

AGENDA ITEM 10E – IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT

DIRECTOR OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT UNIT

I wish to thank delegations for the kind words many of you expressed about the ISU and individual staff members earlier this week. We very much appreciate this.

The “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU” adopted by the 10MSP instructs the ISU to propose and present a work plan and budget for the activities of the ISU for the following year to the Coordinating Committee for endorsement and subsequently to MSPs for approval.

I was pleased in mid-November to distribute to all States Parties the draft 2014 work plan and budget.

You will recall that in order to prepare the draft work plan in an inclusive and transparent manner, I notified all delegations on 19 September at the 13MSP informal meeting of what I had told the Coordinating Committee Meeting on 4 September.

That is, on both September 4th and September 19th, I indicated that it was my intention to prepare a document for 2014 which would not be significantly different from the 2012 and 2013 work plans and budgets in terms of the mix of activities and budgetary amounts.

As well, at both the September 19th meeting and in a summary of the meeting which was distributed to all delegations, I asked that, if States Parties had other views with respect to my intended approach, they should contact me as soon as possible and no later than 30 September as a draft work plan and budget would need to be prepared for initial consideration by the Coordinating Committee.

In addition, I repeated this message on 26 September at a briefing of recent ISU financial contributors.

On the basis of any input received between 19 September and mid-October, I proceeded to prepare a draft work plan, which was distributed to the Coordinating Committee on 20 October.

As I had not received any view contrary to what I had proposed in September, this draft indeed did not deviate to a great extent from recent past work plans in terms of the activity mix and costs.

Only three minor changes were made:

- First, the first two of the six aspects of the ISU mandate were rolled into one section in the narrative and budget given the considerable overlap regarding what is required of the ISU by these aspects.
- Second, the narrative aims to not only speak to activities but also the intended results of these activities.
- And third, the budget takes into account marginally increased costs associated with supporting a formal meeting (i.e., the Third Review Conference) outside of Geneva.

On 1 November, I presented this draft to the Coordinating Committee. In doing so, I recalled the inclusive and transparent manner used to prepare the work plan and budget.

As well I noted that there was indeed a certain logic to proceed with a document that looks much like past work plans and budgets given that it roughly aligns with recent experience in terms of likely contributions and that it does not prejudge any decisions the States Parties may take at the Third Review Conference, which may or may not have an impact on the services and support expected from the ISU.

I also recalled that, as was the case in preparing the 2012 and 2013 work plans and budgets, in establishing a work plan and budget for 2014, I had given due regard to the need for the ISU maintain its operations at the reduced level of costs (relative to costs prior to 2012) and the desire of States Parties that the ISU place a relatively higher priority on certain aspects of its mandate.

I was grateful that the Coordinating Committee endorsed the work plan at its 1 November meeting.

I wish to thank the Coordinating Committee, a representative group of the following States Parties, for their endorsement: Algeria, Australia, Austria,

Belgium, Bulgaria, Colombia, Ecuador, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand.

I now seek your approval of the ISU's 2014 work plan and budget.

I wish to also recall that the "Directive from the States Parties to the ISU" states that the 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 Conferences, 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.

I have distributed the ISU's preliminary narrative and financial report for 2013 as well as the ISU's 2012 audited statement.

You will have seen that the report provides a rich accounting of ISU activities to date in 2013 along with detailed financial information on revenue and costs.

I was grateful for suggestions made by some delegations, including Mexico, led to more detailed information than in the past on costs relative to budgeted amounts.

As time is short and there is much that remains to be done at this meeting, I will let the report speak for itself, with the exception of highlighting new developments as concern paragraph 43, drawing your attention to one matter and correcting one error.

First, paragraph 43 states in part that written commitments have been made by or the process of concluding agreements is underway with five States Parties.

Since I submitted the report, I have been informed that two of these States Parties – Cyprus and Italy – have provided funds in support of the ISU 2013 work plan.

Second, in recalling that the States Parties agreed at the 11MSP to improve the ISU's voluntary funding model and to ensure sufficient contributions are provided to the ISU as long as the financing model remains unchanged, I wish to acknowledge that some States Parties have taken steps in this regard by providing multi-year commitments or contributions and hence greater predictability about expected revenue.

Four States Parties have already provided or have committed to provide contributions in support of the ISU's 2014 work plan and two have done so with respect to the ISU's 2015 work plan.

And third, I wish to highlight that an error occurred in the reproduction of Table 1 in the ISU report. A corrected version of this table has been distributed to you.

Thank you.