



Report of the Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit held
in New York on 20-21 October 2012

Please send any comments/questions to wareham@hrw.org

About this Report

This is a report on the Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit held in New York City on 19-20 October 2012. This international gathering of campaigners working on range of humanitarian disarmament objectives was convened by Human Rights Watch, with the support of 14 other non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

This report describes the Summit's proceedings and its principal outcomes. It was prepared by Mary Wareham of Human Rights Watch and is available online at the blog created for the Summit: www.4disarmament.org.

The Summit brought together 90 civil society representatives from 42 organizations in 14 countries, including seven global campaigns and four Nobel Peace Laureates. Apologies were received from another 16 organizations. (See annexed Participant List)

The Summit was held on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), 1997 Nobel Peace Laureate. On October 19, representatives from governments, NGOs, UN agencies, and international organizations attended a moderated panel discussion by six ICBL leaders. We are grateful to the event moderator, BBC producer Mr. Stuart Hughes, and all the speakers for their contributions: Nobel Peace Laureate Ms. Jody Williams; Dr. Jean-Baptiste Richardier, Handicap International; Mr. Stephen Goose, Human Rights Watch; Mr. Firoz Ali Alizada, International Campaign to Ban Landmines; Mr. Nick Roseveare, Mines Advisory Group (MAG); and Ms. Susannah Sirkin, Physicians for Human Rights. A video recording of the event is available online at: <http://youtu.be/3TzOvNwCTBY> and photographs here: <http://bit.ly/1000OY8>

The Campaigns Summit was held over the weekend of October 20-21 at the UN Church Center, which is located directly across from the UN. We acknowledge the generous support provided by the Hague Appeal for Peace, Peace Boat US, the Control Arms

secretariat, and others. We especially appreciate the contributions of volunteers who gave up their weekend to ensure that the Summit ran smoothly.

We acknowledge the guest speakers who addressed the Summit, including Prof. Philip G. Alston of New York University School of Law, who spoke about the challenges posed by fully autonomous weapons ('killer robots') and Amb. Jayantha Dhanapala of Pugwash Conferences on Science & World Affairs, who delivered the closing address. Audio recordings of these presentations are available online at: <http://bit.ly/15ruNHM>.

Campaigners spent the bulk of the Summit talking to each other in four sessions of small group deliberations on key lessons and actions or commitments/pledges, that were then presented in plenary. We are grateful to all the facilitators and recorders of this group work and for the feedback received on the draft agenda, including from Nancy Ingram of Foot in the Door Consulting.

This report has distilled the lessons from the small group discussions into the following summary, presenting some of the principal actions in the recommendations section. The detailed notes of each small group discussion are available on request.

Prior to the Summit, a Briefing Book containing contributions by participating these organizations was prepared and distributed to all participants. The Briefing Book is not intended for public consumption so it will not be placed online, but please contact us to request a copy.

At the conclusion of the Campaigns Summit, a [Communique](#) endorsed by 31 of the participating organizations was delivered to the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Angela Kane and then distributed to government representatives attending the UN General Assembly First Committee on Disarmament and International Security, as well as disseminated online. We are grateful to all the signatories as well as for the translations and dissemination.

We sincerely appreciate the generous financial contributions provided by the following organizations, without which it would not have been possible to hold the Humanitarian

Disarmament Campaigns Summit and ICBL' 20th anniversary event. A financial report is available on request from Human Rights Watch.

List of Donors

Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy

Action on Armed Violence

Article 36

Handicap International

Human Rights Watch

ICBL-CMC

IKV Pax Christi

International Law and Policy Institute

Mines Advisory Group (MAG)

Norwegian People's Aid

Open Society Foundations

Peace Movement Aotearoa

Physicians for Human Rights

VERTIC

World Council of Churches

Table of Contents

Summary Report	1
Introduction	1
Recommendations	2
Summary of Key Lessons and Findings.....	3
I. Humanitarian Rationale	3
II. Multilateral Processes.....	6
III. Global Campaigns.....	9
IV. Citizen Diplomacy.....	12
Annexes	16

Summary Report of the Campaigns Summit

Introduction

As former UN disarmament chief Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala noted in his closing address, summits mean different things to different people and in diplomacy summits involve meetings of heads of state and heads of government. This Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit was different, however, as it saw leading non-governmental organizations and international organizations working on a range of humanitarian disarmament issues come together for the first time to talk about their work. The Summit enabled different parts of the baseline of civil society actors in humanitarian disarmament to come together and begin to coordinate their efforts, helping as Amb. Dhanapala noted, to “invert the pyramid.”

In extensive consultations undertaken by Human Rights Watch in the lead-up to the Summit, participants said the most important thing for their participation would be the opportunity to connect with and learn from each other, especially by talking “with” each other as opposed to “at” each other through presentations and panels. Therefore the agenda was structured to center around four sessions of facilitated small group discussion to maximize time for these conversations and encourage cross-fertilization of lessons and actions across our campaigns and areas of work. This was a seed-planting event, where we hoped to give participants the opportunity to connect and learn from each other on the possibilities available for our individual and collective campaigning work.

Separate detailed notes taken by recorders of each of the small groups that met during the four sessions of the Summit are available on request. The notes are accompanied by the report-back that each group delivered in plenary detail three lessons and three actions or commitments/pledges that they agreed on in the 2-hour discussion. This report has distilled those lessons into a summary report and some of the main actions are described below in the recommendations section.

One major finding of the Summit was that we all have ownership of the issues that comprise the humanitarian disarmament portfolio and must leverage success on our different issues to communicate that we are winning as a collective. We must try not to get stuck on the differences between our campaigns or bogged down in the details of specific issues, but should instead step back to see the big picture. This requires establishing a wide sense of ownership to build a sense that we are being collectively successful. We must create a sense of authority or force on humanitarian disarmament and shake the basis of status quo. Together we can make a difference.

Recommendations

Practical actions that could be taken by civil society to collectively advance humanitarian disarmament are listed here while the specific actions produced by the different sessions are written up in separate detailed notes that are available on request. The following may seem like small steps forward, but they represent recommendations and actions that were proposed repeatedly in the course of the Summit.

1. Do it again

Meeting face-to-face was a recommendation that came up many times in the course of the Summit. Human Rights Watch does not have the capacity to host another one, but we have prepared a briefing including the budget, contacts, and information on how we organized the 2012 Summit. We would be glad to share this with any NGO or global campaign interested in convening a follow-up meeting in October 2013.

2. Communicate more

Several actions urged increased communications across campaigns and between NGOs working on humanitarian disarmament issues. The 4disarmament email listserv set-up by Human Rights Watch can continue to be used to facilitate communication. Other opportunities to communicate are encouraged.

3. Tell the story

Many actions emphasized the need for the humanitarian disarmament framework and central role of civil society to be explained more, including through publications

(academic and otherwise), blogs and other online materials, and media work. The 4disarmament.org website and @4disarmament Twitter account established for the Summit will continue to be updated periodically to draw attention to challenges and successes experienced by civil society groups working in humanitarian disarmament.

4. Establish best practices

Several actions concerned the need for NGOs and campaigns working in humanitarian disarmament to collectively establish best practices from their experiences, including with respect to their work with vulnerable groups and the field, on research standards, and on good governance structures and practices.

5. Reinforce each other

Several actions emphasized the need to reinforce the sense of power and authority of our community by making public the many linkages between organizations and campaigns working on humanitarian disarmament. Help each other to promote our different events and urgent actions. Support each other online through social media such as Twitter and Facebook.

Summary of Key Lessons and Findings

A topic-by-topic review of the major findings of the Summit sessions follows. For more information, including the specific lessons and actions from each group, please see the separate detailed notes that are available on request.

1. Humanitarian Rationale

The first session reviewed the rationale for “humanitarian disarmament.” Participants split into seven small groups to discuss the evidence base, call to action, field expectations, treaty elements, changing perceptions, burden of proof, and humanitarian disarmament law. They produced a set of lessons from efforts to date to provide a humanitarian rationale for disarmament objectives. This summary highlights some of the major lessons or findings and common agreements. Specific actions are outlined at the end.

While there was debate over the name “humanitarian disarmament,” it was widely acknowledged that the term provides a common framework for our work, specifically the central objective of preventing and addressing or alleviating human suffering. There was agreement that the strongest humanitarian disarmament law instruments are the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty and the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions. Both have reframed multilateral disarmament and humanitarian law diplomacy by putting human security/humanitarian considerations ahead of national security interests.

Changing perceptions of weapons from being a source of power to a source of harm for human beings is one of the most urgent and fundamental challenges facing us as campaigners. If the perceived national security benefits of a particular weapon diminish, then its humanitarian risk is better recognized and acknowledged. Changing the discourse of framing from a national security to a humanitarian focus requires different structures and strategies to pressure governments, including through outreach to parliamentarians, diplomats, and others; by building public awareness; and in engaging the media and using social media tools.

The creation of a sound evidence base requires the collection of comprehensive and credible evidence demonstrating multiple impacts of humanitarian harm, both quantitative and qualitative, and showing the positive impact of action (implementation, advocacy) as well as the negative impact of specific weapons. Storytelling can help communicate humanitarian impact, especially narrative accounts by survivors who can provide firsthand evidence and a personal perspective. To ensure credibility, be transparent by identifying sources, providing the methodology, clearly disaggregating data, and being willing to acknowledge and correct mistakes. Be creative and think outside the box of established data-gathering methods and modes of presentation.

Engaging the “field” is crucial in efforts to provide a humanitarian rationale for disarmament objectives, but clarifying field expectations early on is a necessary first step for any global campaign initiative. Involvement of people on the ground in affected countries can strengthen credibility and lead to the creation of stronger international law, but engagement must be a two-way process so clarify what can and cannot be done over

the long-term to bring about change on the ground. Empower affected individuals—victims, civil society and local media—with information and equip them to fight for their rights. Always follow through and keep the pressure on to ensure effective implementation.

Before generating a call for action on the basis of a humanitarian rationale, it is necessary to look at who to influence and understand the target audience. The call must be understandable/clear and compelling. It must answer: why are you doing it? Base the call on fact and have the right experts on your side to explain it. Identify specific targets and actions for social media campaigns, but be strategic to avoid information overload.

Convincing others of the humanitarian rationale for disarmament objectives requires shifting the burden of proof on to the other, opposing side and making them prove that their weapon does not cause adverse or unacceptable humanitarian harm. So aim to shift the “innocent until found guilty” to the opposite side. This requires finding the ‘tipping point’ to shift the burden of proof. Look for the weak link/point of the other side’s argument/evidence and focus in on it. Seek to win the perception with the right audience and don’t waste time framing arguments to persuade the wrong audience. Rather than spending time in an argument we cannot win, look at it on our territory and park the perception as a lost cause.

Essential humanitarian disarmament treaty elements include the strongest possible provisions as well as transparency reporting, cooperation and assistance measures, and the obligation to ensure penal sanctions. Remedial measures and victim assistance are also important, but not essential for every challenge. Be “aspirational” by aiming high and continue to raise the bar by improving on the essential elements contained in the instruments that have already been created. During processes to negotiate new humanitarian disarmament law it is crucial to “keep the standard high” and not drop it and compromise strength/integrity of the text in return for universalization promises that may not materialize.

In terms of actions, there was strong interest in working to ensure that NGOs adopt a more integrated view of the humanitarian rationale for action on disarmament challenges. This requires framing our common ground with a broad, macro-level framework and then shaping it in humanitarian terms to produce human security arguments. There was interest in developing mechanisms to facilitate more cooperation between NGOs and global coalitions working on humanitarian disarmament challenges, including by making the Summit an annual event, by trading interns and seconding staff to encourage learning, by considering the viability of common initiatives (e.g. days of action, divestment campaigns), and by publishing more on humanitarian disarmament, academic or otherwise (e.g. Wikipedia). Sharing knowledge under the common framework provided by humanitarian disarmament can help us become more of a community and increase our collective power.

II. Multilateral Processes

Session II looked at how to advance humanitarian disarmament via multilateral processes. Participants split into seven small groups to discuss getting traction, fast-track processes, core groups, naming and shaming, vulnerable groups, redlines and compromise, and consensus and power. They identified actions that could be taken to advance humanitarian disarmament through multilateral processes and produced lessons from efforts to date. The following summary highlights some of the major findings and common agreements.

Advancing humanitarian disarmament in multilateral processes first requires starting somewhere by getting on the formal agenda, usually at the United Nations. Getting traction requires commitment and patience as well as a clear vision and a long-term view. There is often only a short window of opportunity available, such as after a crisis in which the weapons have been used, so good preparation and swift execution is essential to seize the opportunity and move forward. It requires that civil society provide a call to action that is clear, concise, and focused on humans and humanitarian impact. Media coverage helps our issues get noticed and can provide a sense of urgency. Champion states are crucial, including (regional) blocs of countries, as is the need to build lasting

relationships with individual diplomats and officials. The involvement of victim/affected states is essential to achieving the bottom-up support necessary to sustain long-term efforts to get issues on the agenda. There is also a need to develop long-term, productive partnerships with international agencies such as the ICRC and UN agencies.

The most successful humanitarian disarmament instruments to date have been the product of fast-track processes. In these unconventional diplomatic processes, the rules are changed to suit the goals, rather than the goals being changed to suit the rules. The fast-track requires inclusivity and diversity are taken into account when mobilizing actors so small and medium-sized states play a strong role, as do affected states and civil society. Major powers should be pressed to join and participate in the fast-track process, but cannot dominate or direct it. We can use the fast-track to take back the power from weapons abusers (producers, users). The fast-track is about managing the pace and tempo of the process to quickly achieve its objective by a specific deadline. Civil society can play a powerful role in mobilizing the public to call for a swift response and strong result.

In humanitarian disarmament diplomacy, core groups of states steer the fast-track processes to their successful conclusion. Diversity is key for any core group composition (e.g. financial, political, regional) and balance is also an important consideration (don't rely on a single country, ensure counterweights). Involvement of specific constituencies is important, especially affected states. Individuals such as political leaders and senior diplomats matter, especially in getting core groups started and resourcing them. A tight deadline (e.g. no more than two years) is usually needed for the process from beginning to end as it may not be possible to keep the core group any longer. Civil society should aim to facilitate the creation and smooth operation of the core group, but the governments must have ownership over the process by leading and driving it. Working with a core group requires a well-organized and unified global coalition of NGOs.

Representatives of so-called vulnerable groups (e.g. survivors/victims of specific weapons, youth) often play a significant role in multilateral processes aimed at advancing humanitarian disarmament. It is important to build an authentic relationship with vulnerable groups that is based upon respect and trust. This relationship building takes

time and requires long-term commitment to ensure sound implementation. Be cognizant of ethical concerns and the likely need for capacity-building, as well as the importance of reporting back on outcomes to individuals and communities. Allow for cross-fertilization so that victims can participate in all aspects of the campaign. Finally, we should share more about how our campaigns have been working with vulnerable groups so that we can learn from each other and identify best practices.

Naming and shaming is just one of a range of tactics employed by civil society to influence multilateral processes aimed at advancing humanitarian disarmament. This requires monitoring government policy and practice and publicizing any changes or developments. It can involve telling a human story to show impact from the victim's perspective. Putting countries on a list can be a good way to get more information by evoking reactions from diplomats. We also should not be afraid to "name and praise" as appropriate to acknowledge good examples or positive policy change.

No humanitarian disarmament treaties that have been achieved using consensus rules of procedure. Rather a two-track approach has been used to first try to reach consensus within the conventional (UN) system and then transition when a tipping point has been reached to a fast-track process based on rules that allow for voting when consensus fails. Moving away from consensus requires forging new coalitions of the willing or like-minded to create a safe space with civil society participation to get the process on its way. To de-emphasize consensus, civil society should avoid emphasizing procedure and forum and instead focus on goal-oriented common interests and affirm the humanitarian imperative for swift action. Another group noted that consensus-based deliberations should include the option of voting when human life is on the line.

Establishing redlines for core objectives and a clear internal process for dealing with possible compromises in the final outcome are crucial for any global coalition participating in a multilateral negotiation on humanitarian disarmament. They are especially important when the "end game" comes and civil society must decide whether to accept the outcome through as a compromise if necessary or reject it and work to stop the negotiations/process. Civil society must be organized as a strong coalition with

strong/clear aims and robust communications before any redlines can be established. Usually redlines are prepared by the coalition's principal decision-making (leadership) body, but via consultation are discussed by the entire coalition to ensure all views are heard. Establish absolute redlines that cannot be crossed or the coalition will withdraw its support. Be ready to stick to these high-priority redlines and outlast governmental pressure. Identify points of flexibility for lower-priority redlines and be responsive to changing circumstances. Have a robust internal decision making process to define redlines and defend them. Communicate demands that are higher than the actual redlines. Timing also matters so do not establish redlines too early.

The small groups brainstormed several actions. There were more calls to hold collective get-togethers like the Summit to learn from each and share information to ensure coordination of effort. Create a unified front within the campaign and more broadly with partners and governments. Look at how we can create coherent human security discourse that informs and links different campaigns, increasing the collective power of civil society.

III. Global Campaigns

Session III looked at how civil society organizes itself to advance humanitarian disarmament through international campaigns and other coordinated initiatives. Participants split into seven small groups to discuss governance structures, common goals, leadership and membership, national campaigns, setbacks and defeat, grassroots or astroturf, and equal partnerships. They identified many lessons from work to date as well as actions that we could take to advance humanitarian disarmament together through global campaigns. The following summary highlights some of the major findings and common agreements.

There are many challenges involved in the creation and maintenance of a credible, flexible governance structure, but good governance in process, structure, and practice is crucial for the smooth operation of any civil society coalition. This requires clarity and articulation of visions regarding a common goal. It involves checks and balances, including to manage strong personalities/organizations. NGO representatives on

governance bodies must have passion/energy for the mandate, knowledge of the issue, good communication skills, and be diverse. The ability to be flexible and to adapt/evolve was also identified as a key element for good governance. Civil society tends to assume that longevity of practice implies effectiveness, but campaigns need to commit to conduct regular assessments and critical review of goals, tactics, and structure. Civil society must be willing to involve new people and constituencies and to change if necessary.

Advancing humanitarian disarmament through international coalitions requires that civil society speak with one voice in pursuit of common goals while being inclusive and maintaining diversity. One lesson was that it always seems easier to agree on big, lofty goals, but harder to identify and prioritize common policy and messages. To facilitate agreement we need to build better relationships between our NGOs and with each other, and work to resolve problems when they emerge. Being part of coalition involves a trade-off between amplifying collective effectiveness through a single coalition voice and meeting individual NGO interests.

Leadership and membership are key governance components. One challenge is how to build a small campaign team of strong leaders and committed workers that can effectively work with all members to advance the coalition's objectives. Strong and inclusive leadership was deemed necessary, but with the requirement that leaders "listen and be responsive." It can be easy to recruit new members, but harder to keep them long-term and ensure they are active so the coalition structure needs to provide incentives for its members. Match the campaign's structure (network, coalition, alliance, etc.) to the goal/objective and ensure that members sign up to and accept/understand the coalition's call/goal. Top-down structure can be effective for international coalitions, but must be carefully structured to ensure diversity and accompanied by excellent communications and transparency. Clarify the campaign's strategy/plan to make it explicit/clear and evaluate it regularly.

The discussion of how national campaigns influence and advance humanitarian disarmament in multilateral processes identified similar lessons to other groups. Not all national members work at the same level; some will be very engaged and others

participate in solidarity and help balance the membership. There was emphasis on the need for formal governance structures and coordination to be kept “as lean as possible.” A successful global coalition is built on strong personal relationships between all its members. Keeping members engaged, committed, and energized is aided when campaigning successes (at every level) are acknowledged and celebrated. Progress nationally helps motivate others and demonstrates that our goals are achievable. Dedicated support to national campaigns is always appreciated, including regular information exchange, small financial grants, technical assistance including IT resources, training, campaign toolkits such as graphics and online tools, and other incentives.

The discussion on equal partnerships looked at elements of a substantive or significant role for civil society in negotiating/implementing processes. The group found that “equal” does not mean the same and “equality” is not a goal as it is aspirational so the goal is better viewed as impact that is achieved through meaningful partnerships. Civil society is most powerful when united and this requires creating and articulating a clear common goal from the beginning. Agreeing on a clear common goal when forming the coalition was seen as more crucial than the number of NGOs that are recruited into the coalition. There is a need to pay attention to who is represented and who is representing in the coalition to ensure substantive and not token representation by different groups. We need to reinforce the standard of NGO involvement by making ourselves indispensable/valuable to governments.

One group discussed examples of actions to maintain campaign momentum after setbacks and defeat in humanitarian disarmament efforts. Framing ourselves as losers is disempowering, but setbacks and failures can be viewed/perceived as successes for civil society by using positive spin. Describe them as building blocks leading to eventual success. Identify who to reprimand as responsible for the failure or set-back (e.g. hostile governments) and play the blame game. Recognize and celebrate the small wins/successes along the way, while staying the course and keeping the pressure on. Manage expectations early on so that campaigns are not set up for failure. Regularly undertake honest internal assessments and be self-critical.

The grassroots or astroturf session looked at how popular participation in campaign actions is evolving with new technology and initiatives. It found that social media is here to stay and unavoidable so we all need to get familiar with it. Social media is an efficient, low-cost tool for campaigning that allows for interaction and active engagement with the public and other audiences, but it is not the only tool and cannot replace traditional campaigning. Time management, transparency, and consistency were seen as important considerations in using social media effectively as was the need to package content carefully to make it user friendly and understandable in simple form.

As the Summit was a gathering of campaigners it is not surprising that they identified many actions to organize and advance humanitarian disarmament through global campaigning. There were calls for more Summits to share experience and knowledge on best practices and lessons learned. More publications are needed to record lessons from our campaigning. There was a suggestion to share and even create a common code of conduct and/or terms of reference for conflict resolution and dispute settlement as well as “rules of engagement.” Online, proposed actions included making linkages between organizations/campaigns with respect to urgent issues and upcoming events. Reinforce/support different campaigns by using the #Follow Friday hashtag #FF on Twitter. Campaigns and campaigners working for humanitarian disarmament should follow each other’s Twitter feeds and be friends with each other on Facebook.

IV. Citizen Diplomacy

The fourth and final session looked at how civil society can collectively work to advance humanitarian disarmament through citizen diplomacy, a concept that, in a vibrant democracy, involves individual citizen exercising their right--even the responsibility--to help achieve outcomes through multilateral diplomacy. Participants split into five small groups to discuss the UN and First Committee, forum or process, success and challenges, collective strategy, and enduring partnerships. They identified lessons from past work to advance humanitarian disarmament via citizen diplomacy and several actions that could be taken collectively. The following summary highlights some of the major findings and common agreements.

The discussion on influencing the United Nations and First Committee found that civil society is currently not strategic, consistent, or assertive enough in its collective approach to the First Committee and in our relations with the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs. The way that NGO statements are delivered at First Committee and in other conventional UN fora was identified as a particular problem. We must work to build our collective bargaining power to influence the agenda and play a more significant role. This requires better planning and preparation throughout the year as well as coordination through stronger communication between and cooperation by NGOs working on the full range of disarmament issues. We also need to better understand our different interactions with the same UN agencies (for the purpose of taking advantage of each other's networks and contacts).

The forum or process discussion found that although the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is still viewed as the traditional body for multilateral disarmament it hasn't worked for more than 15 years and is unable to acknowledge, let alone take up humanitarian disarmament challenges. Monitoring by civil society, particularly WILPF's Reaching Critical Will, has been crucial in keeping both NGOs and governments aware of the failure of the CD and other conventional fora to advance humanitarian disarmament. The CD may provide civil society with diplomats to engage with in Geneva, but this is not enough of a reason to keep it alive. If the CD is going to change, the change has to come from the outside. Geneva can continue to serve as a meeting place for civil society and governments and more use could be made of other existing fora/processes that are proven to work. Moreover, we don't have the time to waste by placing our issues into static structures when action is needed now. We must develop new partnerships and use specific processes instead of fora to advance humanitarian disarmament.

In the successes and challenges discussion, emphasis was placed on the need to understand elements of past campaigning successes and build on them, as well as take advantage of the reputations of and expectations related to successful campaigns. It is crucial to protect and sustain the gains that civil society has made to date and use this established model. Gains include that civil society sets the agenda, leads the way, takes the high ground, has a seat at the table, provides credible content, and develops new

partnerships and works to sustain existing ones. We must accept that success can come from other areas and actors, such as governments, and not shy away from praising external successes. Isolate challenges and try to deal with them on a case-by-case basis. Never give the impression that a challenge undermines the whole campaign. There is no such thing as a “small” success.

Collective strategy requires practical measures that civil society can take to collectively share information and strategy to advance humanitarian disarmament. We need to learn from each other critically and not simply replicate what has been done before. Before taking action, first ask if a campaign or an international treaty is needed as some issues can be addressed on a national or regional basis. We need to sustain our community and reaffirm our collective ownership of successes because a win for one of us is a win for all of us, like tectonic plates moving. Staying in contact gives us mutual support so we need to work more to nurture and build our community as one community. We also need to open up the playing field and get more diversity on our issues in terms of actions and champions and apply the same diversity principals to our coalitions so that people feel empowered and there is true mobilization from the bottom-up.

Strong and enduring partnerships between civil society groups and governments, UN agencies, and international organizations can result in mutually beneficial relationships. Benefits include access to information, shared strategy, joint research products, and advocacy events/activities. Partnerships can result in positive and concrete results and these successes can help build political support, which can in turn help sustain the partner’s future level of engagement. Building and retaining partnerships requires a consistent level of support and follow-up. Civil society groups need to become a resource of reliable and useful information that can be used to press for action. In diplomacy, positions are dependent on national government policies that may shift as a result of national elections. Promote positive aspects of previous work so that the new government accepts the need to continue the work to the extent that it is useful for their reputation.

There were several suggested actions for civil society to collectively work to advance humanitarian disarmament via citizen diplomacy. As with previous sessions this included

a call for further Campaigns Summits or periodic meetings (annual if possible) to bring our community together when locations for our events overlap, e.g. New York in October, Geneva at various times of the year. Suggested coordination meetings for civil society participants attending UN First Committee got underway the next day with a morning meeting at the Beekman Hotel and continued through the week. We could increase use of shared calendars (e.g. via Reaching Critical Will) and global campaigns could look to share/coordinate sponsorship programs. We need to keep thinking about the framework for our collective efforts and communicate more often as well as welcome new players to our issues (don't turn anyone away).

The End – See the separate detailed notes of the small group discussions that are available on request.

#

Communiqué

Working together to advance humanitarian disarmament

Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit

New York

20-21 October 2012

We represent non-governmental organizations and coalitions working in the field of humanitarian disarmament, with the shared objective of protecting civilians from the harmful effects of armed violence. We have come together on the 20th anniversary of the founding of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 1997 Nobel Peace Laureate, to review and strengthen our collective work and to expand and further unite our community.

We support strong disarmament initiatives driven by humanitarian imperatives to strengthen international law and protect civilians. By advancing disarmament from a humanitarian perspective, we seek to prevent further civilian casualties, avoid socio-economic devastation, and protect and ensure the rights of victims.

History has shown that the strongest and most significant disarmament achievements have been driven by humanitarian imperatives, as well as by the need to achieve the clearest and highest standards possible. These initiatives have involved genuine cooperation and substantive partnerships between governments, international organizations, and civil society. They have resulted in the complete prohibition of certain types and classes of weapons that cause unnecessary harm, such as antipersonnel landmines and cluster munitions.

Humanitarian disarmament achievements are rarely the product of consensus decision-making, but rather created by the solid will of an overwhelming majority. Such approaches stand in stark contrast to processes where those few that want the least have been able to block the progress sought by the many.

Civil society plays a critical role in humanitarian disarmament. Our monitoring and research provides credible, first-hand information on the use of various weapons and the egregious harm they cause to civilian populations. Our advocacy leads to the creation and implementation of strong national and international standards. Our operations in affected countries protect civilians, support conflict recovery, and prevent and reduce armed violence.

We welcome the substantive progress that is being made with respect to existing international humanitarian disarmament treaties, but urge continued vigilance to ensure compliance with, full and effective implementation of, and universalization of these instruments.

The world faces an array of emerging and long-standing humanitarian disarmament challenges that must be tackled as soon as possible. But we cannot do this work alone.

We therefore call on all actors to stay focused on making existing humanitarian disarmament treaties work and use every opportunity to advance international law and practice to prevent harm to civilians.

We urge all states to:

- Adopt a proactive approach to tackle existing and emerging issues of concern in humanitarian disarmament by reviewing and strengthening policy and practice, undertaking national measures, and intensifying diplomatic engagement and political leadership;
- Acknowledge that successful multilateral diplomatic work in humanitarian disarmament is best achieved when based on the will of the overwhelming majority of participating states;
- Recognize that civil society plays a vital role in tackling humanitarian disarmament concerns and work to accord a substantive role for civil society representatives in multilateral processes.

Signatories:

[Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy](#)

[Action on Armed Violence](#)

[Article 36](#)

[BioWeapons Prevention Project](#)

[Chemical Weapons Convention Coalition](#)

[Cluster Munition Coalition](#)

[Center for Civilians in Conflict](#)

Ecumenical Campaign for a Strong and Effective Arms Trade Treaty, [World Council of Churches](#)

[Fundació per la Pau](#)

[Green Cross International](#)

[Handicap International](#)

[Human Rights Watch](#)

[IKV Pax Christi](#)

[Institute for Security Studies](#)

[International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons](#)

[International Campaign to Ban Landmines](#)

[International Coalition to Ban Uranium Weapons](#)

[International Committee for Robot Arms Control](#)

[International Network on Explosive Weapons](#)

[Mines Action Canada](#)

[MAG \(Mines Advisory Group\)](#)

[Nobel Women's Initiative](#)

[Norwegian People's Aid](#)

[Oxford Research Group](#)

[Peace Boat](#)

[Peace Movement Aotearoa](#)

[Physicians for Human Rights](#)

[Protection](#)

Strategic Concept for Removal of Arms and Proliferation ([SCRAP](#))

[Women's International League for Peace and Freedom](#)

Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, President, [Pugwash Conferences on Science & World Affairs](#)

Agenda – Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit

	Saturday 20 October			Sunday 21 October	
8.30-9.30	Opening Plenary		8.30-9.00	Plenary	
9.30-10.00	<i>Coffee Break</i>		9.00-9.30	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
10.00-12.00	Session I: Humanitarian Rationale		9.30-11.30	Session III. Global Campaigns	
	1. Evidence Base 2. Urgent Action 3. Field Reality 4. Treaty Elements	5. Changing Perceptions 6. Burden of Proof 7. HD Law		1. Governance Structures 2. Common Goals 3. Leadership/Membership 4. National Campaigns	5. Setbacks/Defeat 6. Grassroots/Astroturf 7. Equal Partnerships
12.00-13.30	<i>Lunch & Optional discussion on nuclear weapons</i>		11.30-13.00	<i>Lunch & Optional discussion on killer robots</i>	
13.30-15.30	Session II. Multilateral Processes		13.00-15.00	Session IV. Citizen Diplomacy	
	1. Getting Traction 2. The Fast-Track 3. Core Groups 4. Naming/Shaming	5. Vulnerable Groups 6. Redlines/Compromise 7. Consensus/Power		1. UN and First Committee 2. Forum or Process 3. Success/Challenges	4. Collective Strategy 5. Enduring Partnerships 6. TBD
	<i>Please leave the building no later than 15.45</i>		15.00-15.30	Closing Plenary	
17.00-20.30	<i>ILPI Drinks then Dinner</i>		18.00-20.30	<i>Closing Drinks</i>	

Agenda - Small Group Topics and Facilitators/Recorders

Facilitators (F) & recorders (R) are shown in (brackets).

Session I. Humanitarian Rationale

What is the rationale for humanitarian disarmament and why do we need it?

Key questions to be answered by each small group discussion:

- List 3 lessons from past/existing efforts to provide humanitarian rationale for disarmament objectives
- List 3 actions that could be taken to advance humanitarian rationale in the pursuit of disarmament objectives

Small Group options:

1. **Evidence Base** (F: Allison Pytlack, Control Arms/R: Matthew Bolton, Pace Uni) – Challenges in the collection and presentation of evidence of/to prevent humanitarian harm, including victims and socio-economic impact.
2. **Urgent Action** (F: Anna MacDonald, Oxfam/R: Cassandra Stimpson, Pace Uni) – Strategies and messaging needed to generate a call to action and creating a sense of urgency to address the root causes of humanitarian harm.
3. **Field Reality** (F: Jeff Abramson, Control Arms/R: Sean Imfeld, Harvard Uni) – How to manage and meet expectations on the ground in affected countries.
4. **Treaty Elements** (F: Chris Loughran, MAG/R: Kenny Pyetranker, Harvard Uni) – The key elements necessary for a “perfect” humanitarian disarmament instrument.
5. **Changing Perceptions** (F: Daniela Varano, ICAN/R: Jacquelyn Bradford, NYU) – How to change the disarmament focus from one of national security to human security.
6. **Burden of Proof** (F: Eva Veble, NPA/R: Danielle DeBold, NYU) – Lessons learned from shifting the burden of proof of humanitarian disarmament challenges on to governments.
7. **Humanitarian Disarmament Law** (F: Bonnie Docherty, HRW/R: Denise Tugade, GWU) – Examples of treaties and regulations that advance/encompass humanitarian disarmament and how to leverage them.

Session II. Multilateral Processes

How can we best advance humanitarian disarmament via multilateral processes?

Key Questions:

- List 3 lessons from past/existing efforts to advance humanitarian disarmament via multilateral processes
- List 3 actions that could be taken to advance humanitarian disarmament via multilateral processes

Small Group options:

1. **Getting Traction** (F: Hector Guerra, IANSA/R: Matthew Bolton, Pace Uni) – How to get on the (UN) agenda/traditional multilateral processes to advance humanitarian disarmament.
2. **Fast-Track Processes** (F: Jonathan Frerichs, WCC/R: Cassandra Stimpson, Pace Uni) – Lessons from taking humanitarian disarmament challenges out of conventional (UN) processes and onto the fast-track.
3. **Core Groups** (F: Kasia Derlicka, ICBL/R: Sean Imfeld, Harvard Uni) – How to build and work with a Core Group of champions/leadership states to advance humanitarian disarmament.
4. **Naming and Shaming** (F: Mark Hiznay, HRW/R: Kenny Pyetranker, Harvard Uni) – Recording and scrutinizing commitments by states and others in multilateral processes to advance humanitarian disarmament.
5. **Vulnerable Groups** (F: Lora Lumpe, OSF/R: Jacquelyn Bradford, NYU) – Lessons from working with “vulnerable” groups (e.g. survivors, youth) to advance humanitarian disarmament.
6. **Redlines and Compromise** (F: Maria-Pia Devoto, APP/R: Danielle DeBold, NYU) – How to identify and defend NGO coalition “redlines” aimed at setting the highest possible standard to advance humanitarian disarmament via multilateral processes.
7. **Consensus and Power** (F: Marion Libertucci, HI/R: Denise Tugade, GWU) – Strategies and tactics for handling major powers and consensus rules while advancing humanitarian disarmament.

Session III. Global Campaigns

How can civil society work together to advance humanitarian disarmament?

Key Questions:

- List 3 lessons from past/existing efforts by civil society to advance humanitarian disarmament via global campaigns

- List 3 actions that could be taken by civil society to organize and advance humanitarian disarmament via global campaigns

Small Group options:

1. **Governance Structures** (F: Susannah Sirkin, PHR/R: Matthew Bolton, Pace Uni) – The challenges involved in creating and maintaining a credible, flexible global coalition structure.

Session III: Global Campaigns - continued

2. **Common Goals** (F: Nerina Cevra, AOA/R: Ms. Cassandra Stimpson, Pace Uni) – How coalitions speak with one voice while being inclusive and maintaining diversity.

3. **Leadership and Membership** (F: Miriam Struyk, IKV Pax Christi/R: Sean Imfeld, Harvard Uni) – Building a small campaign team of strong leaders and committed workers to work with membership and advance campaign objectives.

4. **National Campaigns** (F: Paul Hannon, MAC/R: Kenny Pyetrunker, Harvard Uni) – Lessons from in-country campaigning to influence and advance humanitarian disarmament in multilateral processes.

5. **Setbacks and Defeat** (F: Richard Moyes, Article 36/R: Jacquelyn Bradford, NYU) – Examples of actions to overcome set-backs and maintain campaign momentum after defeat in humanitarian disarmament efforts.

6. **Grassroots or Astroturf** (F: Anna MacDonald, Oxfam/R: Danielle DeBold, NYU) – How grassroots participation in campaign actions is evolving with new technology and initiatives.

7. **Equal Partnerships** (F: Roos Boer, IKV Pax Christi/R: Denise Tugade, GWU) – The elements of a substantive or significant role for civil society in negotiating/implementing processes.

Session IV. Citizen Diplomacy

What practical measures can we take collectively to advance humanitarian disarmament?

Key Questions:

- List 3 lessons from past/existing efforts to advance humanitarian disarmament via citizen diplomacy
- List 3 actions that could be taken collectively by civil society to advance humanitarian disarmament via citizen diplomacy

Small Group options:

1. **UNGA and First Committee** (F: Roy Isbister, Saferworld & Matthew Bolton, Pace Uni) – Practical measures to improve how civil society works with the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs and other UN agencies and how it participates in UNGA First Committee.
2. **Forum or Process** (F: Susi Snyder, IKV Pax Christi/R: Cassandra Stimpson, Pace Uni) – The future of the Conference on Disarmament and its impact on collective efforts to advance humanitarian disarmament.
3. **Success and Challenges** (F: Sylvie Brigot-Vilain, ICBL-CMC/R: Sean Imfeld, Harvard Uni) – Examples of how civil society can leverage campaigning successes to advance humanitarian disarmament and respond to challenges (defeat, set-backs) to protect advances.
4. **Collective Strategy** (F: Thomas Nash, Article 36/R: Kenny Pyetranker, Harvard Uni) – Practical measures that civil society can take to collectively share information and strategy to advance humanitarian disarmament
5. **Enduring Partnerships** – (F: Wim Zwijnenburg, IKV Pax Christi/R: Jacquelyn Bradford, NYU) Lessons from how civil society manages relations with a progressive states to advance humanitarian disarmament.
6. **TBA** (F: Zach Hudson, HI/R: Danielle DeBold, NYU) – TBA

About the Format

The Campaigns Summit agenda has been prepared according to a modified version of the “open spaces” **format**. The aim is to allow participants to engage in semi-structured, semi-facilitated time in small groups, while recording the fruits of those discussions so that they can be shared quickly and widely. Participants can pick the small group they wish to participate in by simply showing up (no sign-up sheet is required). Participants are free to move between the groups (by leaving early and joining other groups late), but are encouraged to take private conversations/phone calls out in the hallway to keep the noise levels down. There will be seven small groups with approximately a dozen people in each, but some may be smaller and others larger. The small groups will be held in the corners of the rooms on the 2nd floor (plenary room) and 10th floor of the Church Center building.

The **outcomes** requested from each small group is a list of three lessons and three actions relating to the topic under discussion. There are likely to be many “lessons” given the wealth of experience of Summit participants, but the aim of the group should be to identify common lessons that are shared across our respective areas of work. The idea behind the “actions” is to collect a set of practical things (ideas, actions, pledges, commitments) that civil society can undertake, or agree to try and do collectively, or pledge to work with others to get done.

A volunteer **facilitator** has been assigned to facilitate the small group discussion, ensuring that everyone gets to contribute and that the group stays on topic and on time. In acknowledgment of their substantial expertise on the topics under discussion, facilitators have been encouraged to provide their own views to kick-start and keep the conversation going. They have also been reminded that the small group discussion is not a training session or lecture, but an opportunity to learn from each other through interactive discussion.

A volunteer **recorder** will ensure that the discussion and outputs (3 lessons/3 actions) of small group discussions are recorded. They will use a template sheet to record the main points of the group’s discussion and its responses to the common questions (lessons/actions) for each session. The record will be kept according to the Chatham House Rule (i.e. discussion is recorded and answers shared, but not attributed to a specific participant or their organization).

Final List of Participants

Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Summit

New York

20-21 October 2012

Contact information is available in the Briefing Book.

Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy

Dr. Rebecca Johnson

Action on Armed Violence

Ms. Katie Harrison

Ms. Nerina Cevra

Ms. Serena Olgiati

Amnesty International

Mr. Oliver Sprague

AP Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit

Mr. Kerry Brinkert

Article 36

Mr. Thomas Nash

Mr. Richard Moyes

Mr. John Borrie

Asociacion para Politicas Publicas

Ms. Maria-Pia Devoto

BioWeapons Prevention Project

Dr. Marie Chevrier

Center for Civilians in Conflict - formerly CIVIC

Mr. Michael Shaikh

Control Arms Secretariat

Mr. Jeff Abramson
Ms. Allison Pytlak
Ms. Emma Ensign

Handicap International

Ms. Marion Libertucci
Mr. Zach Hudson
Ms. Alicia Pierro

Harvard Law School International Human Rights Clinic

Ms. Bonnie Docherty (also with Human Rights Watch)
Mr. Sean Imfeld
Mr. Innokenty “Kenny” Pyetranker

Human Rights Watch

Mr. Steve Goose
Ms. Kate Castenson
Mr. Mark Hiznay
Ms. Mary Wareham
Ms. Denise Tugade

IKV Pax Christi

Ms. Miriam Struyk
Mr. Wim Zwijnenburg
Ms. Roos Boer
Ms. Susi Snyder
Ms. Alex Hiniker

International Action Network on Small Arms – IANSA

Dr. Hector Guerra

International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Ms. Arielle Denis
Mr. Magnus Lovold

International Campaign to Ban Landmines - Cluster Munition Coalition

Ms. Sylvie Brigot-Vilain

Ms. Kasia Derlicka

Mr. Firoz Alizada

Ms. Amelie Chayer

International Coalition to Ban Uranium Weapons

Mr. Doug Weir

Ms. Isabel Macdonald

International Committee of the Red Cross

Ms. Natalie Weizmann

International Committee on Robot Arms Control

Dr. Noel Sharkey

Dr. Peter Asaro

International Law and Policy Institute

Ms. Helle Winge Laursen

Mr. Torbjørn Graff Hugo

International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Dr. Bob Mtonga

Institute for International and Comparative Law in Africa

Prof. Christof Heyns

Ms. Tess Borden

Legacies of War

Ms. Channapha Khamvongsa

Instituto Sou da Paz

Mr. Daniel Mack

Mines Action Canada

Mr. Paul Hannon

MAG (Mines Advisory Group)

Mr. Nick Roseveare

Mr. Chris Loughran

Ms. Patricia Loria

New York University School of Law

Prof. Philip G. Alston

Ms. Sarah Knuckey

Ms. Danielle DeBold

Ms. Jacquelyn Bradford

Nobel Women's Initiative

Ms. Jody Williams

Norwegian People's Aid

Ms. Eva Veble

Ms. Kristin Obrestad

Ms. Hilde Jørgensen

Open Society Foundations

Ms. Lora Lumpe

Oxfam International

Ms. Anna MacDonald

Ms. Allison Boehm

Mr. Martin Butcher

Mr. Luke Roughton

Oxford Research Group - Every Casualty (UK)

Mr. Jacob Beswick

Pace University - Dyson College of Arts and Sciences (US)

Dr. Matthew Bolton

Ms. Cassandra Stimpson

Peace Boat (Japan)

Mr. Akira Kawasaki

Ms. Emilie McGlone

Physicians for Human Rights

Ms. Susannah Sirkin

Dr. James Cobey

Protection (Egypt)

Mr. Ayman Sorour

Pugwash Conferences on Science & World Affairs

Amb. Jayantha Dhanapala

Saferworld

Mr. Roy Isbister

SCRAP

Dr. Dan Plesch

Situ Studio

Mr. Brad Samuels

Mr. Akshay Mehra

WILPF - Reaching Critical Will

Ms. Beatrice Fihn

Ms. Ray Acheson

World Council of Churches

Mr. Jonathan Frerichs

#