

Proposal for the intersessional process

Submitted by South Africa

I. Introduction

1. There is general consensus that the intersessional process of the last ten years was successful, however, the process was introduced to serve a specific purpose and that purpose was achieved. The current environment and circumstances require a new approach to accommodate future developments.

2. The need for specific substantial issues such as implementation of Article X and scientific developments should be attended to on a regular basis during intersessional meetings. Other substantial issues such as the CBM system and implementation of the Convention have also been identified for further consideration during the intersessional period.

3. It is therefore, clear that the intersessional process should be utilised to work on specific substantial issues. This will require that the Meeting of States Parties (MSP) have decision making powers while the experts meetings should concentrate on examining specific issues for the MSP to decide upon. The very effective and positive processes that were developed during the last 10 years can still be utilised very effectively particularly during the experts meetings.

II. Proposal

4. It is proposed that the process consists of a two-week session in the middle of the year that would consist of one-week meetings of different open-ended committees that work continuous issues and a one-week experts meeting (MXP) that considers a specific topic identified by the Review Conference. All these meetings should prepare recommendations to the Meeting of States Parties (MSP) that will meet at the end of the year for one week. The MSP should consider the reports and be able to decide on actions or make recommendation for specific actions to the next Review Conference.

A. Two-week session

1. Open-ended Committees

5. Open-ended Committees should ideally be chaired by the same person for the whole four year intersessional period. Chairpersons would be selected from the Regional Groups. Each Chairperson could be supported by two deputies from the other Regional Groups. Chairpersons should be appointed on the accepted an equitable regional basis. Different members of the ISU would serve as secretaries for the committees. The committees would report to the MSP that would meet at the end of the year. Open-ended Committees would be established for:

- (a) the implementation of the Article X Cooperation Mechanism;
- (b) consideration of new scientific developments; and
- (c) universalisation of the Convention.

2. Meeting of Experts (MXP).

6. The MXP would consider specific issues identified by the Review conference over a longer period that could cover more than one year. A Chairperson would be identified by the Regional Groups for each subject. Deputies to the Chairperson would be nominated from the Groups other than the one from which the Chairperson was nominated. One to two topics could be discussed during the second week. The MXP should report to the MSP that meets at the end of the year, the final report would contain proposals for actions on the subject discussed. The MXP could utilise academic and industry participation in its discussions. Subjects that could be discussed by the MXP:

- (a) Revision of the CBM system;
- (b) Conceptual discussions on what compliance/implementation/verification implies in practical terms;
- (c) Procedures to implement Article VII;
- (d) Procedures to Initiate Article VI;
- (e) Consideration of means to determine implementation of the Convention;
- (f) Implementation of Article V – Consultation.

7. Plenary meetings would be chaired by the various Chairpersons on a rotation basis. Chairpersons would decide in consultation with the States Parties and ISU on the agenda in each committee or group.

B. Meeting of States Parties

8. The Chairperson of the MSP would be appointed annually on a rotation basis from the Regional Groups. The MSP would use its time to consider the reports from the Open-ended Committees and the MXP and decide on actions, continuation of work or referral to the next Review Conference for decision.

9. All meetings, of Open-ended Committees, MXP and MSP, would take decisions by consensus.

10. The subsequent Review Conference would consider recommendations/proposals and decisions of these meetings and decide on any further action or ratify decisions.

Annex

Illustrative programmes

1. Two-week session

<i>Week One</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>Thursday</i>	<i>Friday</i>
10:00–13:00	Plenary statements and general issues	Open-ended Committee on Art X Mechanism	Open-ended Committee on Scientific Developments	Open-ended Committee on Scientific Developments	Committee on Universalisation
15:00–18:00	Open-ended Committee on Art X Mechanism	Open-ended Committee on Art X Mechanism	Open-ended Committee on Scientific Developments	Open-ended Committee on Universalisation	Committee on Universalisation
<i>Week Two</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>Thursday</i>	<i>Friday</i>
10:00–13:00	Plenary statements and general issues	Discussion of Subject 1	Discussion of Subject 1	Discussion of Subject 2	Discussion of Subject 2
15:00–18:00	Discussion of Subject 1	Discussion of Subject 1	Discussion of Subject 2	Discussion of Subject 2	Plenary

2. Meeting of States Parties

<i>Session</i>	<i>Monday</i>	<i>Tuesday</i>	<i>Wednesday</i>	<i>Thursday</i>	<i>Friday</i>
10:00–13:00	Reporting Open-ended Committee 1	Reporting Open-ended Committee 3	Consideration of Reports	Consideration of Reports	MSP Report
15:00–18:00	Reporting Open-ended Committee 2	Reporting MXP	Consideration of Reports	Consideration of Reports	MSP Report