

**10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty**  
**ICBL Statement on the Implementation Work Program Review**  
**3 December 2010**



The ICBL welcomes States Parties' decision at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Conference to conduct a review of the intersessional work program. While the system has generally been working very well, we think it is healthy for the treaty to periodically hold reviews in order to make sure that the work program and associated architecture is still as vibrant and strong as possible. We therefore thank the President for the proposals and encourage States Parties to support them in full. We would just like to touch on a few of the specific suggestions.

First, we would like to support the paper's observation that co-chairs have a responsibility to promote implementation not just by simply chairing a single meeting but rather by undertaking activities during the entire course of their term. We strongly support this notion, and we encourage all co-chairs to seek opportunities throughout the year to work with individual states on implementation challenges as well as to hold discussions on overarching issues among interested stakeholders. Activities could range from the planned mine clearance workshop being organized by the incoming co-chairs in March, to smaller meetings of states with similar concerns as was done by the co-chairs on stockpile destruction in 2008, to informal one on one meetings as needed to discuss states' particular challenges. All such initiatives can make a big difference in moving forward the work of the treaty. The President's paper's recommendation to add transparency and inclusion to the list of principles of the work program is central to the success of the co-chairs' activities. The inclusion of all interested actors in such activities can only help to strengthen them, and transparency among all parties will facilitate such cooperation.

Second, as we stated on Tuesday, the ICBL supports the creation of a new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance. We hope such a forum will allow for in-depth discussion on a range of issues that have not received enough attention to date, including the issues on efficiency and effectiveness that we raised on Tuesday. For this committee to work, we believe the discussions should focus in on a small number of issues per session so that there can be real exchanges of views on critical, though sometimes sensitive, issues; opportunities to develop new ideas; and a chance to share concrete experiences. States should also be called upon to report on implementation of the CAP provisions on international cooperation and assistance.

In this regard, we support the point in the review that calls for experimentation in the structure of the upcoming intersessional Standing Committee meetings. The reporting that goes on at such meetings is essential for keeping up the momentum on implementation. But there should also be significant space provided for the types of open, frank, and interactive discussions that cannot easily take place in a plenary format. We hope that in the coming months, we can find creative ideas to break out of the traditional meeting mold and return more informality to the ISC meetings, with the goal of finding more effective ways to support, challenge, inspire and learn from each other.

Thirdly, we would like to support recommendation 4, which calls on states to examine the possibility of reducing the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, with a view to taking a decision on this matter at the 11MSP. This recommendation is a reflection of the increasing demand for states' leadership on disarmament and humanitarian issues, which makes it increasingly difficult to identify States Parties that have the interest and capacity to fill 8 co-rapporteur positions. We suggest moving to a system of two leaders per committee, each serving for two years but beginning in

alternate years in order to ensure continuity of leadership. The leaders should continue to include a large number of mine-affected states and be a geographically diverse group. We think this system would help maintain a high quality of leadership on the Mine Ban Treaty while ensuring respect for the principles of diversity and inclusion.

In closing, we would like to underscore one of the other principles of the intersessional work program mentioned in the review – that of flexibility. The structures of the intersessional work program were created by States Parties over time with the idea of finding the best ways to support and strengthen the treaty, and they should continue to evolve over time to reflect evolving circumstances. We therefore hope that States Parties will therefore continue to review the intersessional work program at regular intervals so as to ensure it is supporting treaty implementation and universalization in the most efficient and effective manner.

Thank you.