



European Union
Statement by

**Mr Jérôme Legrand, Political Officer,
European External Action Service**

Second Preparatory Meeting for the Maputo Review Conference

Agenda Item 6

Geneva, 10 April 2014

- CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY -

**European Union Speaking Points for the
Second Preparatory Meeting for the Maputo Review Conference,
10th April 2014, Geneva**

Agenda item 6: Exchange of views on the proposed post-Third Review Conference machinery and meetings

First of all, the EU and its Member States would like to thank you for your draft document titled *Proposal for a meeting programme and related implementation machinery 2014–2019*. In our view, it sets a reasonable course for the Convention and its States Parties for the next five years. We have read with interest your approach as regards the new working programme 2014–2019.

We support the proposal to continue annual meetings of the State Parties until 2019, and continue to believe that a structured preparatory process in the form of inter-sessional meetings is necessary. We appreciate your efforts to optimise the costs and rationalise the schedule and work of various meetings relating to the implementation of the Convention.

While recognizing the sovereign right of States to be bound only by the treaties to which they have acceded to, we support the development of synergies in the implementation of international humanitarian disarmament instruments, as applicable.

We agree that the implementation of the ambitious Maputo Action Plan will depend on structure efficiency. We hope that these structures will function well. Their performance will depend on the willingness and efficiency of their members and, ultimately, on all of us.

Allow me, Mr. President-Designate, to offer some comments on specific points.

The Committee on Article 5 Implementation

While being conscious of the challenges faced by affected countries, we are concerned by the increasing number of requests for extension.

We are of the view that this Committee is important for the life of the Convention. Its role in the process of screening of extension requests should be preserved in the future. In this context, we welcome the participation of ICBL and ICRC representatives, whose expertise brought an added value to the Committee. We would advise you to keep the reference to their presence along with the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) in the Committee if not in formal at least in an informal manner.

The Committee on Cooperative Compliance

We are thankful for the proposal to create this Committee, which will, in our opinion, be important. It should welcome the input of experts from ICRC and ICBL, and should address the use of anti-personnel mines and other breaches of the Convention pursuant to art 1 (1) of the Convention.

Special Envoy of the States Parties and Experts Forum on Assistance to mine Victims

We firmly believe that the humanitarian dimension of mine action – victim assistance – should remain a key priority of the States Parties. The EU has always understood mine action as a key vehicle for the wider post-conflict rehabilitation of mine-affected societies. With regard to the proposal to establish a special envoy for assistance to anti-personnel mine victims we would like to know more about financial implications and possible benefits to anti-personnel mine victims of such a proposal.

Coordinators on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance

The EU is of the opinion that coordinated cooperation and assistance is vital. Resources are scarce, and needs are still evident so we should do more to optimise the use of mine-action-related assistance. Coordination among state donors, including those that are not parties to the Convention, international organisations and private sector has increased, but not sufficiently. We note the idea to establish coordinators or a coordinator for cooperation and assistance.

The Role of the President of the Meetings of the States Parties and Review Conferences

The role of the president of the meetings of the States Parties and review conferences is well established. According to us, the States Parties should continue the existing practice.

The Role and Composition of the Coordinating Committee

We believe that the Coordinating Committee plays a major role in the everyday life of the Convention and that this role should be preserved. We agree that the Committee should keep its mandate and that it should be chaired by the current president. We are of the opinion that the current chair should set the agenda and call the meetings of the Committee.

The Purpose of Inter-Sessional Meetings and the Purpose of Meetings of the States Parties

We welcome the ideas put forward by the President-Designate and believe that past experience and lessons learned should be given due consideration. As regards inter-sessional meetings, we agree with your proposal to keep them on the global level in Geneva, rather than having them on the regional level. Inter-sessional meetings should be less formal, shorter and rationalised. We also believe that the agenda should be flexible and could be decided on annually at the meetings of States Parties by all of us, rather than by the Coordinating Committee.

Thank you Mr. President-Designate.