Madam Chairwoman,

The United States supports the six-year cycle agreed upon at the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States. However, as we noted back in 2010, Member States should proceed in a manner that distinguishes between the mandates of various meetings and should be careful about adding meetings just for the sake of holding meetings. In our view, the most effective use of Member States’ limited resources would be to hold biennial meetings that discuss technical issues and bring practitioners together to exchange information on lessons learned and best practices. On the last year of the six-year cycle, States would meet to review and strengthen implementation of the Program of Action (PoA). Thus, States would meet every two years as called for in the PoA. As in previous meetings, we would simultaneously consider the PoA and the International Tracing Instrument (ITI).

The United States continues to highlight the need for early designation of a Chairperson for each PoA meeting, as well as timely development of an agenda and selection of priority issues for consideration well in advance of the meetings to allow Member States to prepare adequately. We would also support linking regional meetings with the global PoA process, including alignment of regional meetings with the six-year cycle, as suggested in the Chair’s non-paper.

When considering follow-up meetings, States should be mindful of budgetary implications and ensure we can take up recommendations within existing resources. In a time of growing resource constraints, States need to analyze carefully the costs and benefits of additional meetings beyond the biennial meetings provided for in the PoA. Resources expended on follow-up meetings may mean fewer resources are available for direct assistance to States in implementing the PoA and the ITI.

Thank you.