions to the discussion and invited the ISU Director to share her insights on the topic.

The ISU Director highlighted that an informal Coordination Committee meeting on the hosting agreement convened on 11 March. The meeting provided the Committee with the opportunity to deliberate on several key points, including provisions for periodic review, cooperation between the GICHD and ISU Directors, and the mechanism for addressing matters of interpretation or implementation of the Agreement.

Past review processes, such as the 2017 formal/explicit review conducted by the Coordinators on General Status and Operation, and the informal/implicit assessment during the split-Second Review Conference (2RC) in 2020/2021, were also examined. Considerations were made regarding the methodology, capacity, and timeline for the current review cycle.

While no definitive decisions were reached, it was agreed that the upcoming Coordination Committee meeting would further address these discussions. Factors to consider moving forward include the review process methodology and capacity, the review timeline, bearing in mind the impending change in GICHD directorship in June 2024, and new administrative policies that could affect the operation of the ISU.

The ISU Director reported that she had discussed the matter with the ISU Director of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) to align the application of new GICHD administrative policies for both ISUs. Both ISUs would be meeting with the GICHD HR department the following week to discuss some administrative procedures. Subsequently, both ISUs would convene to determine how to proceed with these measures.

Furthermore, the ISU Director informed that she would be meeting with the GICHD Director in mid-May to discuss the review of the hosting agreement, particularly regarding what to review and how to interpret the hosting agreement. She expressed her intention to discuss with the ISU team on which issues to seek clarification on and assured the Coordination Committee of continued updates on developments in this matter.

Ambassador Méndez conveyed her intention to not postpone the review of the hosting agreement to the following MSP cycle. While acknowledging Belgium's caution against rushing the process, she emphasized the need for timely decision-making. The President expressed the desire of the presidency to uphold its responsibilities. She viewed the review as an opportunity to enhance the ISU's visibility and significance. Despite the time constraints leading up to the 12MSP, the President assured gathering more insights from the ISU's upcoming meetings and proposed convening another informal meeting on the topic to discuss these insights.

The ISU Director highlighted the GICHD's readiness to address the issue and mentioned the HR department's initiative to meet with both ISUs. She reiterated that the three-year review process was an integral part of the hosting agreement.

Germany noted that meetings involving both ISUs would provide valuable insights for future discussions on enhancing the hosting agreement.

The ISU Director stressed that States Parties would benefit from the debrief of the upcoming meetings and emphasized the paramount importance of transparency throughout this process.

## **5. Update on the Work Plan Implementation by Thematic Coordinators up to the 12MSP**

### **5.1 Universalization (Malawi and Peru)**

Malawi reported on a meeting of the Africa Group held the previous day that included CCM universalization in its agenda. The Universalization Coordinator had presented a briefing at the meeting, which had a good turnout, urging States yet to join the Convention to consider doing so.

Malawi informed that Universalization Coordinators had arranged a meeting with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) scheduled for the following Friday. The objective was to explore avenues for collaboration and to advance discussions on CCM universalization, particularly with the IPU's Committee on Peace and International Security. Ultimately, the goal was to include CCM universalization discussions in the IPU Assembly's plenary session.

Furthermore, Malawi announced that on Monday, 29 April, the Coordinators, in collaboration with the ICRC, CMC and ISU, would host a universalization event for East African countries in the margins of the NDM-UN27.

### **5.2 Stockpile Destruction (Netherlands and Zambia)**

Zambia conveyed the apologies of the Netherlands for its absence from the Coordination Committee meeting.

Zambia reported that efforts were underway by the Stockpile Destruction Coordinators to arrange a meeting with the CMC's stockpile destruction expert. However, due to conflicting schedules, this meeting had not yet taken place. The Coordinators had tentatively scheduled

their first meeting with the expert for the second week of May. The objective of this meeting was to discuss a working paper intended for submission to the 12MSP.

Additionally, Zambia underscored that the CCM meeting with the African Group saw the participation of Malawi, the Universalization Coordinator, and Australia, the Transparency Coordinator.

### 5.3 Clearance and Risk Education (Italy and Norway)

Italy reported that the Clearance and Risk Education Coordinators continued their work within the ad hoc Analysis Group, focusing on the Article 4 extension requests submitted by Chad, Germany, and Lao PDR. Italy informed that feedback had been gathered from all Analysis Group members on these requests and the consolidated comments had been relayed to the respective requesting States. Chad's request required particular attention due to missing key elements. Consequently, the Coordinators, alongside the ISU, engaged with the Mines Advisory Group (MAG), which had operations on the ground in Chad and was closely engaged with the Chadian National Mine Action Authority. The purpose of the meeting was to determine how MAG could support the Analysis Group in their analysis of Chad's extension request.

Regarding the two working papers of the Coordinators, Italy noted that progress had been achieved, with the risk education paper nearing completion while the environmental paper was still in development. Italy assured the readiness of the Coordinators to address any queries on these papers. Furthermore, Italy informed that the Analysis Group had organized to meet with the Lao delegation during the NDM-UN27, on 30 April, to discuss its extension request in detail.

### 5.4 Victim Assistance (Austria and Panama)

Panama reported significant progress achieved by the Victim Assistance Coordinators on two key objectives outlined in their work plan: the development of a guidance document on an Integrated Approach to Victim Assistance and fostering synergies with other VA Coordinators. Regarding the guidance document, the Coordinators aimed to circulate it to the Coordination Committee shortly and subsequently distribute it to all States Parties to solicit feedback.

Panama outlined that Slovenia, in its capacity as VA Coordinator of the APMBC, had represented VA Coordinators of the APMBC, CCM and Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) during the Fourth Meeting of the Standing Committee on Health Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response of the World Health Organization (WHO). The focus of the intervention was on the challenges faced by persons with disabilities, including victims of explosive devices, in accessing rehabilitation, mental health support, and relevant health policies and programmes. Panama expressed the Coordinators' aim to strengthen cooperation across all three Conventions and increase their participation in WHO meetings.

### 5.5 International Cooperation and Assistance (Lebanon and Switzerland)



Switzerland reported that the meeting with the APMBC Committee on Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance, intended to share best practice examples of both Conventions, would not take place as planned in April 2024 due to the lack of best practice examples of the implementation of CCM Article 6. To facilitate the meeting, the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance were still looking for such best practice examples.

#### 5.6 Transparency Measures (Australia)

Australia highlighted the 30 April deadline for annual transparency reporting and thanked the ISU for timely reminders to States Parties. It appreciated the invitation from Zambia and Malawi to participate in the Africa Group meeting. During its briefing at the meeting, Australia reiterated reporting obligations for all CCM States Parties, clarifying both initial and annual reporting deadlines. It found the subsequent discussion insightful, noting challenges affecting reporting rates, including inter-agency coordination at the national level.

Additionally, Australia reported on its recent meeting with the CCM Gender Focal Points, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the ISU to organize a workshop on 30 May, coinciding with the 16<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention's adoption. The workshop would focus on the new reporting template, specifically Form J on "gender and diversity of populations". Australia thanked Belgium, Germany and other co-organizers for their support and aimed for the workshop to have practical implications, given many States Parties had yet to fill out the new Form J.

#### 5.7 National Implementation Measures (Iraq)

Iraq provided an update on the survey conducted in collaboration with the ISU and ICRC to track national implementation measures of States Parties. Several States had already responded, with more expected to do so before the survey deadline the following day. The outcomes of this survey would enable the ISU to offer technical support to States Parties in fulfilling their Article 9 obligations.

Additionally, Iraq had held bilateral meetings with a number of States Parties that had yet to provide information on their national implementation measures. Iraq intended to continue these efforts at the NDM-UN27 the following week.

#### 5.8 General Status and Operation (Belgium and Germany)

Germany highlighted the close collaboration between the CCM Gender Focal Points and their APMBC counterparts. Germany observed that the APMBC was in the midst of preparing for the upcoming Review Conference, which involved the formulation of a new action plan. Germany therefore recommended that the CCM Gender Focal Points be kept informed of developments in the other Convention. Germany noted that the APMBC had gender focal points within each thematic working group, which differed from the standalone structure of the CCM Committee. Germany therefore requested regular updates from the other CCM Coordinators on gender-related issues relevant within their committee. The CCM Gender Focal Points would thus be able to receive a better overall picture on gender within the CCM which would in turn help to ensure that gender remains a priority topic for the convention. In

this context, Germany expressed gratitude to Australia for its initiative to raise the issue of the reporting format and to co-host a workshop with the Gender Focal Points on 30 May.

Germany reported on the Coordinators' ongoing cooperation with UNIDIR. A meeting with UNIDIR was scheduled for the following week to discuss collaborative efforts leading up to the 12MSP. Germany assured the Committee of update on this project's development.

Similarly, Belgium stressed the importance of close cooperation between CCM and APMBC Gender Focal Points during the APMBC's Review Conference preparations. Belgium acknowledged the different structures of Gender Focal Points in both Conventions and noted that that the CCM one was functioning well thus far.

Belgium also expressed its gratitude to Australia for co-organising the workshop with the Gender Focal Points and encouraged other thematic group Coordinators to consider similar collaborative opportunities.

## **6. Update of UNODA on CCM Financing in Accordance with Article 14 of the Convention**

UNODA provided an update, revealing that out of the USD 403,000 budget, over USD 261,000 had been collected, resulting in a deficit of approximately USD 141,000. It emphasized the importance of achieving liquidity by mid-June, noting that time was running out. UNODA illustrated that the deficit then was equivalent to the translation of around 100 pages of documents. Additionally, UNODA intended to send reminder emails to States that had not yet contributed, and approach selected States closer to the deadline. UNODA explained the new practice at the UN, that translation only resumed upon receipt of funds.

Ambassador Méndez expressed gratitude for the update from UNODA and affirmed her readiness to collaborate with UNODA to remind States to pay their contributions.

## **7. Update of the ISU**

### **7.1 ISU Communications**

The ISU Director conveyed that, following discussions with the Presidency, it was decided that the ISU would oversee the procedural aspects of Article 7 reporting and other thematic areas of the Convention. The ISU proposed to manage all procedural aspects of the Coordinators' work, including reminder communications and follow ups. This proposal aimed to streamline processes and ensure better time management for such communications.

### **7.2 Follow up on Article 4 Implementation**

**Chile:** The ISU Director reported that the ISU's Implementation Specialist met with Chile on 14 March. Chile highlighted its successful clearance of one military range but acknowledged remaining challenges, particularly related to funding issues. Adjustments were made to the project plan for 2024 due to budget constraints, emphasizing the need for international cooperation and assistance. Both sides agreed that the upcoming Article 7 report would provide further clarity on Chile's progress.

**Lebanon:** The Director reported that LMAC had visited Geneva on 19-20 March to discuss Lebanon's Article 4 implementation and the upcoming request to extend the current clearance deadline of 1 May 2026. During the visit, LMAC met with various CCM stakeholders, including the 12MSP Presidency and the Article 4 Analysis Group. The LMAC delegation also met with the Coordination Committee on 20 March.

**Chad and Germany:** The Director mentioned that the Article 4 Analysis Group had finalized their feedback to Chad and Germany's extension requests and sent them to the requesting States on 15 March. The Group was awaiting responses from the States Parties. Additionally, efforts were made to organize a meeting with Chad during the NDM-UN27.

**Lao PDR:** The Director reported that the Article 4 Analysis Group had finalized their feedback to Lao PDR, sent on 5 April. A meeting with the Lao delegation was scheduled on 29 April in the margins of the NDM-UN27.

Additionally, the ISU planned to meet with all other CCM States Parties with Article 4 obligations participating in the upcoming NDM.

### 7.3 ISU team UN passes

The ISU Director informed the Coordinators that changes in security policies at the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG) during the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in GICHD staff no longer being issued UN ground passes. This impacted the operations of the ISUs hosted by the GICHD, requiring ISU staff to obtain day passes to organize Convention meetings at the UN. The Director highlighted the necessity for collaborative efforts to address operational challenges arising from the hosting of ISUs.

The Director explained that at the time, the CCM ISU had an informal agreement with the Convention's Presidency regarding the acquisition of their UN ground passes. She expressed her gratitude to UNODA for their assistance to expedite the renewal their passes, which were due to expire imminently.

### 7.4 Engagement with Lithuania

The ISU Director reported a recent meeting with the Deputy Permanent Representative of Lithuania, as part of their monthly engagement. During the meeting, Lithuania had identified two CCM States Parties that could be approached as potential strategic partners to discourage the Lithuanian government from withdrawing from the Convention.

### 7.5 New ISU Newsletter

The ISU Director announced the relaunch of the ISU's newsletter, scheduled to be circulated to its mailing list in the following weeks. She expressed hope that readers would find the articles engaging, noting that the newsletter would feature an article by Ms. Maya Brehm of the ICRC on the stigmatization of cluster munitions.

## 7.6 ISU Finances

The ISU Director informed that the GICHD finance department had closed the 2023 accounts and was currently undergoing audit by external auditors. The final report was expected by the end of May, to be circulated promptly to all States Parties.

The Director highlighted that 2023 represented a unique chapter in the life of the Convention, as the ISU was confronted with an unprecedented process of renewing its directorship. This entailed a number of expenses, including those linked to the recruitment process of the new director and their relocation expenses, as well as compensations and relocation expenses to the outgoing director. In order to comply with the ISU's principles of transparency and accountability to State Parties, the ISU had requested the finance team to provide as much detail as possible on these expenses in its financial statements.

49 States Parties had contributed to the 2024 ISU budget, amounting to CHF 181'934, approximately 38% of the 2024 budget of CHF 477'724.

In response to the ISU's update, Panama emphasized concerns about ISU staff facing obstacles in obtaining long-term UN ground passes, stressing the importance of the ISU's functional autonomy from the GICHD. Panama suggested stronger links with UNODA for smoother operation, noting that treating the ISU as civil society requiring additional security clearance was inappropriate. Panama also raised concerns about security clearance for survivors and persons with disabilities to access UNOG, urging the UN to improve access sooner rather than later.

Regarding issues for the incoming CCM 13MSP Presidency, the Philippines clarified its stance on the review of the hosting agreement, leaving the decision to the incumbent presidency and Coordination Committee. It expressed readiness to assist in the review, including the development of the roadmap of the process, promising consultation with experts in its capital, if requested.

## 8. Conclusion of the Meeting

The President thanked the Coordination Committee for the productive discussions and concluded the meeting.

-----