



MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE CCM COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Held on Friday 17th September 2021

from 9:00 to 10:00 hours

1. Present:

Switzerland – 2RC President

H.E. Mr. Félix Baumann

Mr. Lukas Eberli

Mr. Jonas Wolfensberger

United Kingdom – 10MSP President-Designate

H.E. Mr. Aidan Liddle

Sri Lanka – Immediate past President (9MSP)

Ms. Udani Gunawardena

Australia

Ms. Thuy Nguyen

Austria

Mr. Christoph Sternat

Chile

Ms. Pamela Moraga

Iraq

Mr. Mohammed Ridha Al-Haidari

Mexico

Mr. Alonso Martínez

Montenegro

Mr. Nikola Ražnatović

Netherlands

Mr. Reint Vogelaar

New Zealand

Ms. Charlotte Skerten

Spain

Mr. Juan Manglano

Sweden

Mr. Niklas Nilsson

CMC

Ms. Kasia Derlicka-Rosenbauer

Mr. Aaron Lainé

ICRC

Ms. Fasya Teixeira

UNODA

Ms. Silvia Mercogliano

Ms. Erika Kawahara

Mr. Simon Grimm

Implementation Support Unit

Ms. Sheila N. Mweemba

Mr. Emad Al-Juhaishi

Ms. Elaine Weiss

2. Opening remarks by the President

Ambassador Félix Baumann, President of the 2nd Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (2RC) expressed his pleasure to convene the sixth and final Coordination Committee Meeting under the Swiss Presidency before Part 2 of the 2RC scheduled for the following week.

There being no amendments to the Provisional Agenda, the President proceeded with the plan as presented.

3. Consideration of the Minutes of the previous Coordination Committee Meeting

The Minutes of the Coordination Committee Meeting held on Friday, 3 September 2021, were approved and confirmed as a true record of the proceedings after the following amendment was made: -

Item 5 page 3 – delete the words “**A Committee member**” and replace with the words “**For the sake of transparency, Spain**” in line 3 of the third paragraph.

4. Update from the Presidency on the final preparations for Part 2 of the 2nd Review Conference.

The President reported that his team had sent out the draft documents of the Second Review Conference the previous Tuesday, which was later than planned, because the presidency had received some final comments on the documents that same day. He expressed his hope that all States Parties would have the time to look at the documents before the Conference and explained that his team had strived to minimize changes and only made edits that were deemed necessary while trying to find formulations agreeable to all delegations.

Ambassador Baumann reminded that as the duration of the 2RC Part 2 the following week was only for two days, to avoid long discussions during the Conference, the Swiss presidency team would also remain available throughout the weekend for additional consultations as necessary on the documents.

The 2RC President further informed that the presidency had received queries regarding modifications made to the language on diversity in the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP) as well as in paragraph 16 of the Political Declaration. He clarified that these modifications were introduced in response to the strong reaction of one delegation on the text. He recalled a similar situation two years prior regarding the documents of the 4th Review Conference of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC). In that context, the term “diversity” was removed, even though many delegations had expressed a strong desire for its inclusion. The Swiss presidency, on the other hand, aimed to preserve the term while making sure the final text was satisfactory to all delegations. He added that the proposed language was based on consultations with several key stakeholders, including operators and civil society, therefore hoped that it would be acceptable to all.

Before opening the floor to discuss the final preparations for the Conference, Ambassador Baumann reminded the Meeting that the third informal consultation on paragraph 8 of the Political Declaration would be taking place that afternoon.

In contributing to the discussion, Ambassador Liddle informed that the United Kingdom had sent its comments on the LAP and Political Declaration the previous day and expressed his apologies for the late intervention. He explained that the proposed changes included updating the first paragraph of the Lausanne Declaration to reflect the change of venue and modality of the 2RC, amending the LAP to reflect the language of the Convention in some areas, and more substantive language in the chapter on victim assistance. He expressed his interest in consulting with the presidency on the proposed changes. In response, Ambassador Baumann thanked the United Kingdom for its feedback and assured that he would consult with Ambassador Liddle in the margins of the meeting that afternoon.

In contributing to the discussion, Chile indicated that while it was flexible to support the decisions of the presidency, it expressed dissatisfaction with the modifications to the language on diversity in the documents as they altered the meaning particularly in Spanish as conveyed in the previous draft. In that regard, Chile informed of its desire to read the proposed changes in Spanish to assess the change. Chile also queried the decision to limit the period covered by the Review Document in evaluating the Dubrovnik Action Plan (DAP) to 1 October 2020 rather than to end of the 2RC, asking how the progress on implementation made during the time frame between the two dates would be accounted for.

In response to Chile, the President explained that the presidency had taken the decision to limit the review period up to the first part of the 2RC because reopening the document to include progress made in the following year would require an extensive amount of work. He added that the document had been closed since the summer of 2020 with only minor changes made to figures prior to 2RC Part 1. He assured that this decision would be reflected in the Final Report of the Conference. With regard to the proposed amendments on the sections on diversity, the President informed that a number of States Parties had indicated their wish for strong language on this issue. Nevertheless, the presidency had made the proposed changes based on consultations with operators, civil society, and other stakeholders, recognizing that it was a step forward compared to previous consensus on the subject.

In its contribution to the discussion, the Netherlands asked for the reason the presidency had not chosen to emulate the diversity language of the APMBC documents. In addition, the Netherlands queried how the presidency envisaged Afghanistan presenting its extension request at the 2RC given its complex political situation. In response, Ambassador Baumann disclosed that his team had considered emulating the diversity language used by the APMBC, but the stakeholders they consulted had preferred the language reflected in the new proposal. Regarding the issue of Afghanistan's extension request presentation, the President assured that his team was closely monitoring the situation and enquired if the ISU or UNODA had a further update on this. The ISU Director reported that the ISU had been in contact with the Afghan team that had prepared the extension request, and which indicated that it was prepared to make the presentation via *Interprefy*. However, as the Note Verbale submitted by the Permanent Mission of Afghanistan in Geneva had reflected incorrect meeting details, the ISU had requested the Mission to make the necessary corrections and resubmit their Note Verbale to enable participation of the Afghan

delegation in the 2RC Part 2. UNODA confirmed that it had not received a resubmitted Note Verbale.

Returning to the issue of paragraph 8 of the Political Declaration, Ambassador Baumann reminded that two rounds of informal consultations had already been held with the third and final round taking place that afternoon. He informed that while significant progress had been made during the informal consultations held the previous Monday, a few delegations had communicated their areas of concern that were red lines for them. Based on these, the presidency had prepared a certain number of elements to discuss that afternoon with the aim of reaching a consensus. The President outlined that following the final consultations, the proposed draft would be circulated as a written procedure under silence until Monday 20 September 2021.

5. Any other business

Update on 2RC participants

The UNODA representative reported that a total of 65 States Parties, 15 Observer States and 13 international organizations or institutions had registered for the 2RC. She elaborated that no information in the interim *List of Participants* would be deleted and any new registration would simply be added to the list. She informed that there were only a handful of changes to the list as there were only a few new State registrations and one additional organization, UNDP. Regarding the organization falling under rule 1.3 of the *Rules of Procedure*, the UNODA representative recommended that the President should take a few minutes to approve the updated list of participating international organizations or institutions at the beginning of the Conference.

6. Next Coordination Committee Meeting

The President confirmed that a Coordination Committee Meeting would take place on Tuesday, 21 September 2021, at 09:00 hours in Conference Room Tempus 1 at the Palais des Nations. He concluded the meeting with warm thanks to the Committee members for their participation despite the short notice, as well as for their efforts and commitment to the work of the 2RC.

+++++++