



Report on the 2011 activities, functioning and finances of the Implementation Support Unit

Background:

1. At the 2010 Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10MSP), the States Parties agreed to and adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU” in which it is stated that the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) shall “report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference, and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate.” The “Directive” further states that “an audited annual financial report” for the previous year and “preliminary annual financial report” for the present year shall be submitted by the ISU to the Coordinating Committee and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval.
2. At the 2011 Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP), the Director of the ISU presented a written report on the activities, functioning and finances of the implementation support unit and a preliminary 2011 financial report, as well as an audited annual financial report for the ISU’s 2010 expenditures. The 11MSP approved these documents.
3. The 2011 work plan and budget for the ISU were prepared by the ISU and endorsed by the Coordinating Committee prior to the decisions taken by the 10MSP that see that subsequent annual work plans and budgets are to be endorsed by the Coordinating Committee and adopted by Meetings of the States Parties / Review Conferences. Nevertheless, the objectives and activities, contained within the 2011 work plan were entirely consistent with the mandate agreed to later at the 10MSP.

Report:

4. Regarding the mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including (...) the Coordinating Committee”, the ISU organized a day-long retreat for the Coordinating Committee in February and supported five subsequent meetings of the Coordinating Committee in 2011.¹
5. Regarding the mandate to “prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from (...) the Article 5 Extension Request Analysing Group”, the ISU in 2011 provided support to the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests. This involved organising a one-day training for the analysing group to increase the capacity of the individuals involved to carry out their tasks.² In addition, the ISU supported the pre-analysis efforts of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, assisted in organizing meetings of the analysing group

¹ Costs associated with a retreat for the Coordinating Committee were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

² Costs associated with the training session for the Article 5 analysis group were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

as a whole, obtained working translations of requests, acquired expertise as requested, served as a liaison between requesting States and the analysing group, transmitted communications between requesting States Parties and the President and analysing group, and made requests available on the Convention's website.

6. With respect to the mandate to "prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from (...) Meetings of the States Parties", a significant effort was undertaken throughout 2011 in support of Cambodia as it prepared to host and preside over the 11MSP. The ISU hosted Cambodian delegations in March, May, September and November in Geneva for detailed discussions on preparations. In April, the ISU carried out a mission to Siem Reap to continue these discussions and to support a national preparatory event. In August the ISU carried out a joint planning mission to Phnom Penh with the UN Officer for Disarmament Affairs. It should be noted that none of the ISU's support consistent with its mandate to "prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties (...)" duplicates any responsibilities which, by tradition, are executed by the UNODA.
7. In September the ISU participated in a regional seminar in Phnom Penh that was intended to build interest in the Convention in advance of the 11MSP and co-organized a press seminar in Phnom Penh. In addition, the ISU provided ongoing advice on communications aspects related to the 11MSP, maintained the website www.11msp.org and, on 18 November, briefed the Geneva-based press gallery on the 11MSP.
8. From 28 November to 3 December, the ISU supported the President, host country and individual delegations at the 11MSP in Phnom Penh, including by the ISU Director serving as the President's Executive Coordinator, ISU staff advising delegations on ways to participate in the 11MSP, collaborating with the ICBL in organising the 11MSP's informal session marking two decades of the anti-landmines movement, and coordinating the allocation of space for side events.
9. With respect to the mandate to "provide substantive and other support to the President, President-Designate Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings", the ISU assisted the Co-Chairs in dozens of small group meetings to help them in elaborating strategies for the year and in preparing the Intersessional Work Programme, in supporting their preparations for the 20-24 June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and in providing substantive and other support at these meetings.
10. The ISU's support to the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance included organising a one day seminar in March for representatives of national authorities of States Parties implementing Article 5.³
11. The ISU, on behalf of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, again organised parallel programmes for victim assistance experts for the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP.⁴
12. The ISU provided support in particular to the President, who also serves as the Chair of the Standing Committee on Resources Cooperation and Assistance, in organising an international symposium on cooperation and assistance as concerns victim assistance, which took place in Tirana from 30 May to 1 June.⁵

³ Costs for the Article 5 seminar were covered through enhanced funding provided by Switzerland.

⁴ Costs for interpretation and both parallel programmes and organisational costs associated with the 11MSP parallel programme were covered through enhanced funding provided by Australia.

⁵ Costs for the cooperation and assistance symposium, including the ISU's participation, were covered through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

13. In support of the Presidency, the ISU Director accompanied the 10MSP President to Vienna for a presentation by the President to the 650th plenary meeting of the OSCE's Forum for Security and Cooperation. In addition, the ISU Director supported the President at meetings with OSCE Permanent Representatives and called upon the head of disarmament of the Austrian Foreign Ministry.
14. While it certainly is within the mandate that the ISU shall "prepare, support and carry-out follow-up activities" from formal meetings of the Convention, it was not foreseen that the ISU would be called upon as extensively as it has been to provide information in support of the processes related to a new ISU agreement and ISU funding models, to make arrangements for meetings, to cover the costs of these meetings, to provide a venue for and assist in organizing President's consultations, to distribute documents to the States Parties and to acquire translations of the ISU agreement. This was a drain on the ISU's resources in 2011 and, at times, created challenges in remaining focused on supporting the core work of the Convention.
15. With respect to the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention" as well as the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties' agreement "that requesting States Parties are encouraged, as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their (Article 5) requests," the ISU made its services widely known to the States Parties with pending Article 5 deadlines, with a view to supporting high quality requests being submitted by 31 March 2012. As noted in the final documents agreed to by the States Parties, the ISU has pioneered a methodology for assisting States Parties in preparing Article 5 extension requests. This involves taking steps to ensure that work begins approximately one year before the expected submission date. Subject to the needs and desires of individual State Parties, this may involve advising authorities in capital.
16. The ISU's 2011 work plan states that the ISU would carry out approximately 10 advisory visits in response to requests by States Parties wishing to achieve greater clarity in understanding their Article 5 obligations, to advance preparations of a request for an extension, or, to achieve and declare completion. In 2011, the ISU carried out missions to Chile, Angola (twice, with one of these mission to the USA to support a workshop to assist Angola's expert) and Afghanistan to advise national authorities on the preparation of Article 5 extension requests. In addition, the ISU carried out a mission to Nigeria to advise Nigeria on understanding and declaring completion of Article 5 obligations.⁶
17. Consistent with the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention" and a core activity of the ISU going back to 2005, as noted in the final documents of the Second Review Conference, the ISU continued to provide advice and technical support to States Parties on applying the victim assistance understandings agreed to by the States Parties at the First and Second Review Conferences. In doing so, the ISU continued to respond to individual States Parties needs and acted, as is noted in the agreed mandate, to "carry out follow-up activities" from formal meetings under the Convention.
18. With the position of victim assistance specialist remaining unstaffed, the ISU had to scale back victim assistance advisory activities but did continue to provide support in this area to the extent that was possible. Time allocated to victim assistance support by the Implementation Support Officer was increased in 2011. In addition, the ISU made use of consultancies.
19. The ISU carried out a mission to Burundi in response to a request made by Burundi to support an inter-ministerial effort to develop a national action plan on disability that incorporates an appropriate response to the needs of landmine survivors.⁷ The ISU carried out a mission to Iraq

⁶ Nigeria assisted in off-setting costs related to the ISU mission to Nigeria.

⁷ Costs for the ISU's mission to Burundi were covered by enhanced funding provided by Australia.

to support a national workshop on victim assistance in the context of disarmament, disability and development.⁸ The ISU carried out two missions to Cambodia to assist Cambodian authorities in assessing the implementation of Cambodia's 2009-2011 National Plan of Action on disability, and, in supporting Cambodian authorities in acquiring input on a subsequent national plan. In addition, the ISU carried out a mission to Afghanistan to support Afghan authorities in developing tools for reporting on disability activities in Afghanistan.

20. Also consistent with the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation (...) of the Convention", the ISU provided advice to one State Party regarding the next steps it could take since discovering a small number of PFM-1 type stockpiled anti-personnel mines. In addition, the ISU supported many States Parties in preparing transparency reports, assisted States Parties and others in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes and responded to hundreds of miscellaneous requests for advice, information and support regarding a wide range of matters concerning the Convention.
21. Regarding the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties (...) on universalization", the ISU supported the activities of the President, President-Designate, the President's Special Envoy on the Universalization of the Convention and individual States Parties with their universalization efforts. The ISU also provided information to States not parties, to both support accession processes and facilitate participation in the work of the Convention.
22. The ISU supported the 10MSP President in organizing, in Tirana, a strategy session for universalization partners. The ISU Director accompanied the Special Envoy on universalization missions to the Republic of Korea, Tuvalu and Tonga.⁹ The mission to Tuvalu also featured engagements of heads of missions of States not parties and universalization partners in Suva, Fiji. The ISU accompanied the 11MSP President-Designate on high-level universalization missions to Vietnam and Singapore in October. The ISU carried out preparations for planned universalization missions by the Special Envoy to Nepal and by the 10MSP President-Designate to Morocco. Both missions were cancelled when confirmations regarding meeting programmes and other details were not provided in a timely manner.
23. With respect to the mandate to "provide advice and technical support to States Parties (...), including on the Sponsorship Programme," the ISU twice provided a proposed strategic plan to the Sponsorship Programme Donors' Group – in advance of the Intersessional Work Programme and the 11MSP – and implemented, in concert with the GICHD's conference manager, the strategic direction on sponsorship adopted by the Donors' Group. The ISU also prepared project documents for and fulfilled the reporting requirements of Donors' Group members.
24. The ISU is mandated to "facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public." Furthermore, the ISU is mandated to "keep records of formal and informal meetings under the Convention, and communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from such meetings to States Parties and other stakeholders." The ISU's 2011 work plan noted that in any particular year, personnel from the ISU may be called upon 10 to 25 times to lead seminars and provide training on understanding the Convention and its operations.
25. The ISU participated in seminars for Geneva-based diplomats which were organized by the Geneva Forum (once) and the GICHD (twice). In addition, the ISU delivered presentations at training sessions organised on by the GICHD on mine action contracting (twice). The ISU served as an expert resource at a NATO Partnership for Peace training courses in April and November. In May, the ISU served in an expert capacity at a regional workshop organised by Handicap

⁸ The UNDP assisted in off-setting costs related to the ISU mission to Iraq.

⁹ Costs for the ISU's missions in support of the Special Envoy were covered by enhanced funding provided by Norway.

International in Tajikistan.¹⁰ Also in May, the ISU was invited to a regional workshop hosted by Regional Arms Control Verification and Implementation Assistance Centre (RACVIAC) in Croatia to share lessons learned from the Convention on victim assistance for possible applicability for the Convention on Cluster Munitions.¹¹ In August, the ISU was called upon to again lead a seminar at the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme. In September, the ISU was called upon to again lead seminars (on victim assistance and Article 5 implementation) at the senior management training course organized by Jordan's National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation.¹² In October, the ISU participated in a meeting in Denmark to provide input on a draft evaluation report on the UN's International Mine Action Standards.

26. Also as concerns the mandate to "facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public," the ISU issued press releases on behalf of the 10MSP President and 11MSP President-Designate, continued to maintain and enhance the Convention's website, and made itself available to student groups and others that wish to learn about the Convention and its implementation processes. The ISU hosted visits by five groups of university students in 2011.
27. The ISU's ability to disseminate information and knowledge on victim assistance was enhanced through the development of the publication entitled *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development*.¹³ In addition, the ISU's advisory work on Article 5 implementation continued to benefit from the publication entitled *Understanding mine clearance in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention*.¹⁴ As well, the ISU produced background publications for the June 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP.
28. The ISU's 2011 work plan indicated that the ISU would continue to maintain the Convention's Documentation Centre, receiving and making available up to 1,000 new documents in 2011 related to the implementation process. Thanks to the support of highly skilled interns, the Documentation Centre has been well maintained and brought up to date with statements delivered in June 2011 and with hard copies of transparency reports submitted in 2011.
29. The ISU continued to communicate through social media, including by continuing to maintain the Convention's presence on Facebook, Flickr and Twitter.
30. Also as concerns communications, the ISU sought to respond to the Task Force recommendation which states that "in order to reinforce the identity and visibility of the Convention, the ISU will be identified through a distinct profile that emphasizes its role as supporting entity for the Convention". The ISU did so initially by acquiring a distinct email address and business card for ISU staff. The ISU hopes to proceed with a comprehensive approach to ISU design, taking into account the approximately 20 communications products that may be produced by the ISU. In this regard, discussions with the GICHD Director and the Coordinating Committee on next steps are ongoing.
31. As concerns the mandate to "liaise and coordinate, as appropriate, with relevant international organizations that participate in the work of the Convention", the ISU both sought to maintain good collaboration with the ICBL, ICRC and elements of the UN system that normally participate

¹⁰ Costs for the ISU's participation in the Tajikistan workshop were covered by Handicap International.

¹¹ Costs for the ISU's participation in the RACVIAC workshop were covered by RACVIAC.

¹² Costs for the ISU's participation in the management training course in Jordan were covered by Jordan's National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation.

¹³ The publication *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development* was made possible in 2011 through enhanced funding provided by Australia.

¹⁴ The publication *Understanding mine clearance in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention* had previously been produced through enhanced funding provided by Norway.

in the work of the Convention as well as to deepen relations with other organizations. In 2011, for instance, the ISU sought to ensure that NGOs with a disability focus – such as the International Disability Alliance and International Disability and Development Consortium – and international organizations such as the UN Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the World Health Organization and the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace know that their mandates and missions, and, the understandings on victim assistance adopted by the States Parties, coincide. Liaison with such organisations in 2011 paid off in terms of these organizations' contributions to the Convention.

Finances:

32. The ISU's 2011 work plan, not including the costs associated with returning to full staffing, was projected to cost CHF 1,050,000. If the ISU was to return to previous staffing levels (i.e., by re-staffing the position of victim assistance specialist), an additional CHF 150,000 would be required, bringing this total up to CHF 1.2 million.
33. On 7 January 2011, the 10MSP President wrote to all States Parties to recall that "it remains (the States Parties') collective responsibility in 2011 to fund the ISU's core work plan through the existing funding model" and appealed to all States Parties to contribute to the ISU. On 8 July 2011, the 10MSP again wrote to all State Parties to "appeal to each State Party to consider providing a voluntary contribution to the ISU in order that the burden of financing this important implementation mechanism is shared as widely as possible." In addition to the efforts of the 10MSP President to remind States Parties of their responsibility to fund the ISU, in 2011, given the deliberations of the open-ended working group on ISU finances, there was an unprecedented level of awareness of the ISU's financial situation and existing funding model.
34. The ISU began 2011 with a carry-over from 2010 totalling CHF 141,944. In 2011, the following States Parties contributed to the ISU core work plan: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cambodia, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Malaysia, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey. In addition, the ISU ended 2011 with an agreement in place with Belgium that would foresee Belgium providing a contribution to the ISU for 2011. Together these States Parties contributed CHF 813,628 in 2011. This amount, combined with the carry-over from 2010 and miscellaneous income equalling CHF 1,779, resulted in total revenue in 2011 amounting to CHF 953,447.
35. On 6 September 2011, the Director of the ISU reminded the Coordinating Committee that the ISU's work plan projected expenditures in 2011 totalling CHF 1.05 million and that restaffing the position of victim assistance specialist would bring this total to CHF 1.20 million. The Director noted that fully funding the work plan and restaffing would mean that approximately CHF 490,000 would still be required between 6 September 2011 and the end of the year. The Director noted that, for the following reasons, it would be prudent to take some initial steps to see that total 2011 costs expenditures would be below not only CHF 1.20 million, but also below CHF 1.05 million:
 - a. Some of the States Parties with the greatest means had not as of 6 September 2011 provided support to the ISU despite the increased awareness in 2011 of all matters concerning ISU financing and the expressed preference of these States Parties to maintain a voluntary funding model.
 - b. Some States Parties, which in the recent past have contributed to the ISU, had not done so. The contributions from some of these States Parties would normally be crucial to the ISU in funding its annual work plans.

- c. Most of the ISU's costs are in Swiss francs. However, some of the contributions received in 2011, once converted into Swiss francs, were much less in 2011 than they had been in recent years even though the amounts contributed were relatively constant in the contributing States' own currencies.
36. The ISU Director indicated to the Coordinating Committee on 6 September that he anticipated making savings in the following areas:
 - a. The Director noted that it is clear that restaffing the position of "victim assistance specialist", which carries an annual cost of approximately CHF 150,000, would not be possible in 2011.
 - b. The Director reported that the Implementation Support Specialist, who was on maternity leave for four months in 2011, was not replaced for the entirety of her leave. The Director noted that a key implication of this was significant delays in producing draft Article 5 analyses and the draft Phnom Penh Progress Report and that another implication is that the ISU has been at times without a native French-speaking professional officer.
 - c. The Director reported that with the return of the Implementation Support Specialist in October 2011, this position would be converted from 80 percent of full-time to 60 percent of full-time. The Director noted that the implication of this would be that other ways will have to be found for picking up some duties normally carried out by the Implementation Support Specialist.
 - d. The Director reported that staff travel expenses for the purpose of providing individual States Parties with support and advice on Article 5 implementation would total only about 40 percent of projected costs.
37. Final audited expenditures attributed to the ISU's 2011 core work plan amounted to CHF 996,611, implying a negative carry-over from 2011 to 2012 totalling CHF 39,260.
38. On 6 September 2011, the ISU presented to the Coordinating Committee the auditor's statement on the ISU's 2010 finances, subsequently presenting this to the 11MSP, which approved this statement.
39. The ISU's 2011 work plan noted that, in keeping with past practice, the ISU is able to execute other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, if additional funds are made available to fully fund these efforts (including funding any additional human resource costs). As noted in this report, enhanced funding was provided in 2011 by the following States Parties for the following purposes:
 - a. With enhanced funding provided by Switzerland, the ISU organised a workshop in March for representatives of national authorities of States Parties implementing Article 5. Total expenditures amounted to CHF 33,249.
 - b. With enhanced funding provided by Norway, the ISU supported the enhanced efforts of the 10MSP President, which included the February Coordinating Committee retreat, the March training session for the Article 5 analysing group, the 30 May – 1 June 2011 cooperation and assistance symposium in Tirana, and the universalization efforts of the 10MSP President and his Special Envoy. Total expenditures amounted to CHF 121,450.
 - c. With enhanced funding provided by Australia, the ISU carried out a victim assistance advisory mission to Burundi, produced and launched the publication *Assisting landmine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development*,

organised parallel programmes at the June meetings of the Standing Committees and at the 11MSP, and organised an inclusive-development-focused side event at the 11MSP. In addition, Australia continued to provide enhanced funding to support universalization and implementation in the Pacific. Total expenditures amounted to 141,558.

40. The ISU carried out missions twice to Brussels to engage the European Union on the implementation of a proposed EU Council Decision in support of the Convention. It was noted that an EU Council Decision was a great opportunity for the ISU to do more of what it is mandated to do. On 3 November, the ISU Director presented to the Coordinating Committee a draft implementation plan for such a Council Decision, which would foresee that enhanced support would be provided for the pursuit of various aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Coordinating Committee expressed general appreciation for the commitment of the EU to proceed with a Council Decision and to provide the funding necessary to the ISU to implement this decision. In addition, it was noted that the ISU was sensitive to the fact that while this is an opportunity for the ISU to take on additional activity, it must not be a drain on existing ISU priorities and that any additional human resource need would need to be funded by the EU.

41. The 10MSP mandated the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. On 6 September 2011, the President and the Director of the GICHD signed a new agreement. This agreement is intended to increase transparency in implementation support and to ensure direct accountability on the part of ISU to the States Parties. According to this agreement, the GICHD will continue to provide infrastructure, administrative and other support for the operations of the ISU. In addition, the GICHD will continue to support the organisation of the Intersessional Work Programme and the administration of the Sponsorship Programme. GICHD support to the ISU, to the Intersessional Work Programme and to the Sponsorship Programme includes human resources management, financial management, internal information management, office space and general logistics, information and communication services, travel services, conference management, sponsorship administration, publications support and website management. These support services are funded by Switzerland's core contribution to the GICHD.

Financing of the ISU's 2011 work plan

REVENUE	
Contributions received 2011	
Albania	CHF1'736
Algeria	CHF3'876
Argentina	CHF5'013
Australia	CHF149'634
Austria	CHF42'308
Belgium	CHF60'855
Cambodia	CHF2'723
Canada	CHF92'180
Cyprus	CHF3'200
Denmark	CHF50'374
Estonia	CHF1'263
Germany	CHF16'946
Hungary	CHF11'905
Indonesia	CHF1'700
Iraq	CHF3'904
Ireland	CHF24'470
Italy	CHF59'114
Malaysia	CHF833
Mozambique	CHF4'920
Netherlands	CHF12'901
Norway	CHF166'583
Qatar	CHF3'213
Slovenia	CHF11'716
Switzerland	CHF76'751
Thailand	CHF2'000
Turkey	CHF3'510
Subtotal contributions received 2011	CHF813'628
Other revenue	
Carry-over from 2010	CHF141'944
Misc. Income	CHF1'779
Subtotal contributions expected 2011	CHF143'723
Total revenue	CHF957'351
EXPENSES	
Salaries and social costs	CHF 790'949
Staff travel	CHF 102'283
Consultancy fees and travel	CHF 55'236
Translations	CHF 16'020
Publications	CHF 14'706
Meeting rooms and catering	CHF 11'800
Miscellaneous	CHF 5'617
Total expenses	CHF 996'611
BALANCE 31 DECEMBER 2011	-CHF39'260

13 June 2012