

Geneva, 11-21 December 2001

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 11 December 2001, at 11 a.m.

Acting President: Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden), President
of the First Review Conference

President: Mr. LUCK (Australia)

CONTENTS

OPENING OF THE SECOND REVIEW CONFERENCE

SUBMISSION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE
CONFERENCE

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of the Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

GE.01-66343 (E) 141201 181201

CONTENTS (continued)

ELECTION OF VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE, CHAIRS AND VICE-CHAIRS OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE, THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND THE MAIN COMMITTEES

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE

APPOINTMENT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

ORGANIZATION OF WORK INCLUDING THAT OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONFERENCE

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

OPENING OF THE SECOND REVIEW CONFERENCE (item 1 of the provisional agenda)

1. Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden), President of the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, declared open the Second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention. In his opening statement he said that, as Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts, he had been involved in the Convention process for a long time and considered it to be an innovative and indispensable international legal instrument which had significantly reduced the number of innocent victims among civilian populations. Noting that 88 States had acceded to the Convention, he stated his view that adherence to the Convention was not yet sufficiently high and that the issue of universalization of the Convention must be a priority for the current Review Conference. The international community was, however, moving in the right direction, as evidenced by the increase in numbers of States agreeing to be bound by the provisions of amended Protocol II (63 States), and those ratifying Protocol IV (60 States).

SUBMISSION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (item 2 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/CONF.II/PC.1/1, PC.2/1 and PC.3/1)

2. Mr. LUCK (Australia) said that the Preparatory Committee had held three sessions, on 14 December 2000, 6 April 2001 and 24-28 September 2001, and that open-ended informal consultations had also been held from 27 to 31 August 2001. All procedural and substantive issues necessary for the Second Review Conference to begin its work had been addressed, the rules of procedure had been approved for recommendation to the Review Conference and the costs of the Review Conference had been considered and approved.

3. The Preparatory Committee had considered proposals on the following issues: scope of the Convention; compliance; explosive remnants of war; mines other than anti-personnel mines; and small calibre weapons and ammunition. In addition, delegations had submitted proposals for the text of the final declaration. There had been no consensus on the proposals but a considerable degree of convergence had been achieved among delegations. Accordingly, he had undertaken to prepare a compilation of the proposals, contained in annex III to the report of the Preparatory Committee's third session (CCW/CONF.II/PC.3/1), which he believed to be a fair reflection of the stage achieved in its work. He proposed that the Review Conference should consider the proposals, under items 14 and 15 of the provisional agenda, taking into account all relevant statements, working papers and other documents submitted in the course of the preparatory process.

4. Noting that all decisions of the Preparatory Committee had been taken by consensus and in a constructive and cooperative atmosphere, and that a large number of highly technical documents had been submitted, which attested to the serious commitment and efforts of all involved, he believed that its work presented a sound basis for the successful outcome of the Second Review Conference.

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE (item 3 of the provisional agenda)

5. The ACTING PRESIDENT said that rule 6 of the draft rules of procedure provided that the Conference should elect a president from among the States parties participating in the Conference. At the first plenary meeting of its second session, on 2 April 2001, the Second Preparatory Committee had unanimously decided to nominate Mr. Luck (Australia) as the President-Designate of the Review Conference. He took it that it was the wish of the Conference to confirm Mr. Luck in that office.

6. Mr. Luck (Australia) was elected President of the Conference by acclamation.

7. Mr. Luck (Australia) took the Chair.

8. The PRESIDENT, following his election, thanked his predecessor, Mr. Molander, and hoped that he would prove a worthy successor, working in a fair, transparent and efficient manner. He echoed the sentiments expressed by Mr Molander, namely, the need for broader adherence to the Convention and to ensure that it remained relevant to modern conflicts.

9. Reviewing the work done by the Preparatory Committee under his chairmanship, he expressed gratitude to those delegations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and interested non-governmental organizations which had submitted imaginative and thoughtful proposals, conducive to strengthening and enhancing the appeal of the Convention. He believed that the preparatory work for the Review Conference had been thorough, comprehensive and balanced and provided a sound basis for further progress and informed decisions. The Conference had an opportunity to invigorate the Convention with fresh vitality. He also paid tribute to and welcomed the continued participation of the Friends of the Chair, who had enabled the Preparatory Committee to come forward with mature proposals.

10. He drew attention to the proposed programme of work that he had circulated, and to the duties allocated to the two main committees: Main Committee I being entrusted with reviewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its annexed protocols, consideration of any proposals relating to the Convention or to protocols annexed thereto and the preparation and consideration of the final documents, and Main Committee II with consideration of proposals for additional protocols to the Convention, on such areas as explosive remnants of war, anti-vehicle mines and small calibre weapons and ammunition. As provided in the rules of procedure for the First Review Conference, plenary meetings and meetings of Main Committees would be held in public unless otherwise decided. He envisaged, however, that the discussion of proposals would be held in private but would be guided by the Chairs of the Main Committees. He was confident that the Review Conference would bring a new dynamic to the Convention process and would help reduce the indiscriminate effects of certain conventional weapons on civilians and combatants alike.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (item 4 of the provisional agenda) (CCW/CONF.II/1)

11. The PRESIDENT said that he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt the agenda contained in document CCW/CONF.II/1, approved by the Preparatory Committee at its third session and recommended for adoption by the Review Conference.

12. The agenda was adopted.

ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE (agenda item 5)

13. The PRESIDENT said that, at the first meeting of its first session, on 14 December 2001, the Preparatory Committee had agreed to apply, mutatis mutandis, the same rules of procedure as adopted by the First Review Conference with oral amendments. The Committee had agreed to recommend that the Conference adopt the rules of procedure, as contained in annex II to the report of the First Review Conference (CCW/CONF.I/16). As recommended by the Preparatory Committee, he affirmed that, with regard to rule 34, in the deliberations and negotiations relating to the Convention and its annexed protocols, High Contracting Parties had proceeded on the basis of consensus and no decisions had been taken by vote. In addition, he noted with regard to rule 35 that, at its third session, the Preparatory Committee had agreed to two, and not three, main committees. That rule and other rules referring to main committees would need to be adjusted accordingly.

14. The rules of procedure, as orally amended, were adopted.

CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 6)

15. The PRESIDENT said that, at the first meeting of its first session, on 14 December 2000, the Preparatory Committee, noting that the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs had designated Mr. Vladimir Bogomolov, Political Affairs Officer in the Geneva Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, to serve as provisional Secretary-General of the Conference, had decided to confirm Mr. Bogomolov as provisional Secretary-General of the Conference on the understanding that he would perform that function until the convening of the Conference, at which time his nomination would need to be confirmed. He took it that it was the wish of the Conference to confirm Mr. Bogomolov in that office.

16. Mr. Bogomolov was confirmed as Secretary-General of the Review Conference.

ELECTION OF VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE, CHAIRS AND VICE-CHAIRS OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE, THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND THE MAIN COMMITTEES (agenda item 7)

17. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 6 of the rules of procedure, the Conference should elect from among the States parties participating in the Conference 10 Vice-Presidents, as well as the Chair and a Vice-Chair for each of the two

main committees, the Drafting Committee and the Credentials Committee. Those officers should be elected so as to ensure the representative character of the General Committee provided for under rule 10.

18. Turning to the election of the Vice-Presidents of the Conference, he said that the candidates for the 10 posts were as follows: Mr. Ali (Bangladesh), Mr. Sha (China), Ms. Cek (Croatia), Mr. de La Fortelle (France), Mr. Albin (Mexico), Mr. Jakubowski (Poland), Mr. Petöcz (Slovakia), Mr. Nene (South Africa), Mr. Faessler (Switzerland), and Mr. Cummings (United States of America).

19. He had received the following nominations for the offices of Chair and Vice-Chair of each of the two main committees, the Drafting Committee and the Credentials Committee: Mr. Sood (India) and Mr. Pearson (New Zealand) as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of Main Committee I; Mr. Sanders (Netherlands) and Ms. Filip (Romania) as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of Main Committee II; Mr. Akram (Pakistan) and Mr. Noboru (Japan) as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Drafting Committee; and Mr. Kolarov (Bulgaria) and Mr. Lint (Belgium) as Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, of the Credentials Committee.

20. The candidates, as named, were elected by acclamation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS (agenda item 8)

21. Mr. DHANAPALA (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs) read a message to the Second Review Conference from the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Secretary-General said that since the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons had been signed in 1980, enormous changes had occurred in the world's geopolitical and security structures. The cold war had ended, replaced with a still-evolving global framework. New kinds of conflicts had emerged. And most recently, with terrorist attacks on the United States, the international community had been confronted with terrible new security challenges.

22. Throughout that period, and with all those changes, the Convention had continued to demonstrate its importance. The humanitarian principles embodied by the Convention were eternal, unaffected by technological changes, strategic realignments, or new ways of waging war. And yet, the Convention was a living instrument that could be adjusted and updated to keep abreast of new developments.

23. He said that he was pleased that the States parties were doing just that, and were considering an impressive range of proposals. With internal conflicts now claiming many more casualties than wars between States, and with small calibre weapons and explosive remnants of war continuing to cause avoidable deaths, injury and hardship, an expansion of the scope of the Convention to cover those issues was clearly warranted.

24. The international community must also bear in mind the death and devastation caused every year by mines. Like explosive remnants of war, the destructive power of mines was not limited to the violent explosions that killed and maimed. Mines also killed quietly, by rendering

precious land unfit for agriculture or settlement, thereby hampering a country's economic and social development. The Convention's Amended Protocol II had an important role to play in addressing that issue, and he called on those countries that had not yet signed or ratified that instrument to do so without delay, joining the States parties that had met on Monday, 10 December 2001, in an effort to promote universal adherence to its provisions.

25. The Convention saved lives and reduced suffering while protecting the security interests of States parties, and did not impose large burdens, financial or otherwise, on its members. Regretting that there were not more than 99 States parties, he urged the Review Conference to consider practical steps that could be taken to encourage more accessions in the near future and strongly encouraged delegations to use the Second Review Conference - a milestone in the life of the instrument - to ensure that the Convention remained strong, healthy and effective as it entered its third decade of operation.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING THE COSTS OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 9)

26. The PRESIDENT said that, at its first session on 14 December 2001, the Preparatory Committee had approved the estimated costs of the Review Conference and the three sessions of its Preparatory Committee, as contained in annex III of the report of the first session of the Preparatory Committee (CCW/CONF.II/PC.1/1).

27. At its second session, on 6 April 2001, the Preparatory Committee had decided to convene informal open-ended consultations in Geneva in August 2001 and, in that connection, had approved the cost estimates for that session as contained in annex IV to its report (CCW/CONF.II/PC.2/1). During the Committee's second session, a number of delegations had emphasized that the budgetary decision had been taken on the understanding that the costs of the informal consultations in August 2001 would be covered by savings made on the provisions of services to the Preparatory Committee at its second session. Accordingly, the actual expenditure of the informal consultations would be apportioned among the participants at the time of final billing for the second session when total actual expenditures had been recorded.

28. In accordance with rule 16 of the draft rules of procedure, the costs of the Review Conference would be met by the States parties to the Convention participating in the Review Conference based on the United Nations scale of assessment to the regular budget, prorated to take into account the number of States parties participating in the Conference. States which were not States parties to the Convention and which had accepted the invitation to take part in the Review Conference would share in the costs to the extent of their respective rates of assessment under the United Nations scale. States had been informed about their assessed share of the estimated costs of the Conference in a note verbale to that effect.

29. He said that he would take it that the Conference wished to adopt those arrangements.

30. It was so decided.

APPOINTMENT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (agenda item 10)

31. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with rule 4 of the rules of procedure, the Credentials Committee would consist of five members elected by the Conference on the proposal of the President. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Credentials Committee having just been elected, he proposed China, Cuba and Germany as the three remaining members.

32. China, Cuba and Germany were elected members of the Credentials Committee.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK INCLUDING THAT OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONFERENCE (agenda item 11)

33. The PRESIDENT said that, with the adoption of the rules of procedure, the Conference had established a General Committee, two main committees, the Drafting Committee and the Credentials Committee. He suggested that Main Committee I should review the scope and operation of the Convention and annexed Protocols, consider any proposals relating to the Convention or Protocols, and prepare and consider the final documents, while Main Committee II would consider proposals for additional Protocols. In accordance with rule 44 of the rules of procedure, plenary meetings of the Conference and main committees would be held in public unless the body concerned decided otherwise; meetings of other committees and working groups would be held in private. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Conference approved those arrangements.

34. It was so decided.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (agenda item 12)

35. Mr. LINT (Belgium), making, on behalf of the European Union, a statement to which, he said, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia also subscribed, assured the President of the Union's full cooperation.

36. The European Union condemned terrorism in all its forms. It had approved a plan of action to counter terrorism on 21 September; on 10 December the Council of the European Union had decided to launch a targeted initiative to respond effectively to the threat of terrorism in the field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. It considered there was an urgent need to strengthen the relevant multilateral agreements, make them truly universal and ensure that they were effectively applied. The present Conference afforded an opportunity to strengthen humanitarian law on the subject of conventional weapons and voice a common determination to deny terrorists access to the wherewithal to commit their odious acts.

37. The principal objective of the Convention and its annexed Protocols was to protect civilians and their property, either by banning the use of certain particularly cruel and inhumane weapons or by restricting their use in any circumstances in which lives might be lost, civilians injured or civilian property damaged. He welcomed the accession of 24 further States since the previous Review Conference. In that connection he also emphasized the importance of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of

Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (the Ottawa Convention), to which 122 States were now party. The European Union would continue to work for the universal acceptance and application of those agreements.

38. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the European Union had voiced their support for the Convention and hailed the Conference as an opportunity to assess its implementation and assume further commitments. The Union regarded the proposal on explosive remnants of war as being of the highest priority among those submitted for consideration. In addition to killing and maiming people who had never been among their intended targets, unexploded ordnance hampered humanitarian relief operations and slowed the reconstruction of war-torn regions. The problem of unexploded submunitions required special attention. As had been pointed out in the Preparatory Committee, a settlement on the question of explosive remnants of war would be of military as well as humanitarian benefit. The European Union therefore supported the establishment of a group of experts on the topic, and was particularly anxious that its mandate should allow negotiations on a new protocol to begin in early 2002. Logically, the group should commence with a period of exploratory discussions before moving on to negotiations. The proposal to that effect from the Netherlands deserved to be widely supported. The question of submunitions must figure prominently among the group's discussions.

39. The European Union favoured enlarging the scope of the Convention and Protocols to cover non-international armed conflicts; it hoped the principle could be made as far-reaching as possible and incorporated into the Convention forthwith. Protocol II - the most recent to be negotiated - set a precedent that could be extended to the entire Convention. The Union also supported the proposal to tighten the rules applicable to landmines other than anti-personnel mines, and was prepared to study the question of small-arms ballistics.

40. The European Union attached great importance to enforcement mechanisms for legal instruments generally, and emphasized that such mechanisms, simple but effective, must be made part of the Convention. At present the Convention said nothing on the subject of compliance. Logically, the strong commitments made by States parties to the Convention regime should be accompanied by provisions guaranteeing that they would be honoured.

41. The Union was pleased that all the agreements associated with the Convention had entered into force, and reiterated its commitment to honour their objectives.

42. Agreement must be reached on more regular reviews, enabling States parties to discuss and strengthen the Convention and related rules. The yearly reviews of the amended Protocol II had shown the value of such an exercise. The European Union hoped provision would be made in the final document for an appropriate mechanism for the entire Convention regime, allowing meetings of the States parties to be held between review conferences. The first such meeting should take place in 2002, and the States attending it should be mandated to decide on the subsequent meeting.

43. The three sessions of the Preparatory Committee had enabled delegations to fine-tune the proposals on which the Conference must pronounce; thanks were due to the Chairman of that Committee and the Friends of the Chair for their crucial efforts. The Conference must now confirm the resolve to strengthen humanitarian norms, and the European Union would continue to work actively to that end.

44. Mr. LIVERMORE (Canada) said that, while the international community's mobilization against terrorism might be new, armed conflict within and between States had been having devastating effects on civilians for centuries. The Convention was based on the principle that the parties to an armed conflict did not have an unlimited right to choice of methods or means of warfare. Recent years had witnessed unconscionable human suffering resulting from conflicts: that situation need not and must not continue.

45. Foremost for his delegation was the need to address the humanitarian impact of unexploded cluster bomb munitions and other explosive remnants of war. Civilians should not be terrorized by hazardous unexploded munitions. A group of governmental experts should be established to consider a wide range of ideas relating to the subject. A variety of ideas had already been put forward. His delegation believed that meaningful progress could be made by seeking to prevent explosive munitions from becoming unexploded ordnance, by facilitating clearance and warning civilians about the dangers of such ordnance, and by providing the information required to allow clearance to proceed and warn civilians. The group of experts might consider both generalized approaches to the dangers of unexploded ordnance and specific approaches to particular munitions. Canada respected the views of those who did not wish to establish a specific timetable for the group's endeavours but felt it was important to maintain a serious and deliberate pace, consistent with the gravity of the problem. A comprehensive resolution of matters relating to explosive remnants of war could be achieved within two years.

46. Canada supported the proposed amendment of article 1 of the Convention so as to extend its scope to armed conflicts not of an international character, and would prefer that extension to apply to all future protocols unless their drafters decided otherwise.

47. The majority of the world's States had responded to the First Review Conference's unfinished business on anti-personnel mines by establishing a comprehensive ban on such mines through the Ottawa Convention, to which he urged States that had not yet done so to accede. Much work remained to be done on mines other than anti-personnel mines, and Canada appreciated the extent to which the United States of America and others had promoted discussions on the subject. The irresponsible use of mines other than anti-personnel mines posed a humanitarian problem and all too often resulted in human tragedy; they could block humanitarian aid to vulnerable populations once hostilities had ceased, increase the costs of normal or emergency food distribution and prevent or delay the socio-economic development of war-torn communities. Canada therefore supported the development of ideas to reduce the humanitarian impact of such mines, developing minimum detectability standards and requiring the mines, when delivered remotely, to be equipped with self-destruct and self-deactivation features.

48. The collegial and productive atmosphere during the preparatory process had helped to ensure that a cooperative spirit had prevailed over the past year, offering the potential to strengthen and enhance the Convention. Canada was therefore receptive to the idea of holding more frequent meetings of the High Contracting Parties. Regular assessments of its status and operation and discussions of new areas to explore would demonstrate the vitality of the Convention. Progress in discussions on verification and facilitation of compliance could also enhance the Convention and ensure its legitimacy.

49. The civilians whose lives were threatened by armed conflict could not wait for action. The world also had a moral obligation to assist the countless individuals who, because of past conflicts, were living with disabilities, had lost loved ones or whose communities and lives had been ravaged. The memory of those who had lost their lives as a result of the activities of war should be honoured by ensuring that, in future, civilians were truly protected against the effects of hostilities.

50. Mr. SKOTNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was ready to support the proposals submitted during the review process that were aimed at strengthening the Convention and Protocols and making them truly universal.

51. The new challenges the world faced seemed to have been grasped by the international community only after the shock of 11 September. Many things needed to be looked at afresh, including the need for an uncompromising struggle against terrorism such as his country was having to wage. Resolute support of the anti-terrorist coalition was a natural extension of the Russian Federation's persistent policy.

52. The efforts made during the Conference should be part and parcel of efforts to secure strategic stability by preserving and strengthening current agreements on international security and disarmament. The Conference might also give some impetus to the stalled multilateral talks on disarmament matters.

53. The Russian Federation had been active in drafting the Convention and one of the first countries to ratify it and the annexed Protocols; ratification of the amended Protocol II would be forthcoming very shortly. Its armed forces had taken steps to ensure that the Convention and Protocols would be studied and complied with.

54. The Convention and Protocols had struck the right balance between the need to ensure security and to protect the civilian population; financial and economic matters had been given due attention. That being so, care must be taken not to add to the Convention provisions that might impede the process of universalization, or to create a situation where some States stood by the existing version while a few others acceded to an amended text. The original balance of interests must be maintained.

55. His delegation was willing to discuss extending the scope of the Convention and existing Protocols to armed conflicts of a non-international character; the scope of each future protocol should be determined separately. Work on the problem of explosive remnants of war could be

conducted in the post-Conference period. Other proposals submitted during the preparatory process required thorough analysis. The principle of decision-taking by consensus must be strictly complied with.

56. Mr. CUMMINGS (United States of America) said that the Convention was a strong, integral part of international humanitarian law, whose purposes it served largely by enlisting military, diplomatic and legal experts alike in the crafting of the rules it enshrined: as a result, those who had to wage wars were often also involved in regulating the weapons of war. Securing universal adherence to the Convention and its Protocols must be the goal of the States parties.

57. The Convention was the only instrument in international humanitarian law specifically designed to be adapted to changing means of waging war. The challenge was to decide how to adapt it so that it remained relevant. The preparatory process for the Conference had revealed nearly universal support for the proposition that the Convention and its Protocols should apply in non-international armed conflict, and there appeared to be broad agreement that article 1 of the Convention itself should be amended to that effect. Regarding future protocols his delegation took a flexible stance, largely because future review conferences would always have the authority to expand or restrict their scope even if the Convention itself generally applied to all armed conflicts.

58. The amended Protocol II and the Ottawa Convention did not, even in combination, fully regulate or ban landmines, and the problems posed by anti-vehicle mines needed to be addressed. Research by the International Committee of the Red Cross had demonstrated that indiscriminate use of anti-vehicle landmines not only risked causing injury to civilians but effectively denied humanitarian aid to civilian populations in need. A proposal to minimize the threat posed by such mines would be discussed at the Conference: its three component elements - detectability, self-destruction or self-neutralization with back-up self-deactivation for remotely delivered mines, and restrictions on the transfer of prohibited mines - were in accord with the technical restrictions on anti-personnel landmines found in amended Protocol II. Nonetheless, anti-vehicle mines remained an integral part of his and most other nations' military capabilities. The proposal was, in his delegation's view an achievable, responsible way to help protect civilians, peacekeepers, aid workers and others while maintaining the legitimate military uses of anti-vehicle mines. Some felt it did not go far enough; but seeking to do more, if that "more" lay years in the future, was unacceptable. The Conference could take action immediately, without prejudice to later steps to ensure that anti-vehicle landmines met even stricter standards.

59. His delegation had submitted a proposal for a compliance mechanism under amended Protocol II, which would be available only to States that became a party to that mechanism. Other proposals before the Conference sought to address the issue of compliance more generally. He recognized that many delegations were unpersuaded of the need to add a compliance regime of any kind to the Convention and its Protocols, but continued to urge adoption of his delegation's proposal.

60. He commended ICRC and the Netherlands delegation for drawing attention to the problems of unexploded ordnance left behind after a conflict. Discussion of that matter under the Convention had the potential to advance the humanitarian protection that the Convention envisaged. His delegation supported the efforts by the Netherlands Friend of the Chair to conclude a draft mandate on the explosive remnants of war for adoption at the Conference.

61. His delegation was on record as opposing the adoption of a new protocol to deal with issues associated with small-calibre bullets. Although it remained opposed to the proposal on the subject submitted by the Swiss delegation, it applauded Switzerland's continuing commitment to advance the goals of the Convention and the dedication and careful work behind the submission.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.