
**Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the
Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on
the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which
May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious
or to Have Indiscriminate Effects**

17 November 2009
English
Original: French

Geneva, 7–13 November 2007

Summary record of the 3rd meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 8 November 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Verros..... (Greece)

Contents

Compliance mechanism applicable to the Convention (*continued*)

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 Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the sessions of this Meeting will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Compliance mechanism applicable to the Convention (agenda item 9) (*continued*)

(b) *Consideration of matters arising from the information provided by the High Contracting Parties according to paragraph 5 of this Decision*

1. **Mr. Kolarov** (Secretary-General of the Meeting) gave a brief practical presentation of the part of the United Nations Internet site devoted to the Convention (<http://www.unog.ch/disarmament>) in order to illustrate the measures that had been taken to implement the decision on the compliance mechanism applicable to the Convention. He emphasized that, pursuant to a decision taken the previous year to the effect that the Secretary-General should ensure the transmission of the information received from the States parties to other Contracting Parties, the secretariat's current databases (the list in French and English of States that had submitted their annual reports under Protocol V, and the list of experts, for example) could not for the time being be publicly displayed on the site. A link to the databases could certainly be created on the "Compliance" page, to enable States parties that so wished to obtain a user name and a password in order to access the information that interested them. It was, however, up to the States parties at the meeting to decide whether they wished, by means of the draft forms they had received, to authorize the secretariat to release the information they had provided (national reports, contact details for national experts, etc.).

2. **Mr. Tornberg** (Sweden) explained, in response to the previous day's request from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on national weapons project review mechanisms, that Sweden had had such a mechanism since 1974, when it had created, by Government decision, the Delegation for International Humanitarian Law Monitoring of Arms Projects. The Delegation's task was to examine all weapons projects in order to ensure that the weapons used by the Swedish armed forces met Sweden's international obligations. Its current mandate was contained in an order published in 1994, which replaced the above-mentioned previous decision and provided that weapons projects should be examined in the light of international law and in accordance with article 36 of Protocol I Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts.

3. The Delegation comprised eight members who were elected by the Government, including lawyers specializing in national or international law, members of the armed forces, medical personnel and weapons technology experts. It was an independent body; its status was equivalent to that of a State agency. It was therefore not a Government body and, in accordance with the Constitution, the Government could not influence its decisions. However, appeals against its decisions could be lodged with the Government.

4. If a weapons project did not meet the requirements of international law, the Delegation could ask the competent authorities to modify its design, consider alternatives or restrict the use of the weapons under consideration. It was also authorized to undertake any review of weapons projects that it considered necessary.

5. He said that his Government considered that a weapons review mechanism should meet the four following essential criteria: it should be independent; it should be authorized to undertake reviews; the public should have access to its decisions and be able to request initiation of a review process; and the armed forces should have to notify it as a matter of course of any planned acquisition of new weapons.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.