



Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (APMBC)

Intersessional meeting

19-20 May 2016

Statement by Ms. Palma D'Ambrosio, Deputy-Permanent Representative
Delegation of Italy to the Conference on Disarmament

Synergies

Madam President,

During the past two days, several delegations have stressed how working across instruments that entail similar commitments, in particular the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions, could prove very valuable to work better, and faster, allowing us to meet our common, ambitious goal of the “last stretch”.

As we pointed out in previous meetings, a contaminated land is unusable and dangerous; a victim is a victim; little difference does it make that these are so because of landmines, cluster munitions, or other kinds of unexploded ordnance. Joining forces and exploiting opportunities for cooperation, especially in areas in which the commitments of these two Conventions significantly overlap, can only help us to reach our goals more efficiently and rapidly.

As we all know, the States Parties of both Conventions have entrusted the respective Presidencies with the task of exploring potential synergies between these instruments, particularly at the implementation support level. Italy intends to provide an input into this process, that we will be eager to further discuss with interested parties.

In our view, there are two main possibilities for synergies between the CCM and MBT ISUs, which may be complementary. Their primary goal is to ensure that resources for each Convention are used efficiently, so that eventual surplus can be invested in more activities in support of States Parties' implementation. Such synergies would also allow the two regimes to capitalize on, and learn from, each other's experiences and efforts; to avoid duplicating or overlapping efforts; and to promote coherent policies and programmes for both instruments.

The first possibility involves cooperation in areas that are thematically similar. In these, the

potential for mutual learning and increased effectiveness is high, because implementing strategies and related challenges are similar, and so is, as a consequence, the kind of support that the ISUs are likely requested to provide. These could include clearance, victim assistance, and cooperation and assistance, areas that reflect key operational commitments of both instruments and on which both have appointed coordinating entities or individuals to promote implementation. Another area is represented by transparency measures, which rely on a national reporting mechanism in both the MBT and the CCM.

Cooperation in these domains could take several forms, from information exchange to joint outreach activities; from joint documentation centers to joint training and capacity-building activities. In relation to transparency measures, cooperation could take the form of a harmonized approach to reporting, with synchronized deadlines and joint technical programmes to assist requesting states in collecting and managing information at the national level. This would be particularly useful to address the phenomenon of “reporting fatigue”, often present where reporting commitments multiply.

A second, more elaborate possibility for synergy, which could also entail cost reductions, is represented by the merging of the CCM and APMBC ISUs into one Secretariat. The current model of distinct units that share administrative services would be replaced by an integrated structure serving both Conventions equally, and consisting of different branches to coincide with different operational roles.

In this case, a system should be devised to ensure that each Convention’s membership supports the share of services it uses. In addition, clear lines of accountability would be established to ensure that, while serving both regimes, the Secretariat would be responsible to the respective sets of States Parties. Let me underline that there are successful examples that could give us some useful indications, such as the currently Joint Secretariat of the Chemical Conventions of Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm.

We believe that exploring cooperation opportunities across the Ottawa and Oslo Conventions could lead us to a more effective, efficient and comprehensive action in support of both Conventions’ implementation. For this reason, we will be eager to explore our ideas with interested delegations and see how they could contribute to the process that the MBT and CCM Presidencies will soon start.

Thank you, Madam President