## Statement of Belgium on the non-paper on the CCM ISU establishment: recruitment of Director ISU- proposed process, panel and secretariat.

Mr Chairman, Dear Colleagues,

The Conference of Lusaka took a very important decision in September last year about the creation and implementation of the definitive ISU. It has been a very important step for the Convention as the discussion was going on for a good while.

Belgium would like to thank Zambia for its efforts in Lusaka and since then to implement this decision:

I would like to recall that it has been agreed in Lusaka that:

- 1- the process to establish the ISU 'll start immediately.
- 2- the President of the 4<sup>th</sup> MSP is mandated to conclude an agreement with the GICHD on the hosting of the ISU as soon as possible.
- 3- The President of the 4<sup>th</sup> MSP is mandated to decide on the recruitment of the Director of the new ISU.
- 4- It is also decided that "the transition from the interim solution to the newly established ISU shall commence at the 5<sup>th</sup> MSP and be completed no later than the 1<sup>st</sup> Review Conference at which the new ISU will completely take over the secretariat functions.

On these we think that steps can be taken immediately such as signing the agreement with the GICHD and advertizing for the post of Director so that the selection procedure can start as soon as possible and the transition can take place at the  $5^{th}$  MSP as foreseen.

The President of the 4<sup>th</sup> MSP has been mandated to decide on a director in a transparent way and in consultation with the coordinators". That's

why we do not see the benefit of creating a new structure. We understand that it is for the coordinators to assist the President in examining the candidatures as agreed in Lusaka.

Besides, the suggestion that an external recruitment unit provider would be procured to act as the secretariat would most probably increase considerably the costs of the whole procedure.

Finally we think that we should be careful not to mix the question of the installation of the ISU with the discussion on its financing. We understand that the discussion must go on about the financing of the new ISU as the final decision ha to be taken at the 1st Review Conference but this discussion should not be linked with the discussion about the implementation of decisions already agreed in Lusaka about the ISU.

To sum up my statement Mr Chairman, I would like to underline that the objective of the decision agreed upon in Lusaka is to have a fully operational new ISU for the 1<sup>st</sup> review conference. This is clearly stated in item 32 of the final document and therefore all the implementations measures should to be taken well ahead.

Belgium thanks you again for all your efforts.

Thank you Mr Chairman,