

Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World

Daily Update #3

ICBL Presentations

During the final discussions of the Action Plan, Steve Goose, on behalf of the ICBL, welcomed the document, noting it was a good, concrete Action Plan, although it could have been made even better. He remarked on the unwillingness of States Parties to improve the text of the draft, adding that it was surprising as it would seem natural that some changes would be sought at this final change. He cautioned against departing from the Ottawa Process and turning it into a consensus-driven process like the CCW or Conference on Disarmament. Lastly he reiterated the amendments proposed by the ICBL including on articles 1,2 and 3 and expressed support by amendments put forward by the ICRC.

Shohab Hakimi, co-chair of the Mine Action Working Group also made a presentation with an overview of the situation in Afghanistan.

Concerns for the ICBL

- None of the proposed amendments to the action plan were taken on board (some States Parties said that these proposals could form part of future work but overall they unanimously supported the action plan as it was).
- Need to remain vigilant against sliding into consensus mode of 'business as usual', departing from the hallmark of the Ottawa process.

Highlights for the ICBL

- Government representatives were urged not to rely on NGOs and the ICBL's pressure to implement the Convention. They have the authority and obligation to do so.
- Good, solid, concrete Action Plan which was not weakened, and much of ICBL's input was indeed included.

Quote of the day

“We were surprised when Sweden criticized and called into question the role of the ICRC and NGOs in this process, especially since we have worked very closely and cooperatively with Sweden for many years. I wondered if I was sitting in a CCW session in 1994 and not a Mine Ban Treaty session in 2004.” (Steve Goose, head of ICBL delegation)