

## **Spreekpunten CCM PrepCom - 28 juni 2020**

### **Agenda punt 5a: Review of the operation and status of the Convention 2016-2020**

- Thank you Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation takes the floor allow me to take this opportunity to compliment you on your leadership of the CCM in these challenging times. The Netherlands is of the view that we should continue our work on disarmament in a pragmatic manner and our meeting today serves as a positive example of this. You can count on the full support of my delegation.
- Turning to the Review Document, we would like to thank you and your team for all the efforts in developing this document. As member of the coordination committee the Netherlands has actively contributed to its development and we fully support its content.
- The Review Document provides a comprehensive overview of the progress made since the First Review Conference, while also highlighting existing challenges. Thereby, the document forms an ideal starting point for the development of the Lausanne Action Plan and planning the next 5 years of the Convention.

### **Agenda punt 5b: Elements for the Lausanne Action Plan**

- Allow me from the outset to compliment you and your team on the enormous amount of work that have already been invested the development of the Lausanne Action Plan and you have certainly put us on the right track for a successful outcome in November.
- We welcome your elements paper for the Lausanne Action plan and appreciate that many of the suggestion made by the Netherlands in response to questionnaire have been reflected in the elements paper.
- The LAP should provide the framework for the next 5 years of practical implementation of the convention. In this context, the Netherlands is of the view that based on the lessons learned from the DAP, the LAP should provide concrete and measurable actions that will strengthen the convention and its implementation in the 2021-2025 period.
- Therefore, we also support your support your proposal to formulate the actions in the Lausanne Action Plan according to the SMART-principle.
- For the Netherlands, the following overarching considerations are of importance in the development of the Lausanne Action Plan.
- First, as noted in the elements paper measuring success of the implementation of the actions we agree upon will largely depend on the transparency of all States Parties. Transparency is for the Netherlands an important consideration in developing the Lausanne Action Plan.
- Second, National Ownership is key for effective treaty implementation and can be complimented by capacity building efforts so that all States Parties are in a position to fulfil their treaty obligations.
- Third, it is demonstrated time and time again that inclusivity is important for the success of mine action programmes. Therefore, the Netherlands attaches great importance to mainstreaming gender and diversity in the Lausanne Action Plan.

## **Cross-cutting elements**

- The Netherlands welcomes a new section on cross-cutting elements as the development of the Review Document showed that different actions and articles of the convention are linked and their successful implementation is interdependent to each other. It would therefore be helpful to have a separate section where these cross-cutting elements are introduced.
- In our view, one element that is missing in the elements identified by you is capacity-building. The Netherlands considers this an important to ensure that all states parties are in a position to fulfil all their obligations under the Convention and demonstrate the national ownership required.
- Given the fact that these cross cutting elements are related to the different articles of the convention, it would seem more logical to stick only to principles at this section and have the actions in the parts that are directly linked to the articles of the convention.

## **Universalisation of the Convention and its norms**

- The Netherlands can agree to differentiation of the Universalisation section as proposed by the Presidency.
- Regarding the general consideration for the chapeau on promotion of formal adherence to the convention by non-parties, we would like to suggest to add: “Express concern about the lack of (high-level) political attention.” In our opinion raising of political attention for the CCM would help accelerate the rate of ratification/accession and this was also reflected as one of the challenges within the review document.

## **Stockpile destruction**

- The Netherlands thanks the Presidency for including the suggestions on transparency and capacity building made by the Netherlands in this section.
- In our view, the Lausanne Action Plan should provide the framework for the practical implementation of the obligations under the convention in a progressive manner. Timely implementation of obligations and avoidance of unnecessary extension requests should be a shared aim. Moreover, once an extension is granted, the Analysis Group should be mandated to monitor the progress made by of States Parties that have obtained an extension. This will enable States Parties to monitor the situation in full transparency.

## **Survey and Clearance**

- Besides the elements already mentioned in the general considerations, the Netherlands wishes to emphasize the importance of capacity building when it comes to Survey and Clearance. States capacities to comply with this obligation may vary, seeking assistance at an early stage will help to sustain progress and avoid unnecessary extension requests.
- We therefore suggest to add the importance of capacity building to the general considerations.

- Regarding the actions, the Netherlands would like to mention the fact that – in line with stockpile destruction - if an extension is granted, the Analysis Group should be mandated to monitor the progress made by of States Parties that have obtained an extension. This will enable States Parties to monitor the situation in full transparency.

### **Risk Reduction Education**

- The Netherlands welcomes the fact that Risk Reduction Education is now a separate section within the LAP and support this innovation. Making people aware of the risks of cluster munition remnants is a joint effort by States Parties and relevant stakeholders. It is useful to pay special attention to this.

### **International cooperation and assistance**

- The Netherlands welcomes the point on the Country Coalitions Concept and we fully support the proposal to include it in the Lausanne Action Plan as a way to ensure an inclusive in-country involving all relevant stakeholders.
- For the Netherlands, national ownership and capacity building are essential in international cooperation and assistance. Diversity, in all forms, is also crucial in this respect. We are therefore pleased that these elements are included in the general considerations.
- Transparency by the all States, but especially affected States, helps to demonstrate national ownership in fulfilling its obligations undertaken the Convention. That is why we would like to emphasize the importance of complete and yearly reporting by States Parties receiving assistance.

### **Transparency measures**

- The Netherlands thanks the Presidency for including the suggestions made by the Netherlands in this section.
- Transparency reporting is one of the essential tools that enables States Parties to monitor the implementation of obligations under the Convention.
- We would therefore like to take this opportunity to stress that all States Parties should adhere to this obligation and submit their initial and yearly reports in due time.
- The Netherlands is open to consider ways in which we can improve both the quality and quantity of reporting. In this context, we would welcome any proposals to this end.

### **National Implementation Measures**

- The Netherlands is concerned about the lack of progress on national implementation measures.
- Capacity building is an important cross-cutting theme when it comes to the development of national implementation measures.
- The Netherlands is one of the 13 States Parties that at this moment have legislation prohibiting investment in production of cluster munition.
- As mentioned in the actions, raising political profile would further this process.

### **Possible additional section on general implementation and the machinery**

- The Netherlands welcomes this new section in the LAP. In the questionnaire on the LAP we suggested to add the machinery. Also the elements identified in the working paper build on the suggestions made by the Netherlands.
- One continuous matter of concern is the payment of assessed contributions. The Netherlands hopes that adding this subject to the LAP will encourage all States Parties to respect the financial commitments.

### **Agenda punt 5d Institutional Aspects of the Implementation Support Unit**

- The Netherlands remains concerned with the low level of payment by States participating in the meeting of States Parties and States Parties of the CCM towards the ISU. In particular, the billing of non-states parties for their participation in CCM meetings carries significant risks as it is difficult to hold them accountable for non-payment. Therefore, the Netherlands advocates for a simplified payment system, by merging category 7a and 7b in one, paid only by States parties (no longer by participating States), and keeping the option for voluntary contributions 7c.
- Ideally, we would go to a system of fully voluntary contributions, but as that may be a bridge too far at this point as it risks the ISU budget not being fully met, this option could be considered at a later stage, but should in the meantime continue to be encouraged. So, the States parties are encouraged to contribute voluntarily (perhaps organizing a pledging conference as well, like the APMBC), but if that is not possible, a minimum assessed contribution still applies, based on the scale of assessment. If the ISU ends-up with more money than the budget requires, rather than putting it into the reserve, options may be explored to direct it to ‘extra-budgetary activities for the benefit of the Convention’ to be agreed on by the donors and/or States Parties.

### **Synergies ISU**

- The Netherlands encourages the ISU to continue to explore synergies with other conventions on thematic issues of common concern. In particular, on the issue of implementation and universalization there remains scope for collaboration as the convention further develops. Moreover, the Lausanne Action Plan also provides an opportunity for the States Parties to identify further synergies with other ISU’s and provide guidance on how to explore these synergies.

### **GICHD hosting agreement**

- The Netherlands remains satisfied with the implementation of the Hosting Agreement of the ISU by GICHD. Notwithstanding our satisfaction with the implementation of the Hosting Agreement of the ISU by GICHD, increasing the flexibility to amend or change the agreement, if necessary, would benefit the agility of the ISU to respond to changing circumstances.

## **Tenure of ISU Director**

- Streamlining the tenure of the ISU director with that of other similar ISU can be supported by the Netherlands. In this context, we can support the extension of the current director for two more years, this would also ensure that the current director will be closely involved in the development of the Lausanne Action Plan and the implementation in its first years. At the same time, would it allow her successor to be recruited well ahead of the third Review Conference.