

**Cluster Munition Coalition Intervention on Definitions of a Cluster Munition
Committee of the Whole, Dublin Diplomatic Conference
26 May 2008**

Richard Moyes, Landmine Action

Thank you Mr. President,

We would like to join others in thanking Ambassador MacKay and Charlotte Darlow for their excellent work in bringing us closer to a comprehensive prohibition on cluster munitions. We believe the field reality from Laos to Lebanon has entirely justified that comprehensive prohibition.

The reason we and others have supported the deletion of Article 2(c) is to prevent any weapons from being used that cause the same humanitarian harm as cluster munitions. This should remain the focus of this work.

If there is to be a 2(c) and like many others we would prefer there was not, we must make sure it does not become an exception and that it is kept as clear, unambiguous and restrictive as possible. We believe your work is going in the right direction on this.

We agree with Argentina and others that the work on definition should be more strongly effects-oriented because this is the only way we can ensure that no weapons are allowed that have the indiscriminate area effects or post-conflict UXO effects of cluster munitions. To do that we must ensure that we prevent the scattering of explosive force across an area and to leave the absolute minimum risk of unexploded items.

As long as the criteria to achieve this can be clear, effects-oriented and objective, then taken together they could help ensure that no weapons be allowed through 2(c) that could cause the area effects or UXO effects of cluster munitions either now or in the future. We believe that future proofing as a number of delegations have noted, is critical in this regard.

Thank you Mr. President