

**GROUP OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS 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**

CCW/GGE/2008-II/3
16 April 2008

Original: ENGLISH

**2008, Second Session
Geneva, 7 – 11 April 2008
Item 9 of the Agenda
Adoption of procedural report**

PROCEDURAL REPORT

Submitted by the Secretariat

1. The 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 (CCW) held at Geneva from 7 to 13 November 2007 decided, as contained in paragraph 37 of its Report (CCW/MSP/2007/5), that:

“The Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) will negotiate a proposal to address urgently the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions, while striking a balance between military and humanitarian considerations.

The GGE should make every effort to negotiate this proposal as rapidly as possible and report on the progress made to the next Meeting of the High Contracting Parties in November 2008.

The work of the GGE will be supported by military and technical experts. The GGE will meet in 2008 not less than three times for a total of up to seven weeks, as follows:

- 14 – 18 January
- 7 – 31 July
- 1 – 5 September
- 3 – 7 November

The Chairperson of the GGE, in consultation with the regional groups, shall decide on the duration of the second and the third sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts.”

2. Pursuant to the relevant decision of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to appoint “a representative of the Western European and Others Group as Chairperson of the Group of Governmental Experts” as contained in paragraph 41 of its Report (CCW/MSP/2007/5), the Group of Governmental Experts was chaired by Ambassador Bent Wigotski of Denmark.

3. Pursuant to the relevant decision of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties, the Chairperson of the Group of Governmental Experts in consultation with the regional groups decided at its first 2008 session that the second 2008 session of the Group of Governmental Experts would be held from 7 to 11 April 2008, as contained in paragraph 17 of its Procedural Report (CCW/GGE/2008-I/3). The third 2008 session of the Group in July would be shortened and would end one week earlier than scheduled by the 2007 Meeting of the High Contracting Parties.
4. The second 2008 session of the Group of Governmental Experts was held at Geneva from 7 to 11 April 2008.
5. The following States Parties to the Convention participated in the work of the Group: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela.
6. The following Signatory States to the Convention also participated in the work of the Group: Afghanistan, Egypt and Sudan.
7. The following States not parties to the Convention participated as observers: Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burundi, Chad, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ghana, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Oman, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, and United Arab Emirates.
8. The representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), and United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) took part in the work of the Group.
9. The representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) took part in the work of the Group. The representatives of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and the European Commission also participated in the work of the Group.
10. The representatives of the following non-governmental organisations took part in the work of the Group: Cluster Munition Coalition, Danchurch Aid, Handicap International, Human Rights Watch, International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), Landmine Action (UK), Landmine Survivors Network, Mines Action Canada, Norwegian People's Aid, Oxfam GB, and Pax Christi.

11. The representatives of Instalaza S.A. and Textron Defense Systems also took part in the work of the Group.

12. On 7 April 2008, the session was opened by the Chairperson, Ambassador Bent Wigotski of Denmark. He was assisted by Maj. Gen. Lars C. Fynbo of Denmark as Chairperson of the meetings of the Military, Legal, and Technical Experts, Mr. Ryuichi Hirano of Japan, as Friend of the Chair on International Humanitarian Law, and Mr. Markus Reiterer of Austria, as Friend of the Chair on Victim Assistance; Mr. Craig Maclachlan of Australia, as Friend of the Chair on Cooperation and Assistance. Mr. Peter Kolarov, Political Affairs Officer, Office for Disarmament Affairs, Geneva Branch, served as Secretary of the Group, and was assisted by Mr. Bantan Nugroho, Political Affairs Officer.

13. The Group held formal and informal plenary meetings and considered the following issues: implementation of International Humanitarian Law; technical aspects of cluster munitions; types of cluster munitions that may cause particular humanitarian harm; victim assistance; cooperation and assistance; implementation of Protocol V; definitions; stockpile management; and transfers.

14. At its first plenary meeting, on 7 April 2008, the Group confirmed the agenda as adopted at the first 2008 session of the Group (CCW/GGE/2008-I/3, Annex 1), confirmed the Rules of Procedure as adopted and used by the Third Review Conference (CCW/CONF.III/11, Part III), and adopted the Programme of Work, as contained in Annex I.

15. During the course of the session, the Group of Governmental Experts considered documents CCW/GGE/2008-II/1 and CCW/GGE/2008-II/2, and CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.1 to CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.7, as well as CCW/GGE/2008-II/CRP.1, as listed in Annex VI, as well as other relevant documents. These documents are available in all official languages through the Official Document System of the United Nations at <http://documents.un.org>, and the official CCW website as part of the website of the United Nations Office at Geneva at <http://www.unog.ch/disarmament/CCW>.

16. The Group of Governmental Experts heard presentations by Germany on “Area Target versus Point Target Munitions”, Prof. Ken Rutherford of Landmine Survivors Network on “Survivor Voice (Victim Assistance)”, Instalaza, S.A. on “[sD]²”, and Textron Defense Systems on “Achieving Military Utility While Eliminating the Humanitarian Impact. Sensor Fuzed Munition Technology.”

17. At its final plenary meeting, on 11 April 2008, the Group of Governmental Experts heard the reports on the work of the military, legal, and technical experts by the Chairperson of the Meetings of Military, Legal and Technical Experts, as contained in Annex II; on the implementation of International Humanitarian Law by the Friend of the Chair on International Humanitarian Law, as contained in Annex III; on victim assistance by the Friend of the Chair on Victim Assistance, as contained in Annex IV; and on cooperation and assistance by the Friend of the Chair on Cooperation and Assistance, as contained in Annex V. These reports were submitted under the responsibility of the Chairperson of the Group of Governmental Experts.

18. At the final plenary meeting on 11 April 2008 the Group of Governmental Experts adopted the procedural report of its second 2008 session, as contained in document CCW/GGE/2008-II/CRP.1, as orally amended, which is being issued as document CCW/GGE/2008-II/3.

Annex I**PROGRAMME OF WORK**

of the Second 2008 Session of the Group of Governmental Experts
as adopted during the first plenary meeting on 7 April 2008

Monday, 7 April 2008	10.00 – 13.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plenary meeting: Opening formalities • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Implementation of IHL
	15.00 – 18.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Technical aspects of CM
Tuesday, 8 April 2008	10.00 – 13.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Implementation of IHL
	15.00 – 18.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Types of CM that may cause particular humanitarian harm
Wednesday, 9 April 2008	10.00 – 13.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Victim assistance. Cooperation and Assistance. Implementation of CCW Protocol V
	15.00 – 18.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Types of CM that may cause particular humanitarian harm • Plenary meeting
Thursday, 10 April 2008	10.00 – 13.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: Definition; Stockpile management; Transfers
	15.00 – 17.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal consultations
	17.00 – 18.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plenary meeting
Friday, 11 April 2008	10.00 – 13.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting of military, legal, and technical experts: discussion on any pending issue
	15.00 – 18.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap-up • Adoption of the Procedural Report • Closure of the session

Annex II

**REPORT
ON THE WORK OF THE MEETINGS OF THE MILITARY, LEGAL AND
TECHNICAL EXPERTS**

By the Chairperson of the Meetings of Military, Legal and Technical Experts

1. The Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) had a constructive approach to all the different aspects of the cluster munitions problem. The interactive dialogue in the meetings of military, legal and technical experts further clarified delegations' positions and greatly helped the GGE to better understand the topics in order to arrive at common ground. The Group's positive approach towards the issues under consideration permitted it to take one stride further in fulfilling the mandate. The understanding of the different aspects of this important issue was deepened further.
2. It was appreciated that all delegations responded positively to keep the deliberations at a good expert level.
3. Following are a few impressions of the deliberations at the Meetings of Military, Legal and Technical Experts during the session:

Implementation of IHL

4. There was a fruitful debate on the implementation of international humanitarian law (IHL). The need to strengthen IHL was underlined. In particular, several delegations referred to the law relevant to the use of cluster munitions, in particular the rules of distinction, indiscriminate attack, proportionality and feasible precaution. The improper use of civilians to shield military objectives was also an issue which was quoted for inclusion. Considerable work was achieved under the Friend of the Chair, Mr. Ryuichi Hirano of Japan.
5. Thanks to the productive work carried out by Japan, two papers have now been drafted and discussed in open-ended informal consultations.
6. First, one paper outlines the applicable rules of the current IHL and includes a couple of suggestions for adopting additional provisions on the use of cluster munitions. Though the text is bracketed in places, there is a general feeling that the draft elements to a large extent reflects consensus on at least the core of the applicable rules of the existing IHL. The Group has moved a significant step closer to bringing in one format the relevant rules and principles of IHL, which are particularly important to the use of cluster munitions.
7. Secondly, Japan has also produced a paper on elements of best practice in order to strengthen the implementation of IHL regarding cluster munitions.
8. These two documents are the outcome of the fruitful work carried out by the delegations headed by Japan and provide a sound basis for future work.

Technical aspects of Cluster Munitions

9. On the issue of technical aspects of cluster munitions, the GGE heard presentations from two major defence companies from North America and Europe, and one State Party focusing on the technical improvements to cluster munitions. The presentations were useful in keeping us informed on the technology which attempts to minimize the hazard to civilians. Military utility, reliability and accuracy of these weapons were the underpinning factors. Some delegations felt that those cluster munitions that meet defined standards in reliability or accuracy should not be subject to prohibition. Others felt that reflecting technological requirements in a document would be complex and challenging. There was general agreement that although technology could contribute to reducing the humanitarian impact of these weapons both during and after conflict, such measures would not be sufficient and must also be supplemented by an integrated, global and preventive approach to enhance compliance with IHL and promote responsible use. One delegation stressed the need to reduce the physical attractiveness of cluster munitions to civilians and children in particular.

Types of Cluster Munitions that may cause particular humanitarian harm

10. More intensive consultations are needed on the issue of technical aspects of cluster munitions, although the overall atmosphere was positive and cooperative. The exchange of views exposed clear and fundamental differences in the approach favoured by different delegations. Some delegations argued for an approach that does not seek to distinguish between different types of weapons as “good” or “bad”, “acceptable” or “unacceptable” as all weapons can pose humanitarian harm if used improperly. Other delegations placed more stress on the disproportionate impact that technologically based distinctions would have on developing countries, and called for adequate transition periods, technology transfer and economically viable alternatives as essential incentives if any regulations were to be established. There were also those States which called for a total ban of cluster munitions. Some delegations expressed support for an approach that would phase out the types of cluster munitions that do not have certain technological features or reliability and accuracy characteristics. In this regard, the need for adequate transition periods to allow the militaries to reform their acquisition processes was also raised.

Definition

11. Delegations briefly discussed the approach to the definitions. Many delegations want a broad generic definition – and then maybe adding exemptions for those types of cluster munitions that might not cause particular humanitarian harm. Other delegations favour that those kinds of weapons should be excluded in the definition itself.

12. The draft working definition as contained in CCW/GGE/2008-I/3, Annex III is on the table, as well as other proposals, and the GGE would need to revisit this issue at the July session. Whatever the difficulties encountered in reaching agreement on this matter, should not prevent the Group from pursuing its prime objective of addressing humanitarian risk to civilians.

Stockpile Management

13. With regard to stockpile management, some delegations suggested that the best practices set out in Protocol V would be a good starting point for developing text. Some other delegations pointed out that stocks of cluster weapons are at varying stages of usability and underscored the need to make sure that unreliable and unsafe weapons were not transferred, thus the need to distinguish between operative and non-operative stocks.

Transfers

14. On the issue of transfers, one delegation repeated its call for provisions that will prohibit the transfer of cluster munitions to non-state actors, which deserves the Group's consideration. It was proposed that transfers of outlawed cluster weapons or those marked for destruction should be prohibited, except when done for the purpose of training and research or their destruction.

Annex III**REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW**

By the Friend of the Chair on International Humanitarian Law

I. DRAFT ELEMENTS ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAWDefinitions

1. “Military objective” means, so far as objects are concerned, any object which by its nature, location, purpose or use makes an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage. **[Reference: Article 52 (2) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 2 (6) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]**
2. “Civilian objects” are all objects which are not military objectives as defined in paragraph X. **[Reference: Article 52 (1) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 2 (7) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]**

Protection of civilians and civilian objects

3. The Parties to the conflict shall refrain from deciding to launch any attack using cluster munitions which may be expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, damage to civilian objects, or a combination thereof, which would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. **[Reference: Article 51 (5)(b) & Article 57 (2)(a)(iii) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 3 (8) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]**
4. In order to ensure respect for and protection of the civilian population and civilian objects, the Parties to the conflict using cluster munitions shall at all times distinguish between the civilian population and combatants and between civilian objects and military objectives and accordingly shall direct their operations only against military objectives. **[Reference: Article 48 of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention]**
5. The civilian population as such, individual civilians or civilian objects shall not be the object of attack by cluster munitions. **[Reference: Article 51 (1) & (2) and Article 52 (1) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 3 (7) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]**
6. [Several clearly separated and distinct military objectives located in a city, town, village or other area containing a similar concentration of civilians or civilian objects are not to be treated as a single military objective.] **[Reference: Article 51 (5) (a) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 3 (9) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]**

7. [It is prohibited in all circumstances to make any military objective located within a concentration of civilians [or in areas normally inhabited by civilians] the object of attack using cluster munitions.] **[Reference: Article 2 (2) of Protocol III to the CCW]**

8. [It is prohibited to attack, destroy, remove or render useless by cluster munitions objects indispensable to the survival of the civilian population, such as food-stuffs, agricultural areas for the production of food-stuffs, crops, livestock, drinking water installations and supplies and irrigation works, [or pharmaceutical installations] for the specific purpose of denying them for their sustenance value to the civilian population or to the adverse Party, whatever the motive, whether in order to starve out civilians, to cause them to move away, or for any other motive. The prohibitions in paragraph X shall not apply to such of the objects covered by it as are used by an adverse Party:

- (a) as sustenance solely for the members of its armed forces; or
- (b) if not as sustenance, then in direct support of military action, provided, however, that in no event shall actions against these objects be taken which may be expected to leave the civilian population with such inadequate food or water as to cause its starvation or force its movement.]

[Reference: Article 54 (2) & (3) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention]

9. With respect to attacks by cluster munitions the following precautions shall be taken:
- (a) those who plan or decide upon an attack shall take all feasible precautions in the choice of means and methods of attack with a view to avoiding, and in any event to minimizing, incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians and damage to civilian objects; and
 - [(b) effective advance warning shall be given of attacks which may affect the civilian population, unless circumstances do not permit.]

[Reference: Article 57 (2) (a) (ii) & (c) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention & Article 3 (11) of the Amended Protocol II to the CCW]

10. To minimize incidental damage to the civilian population or civilian objects that may legitimately occur as the result of the use of cluster munitions, the presence or movements of the civilian population or individual civilians shall not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations, in particular in attempts to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield, favour or impede military operations. The Parties to the conflict shall not direct the movement of the civilian population or individual civilians in order to attempt to shield military objectives from attacks or to shield military operations. **[Reference: Article 51 (7) of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention]**

11. **NOTE:** The Convention stipulates as follows:

“Preamble

Confirming their determination that in cases not covered by this Convention and its annexed Protocols or by other international agreements, the civilian population and the combatants shall at all times remain under the protection and authority of the principles of international law derived from established custom, from the principles of humanity and from the dictates of public conscience,

Article 2

Relations with other international agreements

Nothing in this Convention or its annexed Protocols shall be interpreted as detracting from other obligations imposed upon the High Contracting Parties by international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflict.”

II. DRAFT ELEMENTS OF BEST PRACTICE GUIDE

12. In order to strengthen compliance with the applicable rules and principles of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), High Contracting Parties should develop, on a voluntary basis, national mechanisms, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (i) To identify the applicable rules and principles of IHL pertaining to the application of military force and of the particular weapon in use.
- (ii) To determine the lawfulness of a weapon, means or method of warfare under consideration by way of a legal review.
- (iii) To ensure that military doctrine reflects the applicable rules and principles of IHL.
- (iv) To have adopted a manual of IHL for the use by the military.
- (v) To ensure that military planners take into consideration the relevant rules and principles of IHL.
- (vi) To have a targeting procedure conducted by trained personnel that leads to a targeting directive, which is cleared by appropriate political and legal authorities. The process should allow applicability during both deliberate and dynamic targeting. Additionally, as a part of targeting process, a methodology for estimating collateral damage should be developed.
- (vii) To ensure that appropriate Rules of Engagement (ROE) are in place, which are cleared by appropriate political and legal authorities.
- (viii) To train all military personnel in IHL and ROE to ensure they understand and comply with humanitarian and legal obligations.
- (ix) To ensure the availability of legal advice at every appropriate step above, including for training and operations.
- (x) To have in place within domestic law an enforcement mechanism properly to investigate and deal with breaches of IHL.

Annex IV

REPORT ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE

By the Friend of the Chair on Victim Assistance

1. The Group of Governmental Experts discussed the issue of assisting victims of cluster munitions in a constructive and forward-looking manner during its session on April 7, 2008.
2. The Group of Governmental Experts heard a presentation by Prof. Dr. Ken Rutherford, Co-founder of the Landmines Survivor Network, entitled “Survivor Voice (Victim Assistance).”
3. The statements made during the discussion on victim assistance portrayed a strong support for the future proposal to confirm the importance and humanitarian significance that is attached to the issue of victim assistance. Hence, there is a good opportunity and need for the Group of Governmental Experts to continue further and intensify its discussions to identify the best manner in which such a commitment to assist cluster munitions victims will be included in the future proposal.
4. The discussion focused on key concepts in relation to victim assistance, including on the concept of victim as such, the elements of victim assistance, the question of coherence of approaches, non-discrimination, non-duplication of efforts, etc.
5. The discussion highlighted a broad approach to the concept of *victim* which encompasses the survivor of the accident as such, but his/her family and community.
6. Clear arguments have been made that in relation to victim assistance duplication of efforts should be avoided. This could also contribute to a rational use of limited resources, but at the same time should not result in appropriate action not being taken. It has also been highlighted that efforts to assist victims of cluster munitions need to be linked to the health and disability sectors.
7. The notion of non-discrimination or – in other words – of avoiding a hierarchy among victims of different kinds of weapons has been raised; in this context, it was suggested that assistance to victims should be based on the needs and the rights of the victims rather than on the cause of the injury.
8. There seems to be an emerging understanding that victim assistance signifies a rather comprehensive and long-term commitment comprising various necessary ingredients, most notably:
 - Emergency medical care
 - Ongoing medical care and rehabilitation
 - Psychological support
 - Social and economic inclusion

9. It has also been highlighted that national ownership is crucial for effectively assisting the victims as it is the affected State as such who bears primary responsibility vis-à-vis the victims. At the same time, however, those States already often tend to be particularly vulnerable and face significant problems also in respect to their health systems. This highlights the importance of international cooperation and assistance particularly in respect to assisting the victims of this weapon.

Annex V

REPORT ON COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

by the Friend of the Chair on Cooperation and Assistance

1. In keeping with the mandate for the GGE to negotiate a proposal addressing, inter alia, the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions, consideration should be given to the role of international cooperation and assistance. While affected States will play a primary role in addressing such humanitarian impacts, experience shows some of these States may need assistance to fulfil this task.
2. A provision on international cooperation and assistance could take into account areas including, but not necessarily limited to:
 - (i) risk education, marking and clearance, removal or destruction of cluster munitions;
 - (ii) care and rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration of victims;
 - (iii) exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information relating to addressing the humanitarian harm of cluster munitions;
 - (iv) development and operationalisation of techniques, and training in these, for the destruction, neutralisation and clearance of cluster munitions;
 - (v) reporting and recording of information, including through existing databases and templates.
3. Consideration could be given to factors maximising the effectiveness of international cooperation and assistance, including but not necessarily limited to:
 - (i) the role of information exchange in ensuring well-targeted assistance and avoiding duplication of assistance;
 - (ii) means for facilitating financial contributions including, for example, use of existing trust funds;
 - (iii) methods to ensure timely requests for, and delivery of, assistance including, for example, by use of existing reporting templates.
4. In developing relevant provisions, consideration could be given to systemic issues, including:

- (i) the need to avoid duplication of existing mechanisms, while exploiting the benefits these might provide in furthering the aims of any instrument;
- (ii) means to avoid establishment of a hierarchy of assistance in respect of weapon types;
- (iii) appropriate measures to encourage participation in international cooperation and assistance by all parties to the instrument.

5. The ideas presented above are meant in the first instance to provoke thought and are without prejudice to other ideas that may be brought forward.

Annex VI

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

of the Second 2008 Session of the Group of Governmental Experts

7 – 11 April 2008

CCW/GGE/2008-II/1	Compilation of Inputs from Delegations on Subjects Listed in the Provisional Programme of Work, submitted by the Chairperson
CCW/GGE/2008-II/2	Provisional Programme of Work, submitted by the Chairperson
CCW/GGE/2008-II/3	Procedural Report, submitted by the Secretariat
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.1	The application of international humanitarian law to the use of cluster munitions suggestions for discussion, submitted by the United States of America
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.2	Application of international humanitarian law to the use of cluster munitions, submitted by Japan
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.3	Proposals relating to technical aspects of cluster weapons, submitted by France
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.4	Benchmarks to improve reliability and accuracy of cluster munitions and a way to better protect civilians, submitted by Japan
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.5	Explosive Remnants of War, submitted by the United States of America
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.6 and Corr.1 [English Only]	Proposal for main elements of a draft CCW protocol on prohibitions or restrictions of cluster munitions, submitted by Turkey
CCW/GGE/2008-II/WP.7	Proposal on transfers of cluster munitions, submitted by Israel
CCW/GGE/2008-II/INF.1 and Add.1 [English/French/Spanish Only]	List of Participants, submitted by the Secretariat
CCW/GGE/2008-II/CRP.1	Draft Procedural Report, submitted by the Secretariat

CCW/GGE/2008-II/MISC.1

Provisional List of Participants, submitted by the
Secretariat

The documents above are available in all official languages through the Official Document System of the United Nations at <http://documents.un.org>, and the official CCW website as part of the website of the United Nations Office at Geneva at <http://www.unog.ch/disarmament/CCW> .
