

2nd Prepcom to the Review Conference of Maputo-
Statement of Belgium on point 5 of the agenda – draft
Maputo action plan

Mr President- designate ,
Dear Colleagues,

First of all I would like to thank you for all your efforts in the last run before the Review Conference of Maputo and for the preparation of the draft documents that are tabled today.

You can count on the full cooperation of Belgium to prepare the Conference and to make it a great success.

Mr President,

Belgium aligns on the statement that has been made by the EU that highlights the elements that we wish to support particularly in the draft action plan.

We appreciate that the draft is short, clear and targeted on pragmatic actions.

I would like to underline the following points :

1- As coordinator of the contact group on universalization, we are very satisfied with the provisions included in the draft action plan in this regards particularly those related to the Non States Parties being able to make a political commitment to subscribe to at least some of the obligations of the convention if they are in a position where they feel unable to accede to it in the short term.

2- Also targeting assistance to those states that significantly support mine action is a sensible incentive to commit Non State Parties to some of the obligations of the convention.

Although the ultimate goal is to reach the goal of making of the Convention of Ottawa a universal instrument, finding a way to bring NSP closer to the objectives of the convention and in the same time reducing the number of potential victims of anti personnel mines is extremely important.

3- About reporting, Action 7 (on mine clearance) and 13 & 14 (on victim assistance) are expressing the need for accurate information for guiding our work in those fields. The “Roadmap for a better reporting”, submitted by Belgium in December 2012 mentioned the need for a better guidance in reporting on Victim Assistance. We welcome the acknowledgment of the importance of reporting for guiding our work within the Convention.

However, we have some questions on the request for reports foreseen in these actions: is it the intention to create a parallel reporting process for these issues or is this request to be seen in the framework of the Article 7 reporting process. It seems to us that it would be inopportune to create an extra reporting burden.

About the specific actions on reporting :

- We'd like to see a reference in action 24 to the use of simplified procedures for reporting, for State Parties without implementation obligations.

- The feedback on reporting foreseen in action 25 will not only enhance cooperation and assistance but will also guide us in managing our future work.

We have already provided wording for both proposals and would happy to see it reflected in the document.

Mr President, we have some additional comments on the document on the new machinery that will be discussed under point 6 of the agenda and I'll come back on these points when we start the discussions on this point of the agenda.

2nd Prepcom to the Review Conference of Maputo-
Statement of Belgium on point 6 of the agenda – the new
machinery

Mr President ,

Her again Belgium aligns to the EU statement but I would like to add some additional remarks at national level.

We understand that the priorities highlighted on the action plan need to be implemented by the right tools to give as much efficiency as possible to the priorities .

We some of the initiatives and changes that we find very useful.

We support the creation of a committee on article 5 on implementation and of a committee on cooperative compliance. As it is proposed that intersessional meetings would not be more than 2 days long, it is very important that these new committees are able to prepare work before hand and can present analysis and reports to the intersessional meetings and Meetings of the State Parties.

Nevertheless we are quite doubtful on the idea suggested to create a Special Envoy on assistance to anti personnel victims. We recognize of course that victims assistance remains a crucial part of the objectives of the OTTAWA Convention but we do not see clearly what the added value would be of a Special Envoy on victim assistance.

Besides at a time when all State parties have to face budgetary cuts it seems to us the available potential contributions should not be devoted to a new structure. It is true that the draft on the new machinery mentions that “the designation of a Special Envoy would not need any financial cost given that the main opportunities to represent the State Parties’ views on victim assistance are within Geneva based forum” but art 29 of the action plan states that “all states parties will adequately

share the burden of the costs of the implementation machinery that they have established “ and we would definitely appreciate a certain clarification about that.

We would like in any case to see art.29 modified as follows as other delegations have suggested :“all states parties will adequately share, on a voluntary basis, the burden of the costs of the implementation machinery that they have established “ .

We support the proposal that has been made in the non paper by Austria and we also see the need for a more substantive structure than the suggested experts forum mentioned in the new machinery on victim assistance.

We would support the creation of a committee on victim assistance that would be in a position to assist States in their implementation of the Maputo action plan.

Mr President, I'd like to thank you again for all the work that has been done in the preparation of the review conference .