CANADIAN INTERVENTION – CLUSTER VI

FOLLOW-UP AND REPORTING MECHANISMS

Delivered by Earl Turcotte – Head of the Canadian Delegation

Thank you Mr.Moderator. And thank you to the Chair for including this important topic in our discussions.

1. States in their General Statements and interventions in the interactive thematic debates, have noted the importance of – and critical need for – continued follow-up work to ensure effective implementation of the Programme of Action.

2. As we know, the 2001 UN Programme of Action made provision for meetings of States every two years to assess implementation of the Programme of Action, and a Review Conference in 2006. The question now is where do we go from the Review Conference?

3. Several States, UN agencies, international organizations and NGOs are of the view that the current regime of meetings and other cooperative arrangements simply do not afford the small arms and light weapons issue the attention and dedicated resources it warrants and, indeed, are <u>essential</u> in order to implement the Programme of Action.

4. For this reason, Canada and the Netherlands have suggested adoption of an Inter-sessional programme of Work in separate but, we believe, very complementary proposals.

5. Yesterday Canada circulated Conference Room Paper 9, that suggests that this community meet informally, semi-annually, to address related clusters of priority thematic areas on a regular and ongoing basis.

6. Though we are happy to explore various options as to how the work would be organized and carried out, we have suggested establishing four or five Standing Committees to address key thematic areas in depth, and to generate ideas and recommendations for consideration during formal meetings of States. The Standing Committees would be deliberative bodies with no decision making authority.

7. We have also suggested establishing a Contact Group on Communications and Resource Mobilization to develop strategies to generate the political and popular will, and the human, technical and financial resources that are essential to putting our words into action.

8. For example, the initial work of such thematic Standing Committees could focus on: (i) Transfer controls (ii) Stockpile Management (iii) Reducing Demand (iv) National Regulation and (v) Cooperation and Assistance, including Survivor Assistance.

9. The work of the Contact Group on Communications and Resource Mobilzation would serve to advance implementation of all of these.

10. We wish to thank India, the Netherlands and South Africa for providing us with various options from which to choose for continued formal meetings of States. In our view, any of the three options before us for formal meetings of states could be complemented by meeting informally, semi-annually between formal meetings.

11. Cost is always an issue of course. As with the Ottawa Convention, States in a position to do so could provide voluntary contributions to cover the cost of meeting, including establishing a sponsorship programme as recommended by the Netherlands, to ensure that everyone can participate.

12. Mr. Moderator, we are excited about the possibilities here and believe we can significantly increase our level of activity and the results we achieve over the next five years. Canada will continue to consult widely with other States in order to refine these suggestions as we move toward the coming Review Conference. Thank You