

RATIONALISING THE NUMBER OF STATES PARTIES IN LEADERSHIP POSITIONS ON STANDING COMMITTEES

**Presented by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on behalf of the
Coordinating Committee**

**(For discussion on 24 June 2011 at the meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status
and Operation of the Convention)**

Background

At the 2009 Second Review Conference, the Coordinating Committee was mandated “to review the operation of the Intersessional Work Programme, with the Chair of the Coordinating Committee consulting widely on this matter and presenting a report and, if necessary, recommendations to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties” (10MSP).

In its report to the 10MSP, the Coordinating Committee “noted that it has become increasingly challenging for States Parties to fulfil responsibilities related to being a Co-Chair / Co-Rapporteur (given the increased volume and complexity of work) and increasingly difficult to identify a geographically representative group to take on all roles (given an increase in demands for States to take on tasks related to conventional weapons)”.

The report further noted that “moving to a leadership team of two States Parties for each Standing Committee, rather than four, would be an effective means to rationalise the numbers of States in leadership positions” and that “a structure could be devised that maintained the coherence and continuity of the leadership team”.

In response to the report of the Coordinating Committee, the 10MSP “agreed to examine the possibility of rationalising the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, requested that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Chairs / Co-Rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties” (11MSP).

Considerations:

At its meetings in the first trimester of 2011, the Coordinating Committee considered ways and means of “rationalising the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees”, particularly with a view to arriving at a situation wherein there would be “a leadership team of two States Parties for each Standing Committee, rather than four”. The Coordinating Committee also considered that “to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties” meant that, in part, it was essential that any new configuration would continue to ensure continuity and geographic representation.

At present, there are four Standing Committees that have a leadership team of four States Parties per Standing Committee and one Standing Committee that is led by one State Party (i.e., the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, which the 10MSP agreed would be presided over by the President in 2011).

While the ultimate goal may be a leadership team of two States Parties per Standing Committee, it may be practical to consider that achieving this goal could be reached in two stages, at least for those four Standing Committees which currently have a leadership team of four States Parties. That is, these leadership teams each include two States Parties which, by the time of the 11MSP, will have served for only one year (as Co-Rapporteurs) and which represent continuity on their Standing Committees. These Co-Rapporteurs elected at the 10MSP, in keeping with past practice, could be elected as Co-Chairs at the 11MSP. However, to move one step toward a leadership time of two, at the 11MSP only one additional State Party would be elected to join the leadership team of each of these four Standing Committees as Co-Rapporteurs.

As concerns the one Standing Committee that is led by one State Party (i.e., the Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance), to ensure continuity the State Party that currently chairs this Standing Committee alone could be elected at the 11MSP to a second one year term (which would be consistent with the existing practice of Standing Committee leaders serving for two years). In addition at the 11MSP, an additional Co-Chair of this Standing Committee could be elected for a two year term.

At the 12MSP, all five Standing Committees could see be regularised as being led by two States Parties. “Co-Rapporteurs” would no longer be elected. Rather, both States Parties in leadership positions would be equals – as “Co-Chairs”. To ensure continuity, each would serve overlapping terms.

	Current situation	Proposed 11MSP Decision	Proposed 12MSP Decision
General Status	Co-Chairs: Canada and Thailand Co-Rapporteurs: Norway and Peru	Co-Chairs: Norway and Peru Co-Rapporteur: State A	Co-Chair: State A Co-Chair: State F
Stockpile Destruction	Co-Chairs: Lithuania and the Philippines Co-Rapporteurs: Germany and Romania	Co-Chairs: Germany and Romania Co-Rapporteur: State B	Co-Chair: State B Co-Chair: State G
Mine Clearance	Co-Chairs: Colombia and Switzerland Co-Rapporteurs: Indonesia and Zambia	Co-Chairs: Indonesia and Zambia Co-Rapporteur: State C	Co-Chair: State C Co-Chair: State H
Victim Assistance	Co-Chairs: Australia and Uganda Co-Rapporteurs: Algeria and Croatia	Co-Chairs: Algeria and Croatia Co-Rapporteurs: State D	Co-Chair: State D Co-Chair: State I
Resources, Cooperation & Assistance	Chair: Presidency (Albania)	Co-Chair: Albania Co-Chair: State E	Co-Chair: State E Co-Chair: State J