

**Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit
2011 Work Plan and Budget**

Adopted by the Coordinating Committee, 17 November 2010

Background

1. At the September 2001 Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP), the States Parties endorsed the 3MSP President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and mandated the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to establish the ISU. The 3MSP also encouraged States Parties in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the ISU. In addition, the States Parties mandated the President of the 3MSP, in consultation with the Coordinating Committee, to finalise an agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU. The Council of Foundation of the GICHD accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.
2. In accordance with the above-mentioned actions taken by the States Parties at the 3MSP, an agreement on implementation support for the Convention was finalised between the States Parties and the GICHD by the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD on 7 November 2001. This agreement indicated that an annual budget for the ISU will be established by the Coordinating Committee and the Director of the GICHD and that it shall include figures for the forthcoming financial year and, if necessary, a set of priorities that shall be understood as guidelines in order to allocate available resources.
3. The general duties – hence the general priorities – of the ISU are listed in the 3MSP President's Paper that serves as the mandate for the Unit. Also in a manner consistent with this mandate, more specific direction regarding priorities is received from the Coordinating Committee, thus ensuring ongoing input from States Parties into the work of the ISU. Moreover, clear direction for the ISU in 2011 has been provided by all States Parties through the Cartagena Action Plan 2010-2014 and the other conclusions and understandings agreed to at the Second Review Conference.
4. At the Second Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to proceed with an evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit. While decisions the States Parties may wish to take on the basis of this evaluation may affect future work planning and financing of the ISU, any such decisions would come too late for planning for 2011. Hence, the existing procedure is being used to plan the work and establish a budget for the ISU in 2011, albeit without prejudice to the fact that ongoing direction to the ISU is received from the Coordinating Committee thus insuring the ongoing input from States Parties.

Priorities

5. On the basis of the direction received from the Coordinating Committee, in 2011 the ISU will continue to provide the support largely consistent with that provided in 2010, albeit with in-country victim assistance advisory services provided at a reduced level. On 7 September 2010, the Director of the ISU informed the Coordinating Committee that, while the ISU should have the resources necessary to complete most of its intended work plan in 2010, cuts would have to be made and that planning for the remainder of 2010 could not be divorced from planning for 2011. The Director indicated that a structural change would need to be made that would result in a significant cut in support that the States Parties have come to expect and appreciate – in-country victim assistance advisory services and a dedicated expert advisory service in Geneva.

The Coordinating Committee was informed in particular that as of 1 December 2010, the position of "victim assistance specialist" would no longer be staffed and it would remain vacant until such a time as States Parties provide the necessary resources to cover the costs of this position and related services.

6. Also on 7 September 2010, the Director of the ISU expressed his hope that the ISU could return to a staffing and service level that States Parties have come to expect as the norm in recent years, noting that even this level of staffing leaves the ISU far short of meeting demands from individual States Parties for victim assistance advisory services and far short of fulfilling the potential to provide advisory services to Article 5 implementing States Parties well before Article 5 deadlines. The Director also observed that, while the work of the ISU Task Force in evaluating the ISU has an opportunity to devise approaches to overcome these challenges, ways and means proposed by the Task Force would still not serve as a substitute for the immediate need for States Parties to live up to their Cartagena commitments as concerns the ISU during the remainder of 2010 and through 2011.
7. Support that will be provided in 2011 will include advising State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance, furnishing information or assistance in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes, providing strategic direction to Co-Chairs and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, supporting States Parties in preparing transparency reports, leading seminars and providing training on understanding the Convention and its operations, supporting the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts, supporting the preparations of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP), continuing to fulfil the ISU's mandated communications and liaison role including by serving as the authoritative source of information on the Convention and maintaining the Convention's Documentation Centre. In addition, the ISU will continue to provide advice on applying, in other areas, the lessons learned from implementing the Convention and will explore, as appropriate, efforts undertaken within related frameworks with a view to facilitating cooperation and meeting overlapping obligations in a way that maximises efficiency and impact of efforts.
8. A specific area of support that the ISU will continue to provide concerns Article 5 extension requests. In 2006, the States Parties agreed to encourage States Parties requesting extensions in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention "as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their requests." In doing so, the States Parties underscored the already increasing workload of the ISU in providing to individual States Parties and to Co-Chairs professional support and advice on matters concerning the implementation of Article 5. This additional workload was taken into account in ISU budgets since 2007 and again is reflected in the 2011 budget.
9. In addition in 2006, the States Parties agreed on a process to assist them in considering requests for extensions including: (a) that in preparing "an analysis" of extension requests "the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs, in close consultation with the requesting State, should, where appropriate, draw on expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice, using the ISU to provide support;" and, (b) that all States Parties in a position to do so are encouraged "to provide additional, earmarked funds to the ISU Trust Fund to cover costs related to support the Article 5 extensions process." This aspect also was taken into account in ISU budgets since 2007 and again is reflected in the 2011 budget.
10. Another area of support that the ISU will continue to provide concerns victim assistance. At the 2004 First Review Conference, the States Parties adopted understandings on victim assistance

that provided a basis for the States Parties to act strategically in this area. At the 2009 Second Review Conference, these understandings were updated and a clear and unequivocal message was sent by the States Parties of their reaffirmation of the “fundamental goal” of “promoting and protecting the human rights of mine survivors, and addressing the needs of mine victims, including survivors, their affected families and communities”. In 2011, the ISU will continue to take seriously the emphasis that the State Parties have placed on victim assistance, although planning to do so with fewer resources while standing ready to return to normal levels of support should additional resources be made available.

Work plan and staffing

11. General support: As in the past, the ISU expects to receive hundreds of requests from State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance. Immediately in advance of the meetings of the Standing Committees and the 11MSP, the ISU expects dozens of requests to furnish information or assistance in maximising participation in the Convention’s implementation processes. In terms of providing strategic direction to Co-Chairs, the ISU typically takes part in dozens of small group planning meetings which culminate in approximately six meetings of the Coordinating Committee each year. A proposed strategic plan for the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme will be developed twice – once in the lead up to the meetings of the Standing Committees and once in the lead up to the 11MSP. The ISU typically responds to approximately 50 requests a year from States Parties requiring assistance or advice preparing transparency reports. 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.
12. The ISU will continue to provide secretariat support to the Universalisation Contact Group, which usually meets twice a year, and provide information to the Contact Group Coordinator. If requested, ISU personnel will support the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts. In recent years, this may involve preparing background information for four to ten individual initiatives and accompanying the President and other States Parties on the same number of visits. In addition, the ISU will 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.
13. Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties: The ISU will fulfil its traditional role of supporting the preparations of the 11MSP, particularly by providing substantive advice to the President, supporting host country organisational efforts and coordinating communications and media relations. As is normally the case when Meetings of the States Parties or Review Conferences are held outside of the Geneva, there are additional workload and budgetary pressures on the ISU.
14. The ISU will continue to take its communication and liaison mandate extremely seriously. The ISU will seek to work closely with individual States Parties to maximise the communications opportunities presented by the achievement of various implementation and universalisation milestones. The ISU will produce publications containing the programmes and information on the Intersessional Work Programme and on the 11MSP and make its Convention background brochure available in Spanish (in addition to the existing English and French language versions). In addition, the ISU will continue to update and enhance the Convention’s website. With respect to liaison, the ISU will deepen its collaboration with non-governmental, international and other organisations who share the States Parties’ aims.

15. Article 5 Implementation Support: The ISU will carry out approximately 10 advisory visits in response to requests by States Parties wishing to meet one of the following objectives: (a) to achieve greater clarity in understanding the nature and extent of one’s obligations, (b) to advance preparations of a request for an extension, and, (c) to achieve and declare completion. Priorities for the ISU will be those States Parties with Article 5 deadlines that occur in 2012 and 2013 and those States Parties that lack clarity regarding the nature and extent of their implementation challenges.

Upcoming Article 5 Deadlines

Deadlines in 2012	Deadlines in 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algeria • Chile • DRC • Eritrea • Jordan • Nigeria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Afghanistan • Angola • Cyprus • Gambia

16. Article 5 Extensions Process: Costs associated with support to the Article 5 extensions process – that is, to acquire for and at the request of the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs “expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice” and to otherwise support the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 extension requests – will largely take the form of acquiring working translations of extension requests.

17. Victim Assistance Implementation Support: The ISU will carry out approximately 3-4 advisory visits (down from 9-12 in recent years) in response to requests by States Parties wishing to meet one of the following objectives: (a) for those with good victim assistance objectives, to develop good plans; (b) for those with underdeveloped objectives, to develop more concrete objectives; (c) for those with good plans, to advance implementation of these plans, (d) for those that have engaged little to date in applying the understandings agreed to by the States Parties, to achieve a higher level of engagement, and, (e) for all, to develop monitoring mechanisms. Priorities for the ISU will be those States Parties that are responsible for significant numbers of landmine survivors, particularly those where a meaningful difference will be made as a result of ISU support.

States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of survivors

• Afghanistan	• DRC	• Peru
• Albania	• El Salvador	• Senegal
• Angola	• Eritrea	• Serbia
• Bosnia and Herzegovina	• Ethiopia	• Sudan
• Burundi	• Guinea Bissau	• Tajikistan
• Cambodia	• Iraq	• Thailand
• Chad	• Jordan	• Uganda
• Colombia	• Mozambique	• Yemen
• Croatia	• Nicaragua	

18. While there will be a dramatic diminishment in the victim assistance services that affected States Parties have come to greatly appreciate, the ISU will still do what it can to support States Parties in applying the victim assistance understandings that they have adopted. The ISU will continue to provide advisory services to individual States Parties, albeit from a distance (i.e., from

Geneva). The ISU will give intensive attention to 3-4 States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of survivors. The ISU will continue to provide advice and support to the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance. The ISU will continue to organize on behalf of Co-Chairs parallel programmes (subject to project funding being made available to cover the costs of interpretation and other matters). In addition, the ISU will continue to be available to deliver presentations and lead seminars on understanding victim assistance in the context of the Convention.

19. **Staffing:** The following positions will be staffed as of 1 January 2011: director, mine action implementation specialist, implementation support specialist, implementation support officer and administrative assistant. The position of victim assistance specialist will remain vacant until such a time as sufficient funding is provided by the States Parties to return to normal service levels. In addition, the ISU will continue to engage interns, both to acquire additional no / low cost support and as part of broader outreach efforts.

ISU Staffing 2011

Staff Position	Full-time equivalent of positions staffed as of 1 January 2011	Full-time equivalent of positions to be staffed should sufficient funds be provided
Director	1.0	1.0
Mine Action Implementation Specialist	1.0	1.0
Implementation Support Specialist	0.8	0.8
Victim Assistance Specialist		1.0
Implementation Support Officer	1.0	1.0
Administrative Assistant	0.5	0.5
Total	4.3	5.3

Enhanced activities in addition to the ISU’s core work plan

20. 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). With funds made available by Australia, the ISU will complete enhanced victim assistance efforts which it began in 2010. These initiatives involve supporting national efforts by Burundi and Uganda, victim assistance experts’ parallel programmes and the development of a guide to understanding the Convention’s victim assistance provision in the broader context of disability. These two initiatives, which span 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011, are valued at approximately CHF 225,000.
21. In 2010, the ISU was able to provide enhanced support to the Presidency with funds made available by Norway. The Director of the ISU is in discussions with Norway about the possibility of providing further enhanced support to the Presidency should funds be made available.
22. Throughout 2010, the ISU has been in discussions with the European Union regarding the possibility of the EU adopting a “Council Decision” in support of the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The EU has indicated that the ISU would be the designated as the “technical implementer” of such an initiative as was the case with respect to the 2008-2010 EU Joint Action in support of the Convention.

GICHD support to the ISU

23. Costs for basic infrastructure and services in support of the ISU (office space, information technology, telecommunications, postage, publications coordination, travel support, human resources management, accounting, audit and other administrative support, etc.) are not included in this budget. These costs are covered by the GICHD general budget, on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland, and are valued at approximately CHF 380,000 in 2011.
24. While costs associated with providing substantive support to the Presidency and Co-Chairs in preparing the Intersessional Work Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs totalling CHF 150,000 related to facility, interpretation and organisational matters concerning the Intersessional Work Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland.
25. While costs associated with providing strategic direction to the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs related to the administration of the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland. The value of these costs is projected to be CHF 40,000 in 2011.
26. The GICHD can serve to advance funds to the ISU's operations in periods of cash flow problems. It would also be the last resort in the case of a deficit.

Contingencies

27. The budget assumes that States Parties will fulfil their commitment to provide the necessary resources to ensure the operations of the ISU. It is expected that the Coordinating Committee will monitor the ISU financial situation at least quarterly in 2011, receiving proposals from the ISU Director on taking contingency actions should insufficient funds be provided in 2011. It is understood that, given the gravity of potential decisions the Coordinating Committee may need to make, proposals for contingency actions would be received well before meeting when they would be discussed.
28. Should it be clear by 30 June 2011 that contributions or commitments made by that time will be insufficient to cover the majority of the costs of the ISU's 2011 core work plan, the Director of the ISU will propose options to the Coordinating Committee, all of which would result in a significant reduction in the services provided by the ISU. It should be noted that such an action, while perhaps necessary, would be inconsistent with key conclusions contained in 1 September 2010 ISU evaluation report, which noted that "no one actually proposed any reduction of the Unit" and that "a strong wish was evident amongst mine-affected Parties that the ISU should be expanded."
29. Should sufficient funds be provided in addition to those required to cover the costs of the ISU's 2011 core work plan, the ISU would, first, increase in-country victim assistance advisory services through the use of consultancies and, second, if possible, restaff the position of victim assistance specialist to return to at least the level of State Party-specific advisory services that States Parties have grown used to in recent years.

Bank account information

30. In accordance with the 3MSP President's Paper on the Establishment of an Implementation Support Unit, a fund for voluntary contributions to finance the activities of the ISU has been established, with States Parties to endeavour to assure the necessary financial resources. The relevant details of this fund are as follows:

UBS Geneva, P.O. Box 2600, CH-1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland

Account no.: FP 100 627.6

IBAN: CH45 0024 0240 FP10 0627 6

Swift code: UBSWCHZH80A

Account owner: Centre international de déminage humanitaire – Genève

(Contributors should indicate "ISU Core Work Plan 2011" when forwarding funds.)

ISU 2011 Budget

GENERAL SUPPORT		
· Provide advice State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance.	Salaries & employer's payroll costs	CHF430'000
· Assist States Parties in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes	Staff travel	CHF50'000
· Provide strategic direction to Co-Chairs	Other Costs	CHF10'000
· Provide strategic direction to the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme	Subtotal	CHF490'000
· Support States Parties in preparing transparency reports		
· Lead seminars and provide training on understanding the Convention and its operations		
· Support the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts		
· Provide advice on applying, in other areas, the lessons learned from implementing the Convention		
· Support the President-Designate and the 11MSP host country in their preparations		
· Continue to serve as the authoritative source of information on the Convention		
· Maintain the Convention's Documentation Centre		
COMMUNICATION AND LIAISON		
· Maximise opportunities presented by implementation and universalisation achievements	Salaries & employer's payroll costs	CHF40'000
· Deliver information in a professional manner about the Convention through publications	Staff travel	CHF10'000
· Deliver information in a professional manner about the Convention by maintaining websites	Layout, printing and translations	CHF15'000
· Deepen collaboration with actors that share the States Parties' aims	Other Costs	CHF5'000
	Subtotal	CHF65'000
ARTICLE 5 IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT		
· Support States Parties in clarifying the nature and extent of one's obligations.	Salaries & employer's payroll costs	CHF195'000
· Support States Parties in preparing Article 5 extension requests.	Staff travel	CHF50'000
· Support States Parties in achieving and declaring completion of Article 5 implementation.	Other Costs	CHF10'000
	Subtotal	CHF255'000
ARTICLE 5 EXTENSIONS PROCESS		
· Support the President and the other States Parties mandated to analyse requests	Salaries & employer's payroll costs	CHF40'000
· Acquire expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice at the request of the analysing group	Translations	CHF15'000
· Acquire working translations of requests submitted	Other Costs	CHF5'000
· Make requests and other relevant documentation readily available	Subtotal	CHF60'000
VICTIM ASSISTANCE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT		
· Support States Parties with good victim assistance objectives in developing good plans	Salaries & employer's payroll costs	CHF100'000
· Support States Parties with underdeveloped objectives in developing more concrete objectives	Staff travel	CHF10'000
· Support States Parties with good plans in advancing implementation of these plans	Other Costs	CHF70'000
· Support States Parties that have engaged little to date in achieving a higher level of engagement	Subtotal	CHF180'000
· Support States Parties in developing monitoring mechanisms.		
	TOTAL	CHF1'050'000