TIME FRAMES, MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION SUB-COMMITTEE.

1   **Introduction.**

There are presently two submissions that we wish to make. These are as follows:-

1.1   The decision of our sub-committee to divide itself into four further sub-committees was incorrect, self defeating, irregular, contrary to the spirit of the terms of reference and which would only serve to unnecessarily delay the processes intended by Codesa.

1.2   The earliest oppurtunity at which Codesa II could take place is the 24th to the 26th April, 1992.

2   **The Terms of Reference.**

2.1   The terms of reference calls on us:-

2.1.1   To make recommendations with regard to appropriate time frames and target completion dates for all of the processes and assignments being undertaken by Codesa; [see:- 1.1.1.1]

2.1.2   To consider whether and how to address the practicability of setting of target completion dates for all agreements/ activities/ decisions; [see:- 1.1.1.4 (c)]

2.1.3   To consider realistically attainable time frames. [see:- 1.1.1.4 (h)]

2.2   Equally important to consider is the fact that the terms of reference of the preceding four working groups do not make any mention of the setting of time frames within which their processes are to take place. In any event, it would be impossible for one group to set the time frames of its processes without regard being had of the processes in the other working groups. The only working group empowered to do this is working group five.

3   ## The Impracticality of creating four task groups.

The decision by Working Group V Sub Committee II to divide itself into four task groups is incorrect for the following reasons:-

3.1   The task groups have been established with a view to monitoring a particular Working Groups minutes so as to glean what agreements have been reached with a view to deciding on time frames for such agreements/ processes. No one task group could effectively set time frames to any of the processes monitored without having regard to what is taking place in the other task groups. To do this would only lead to contradictions and confusion.

3.2   Irrespective of the political views of the different parties, organisations or administrations present, our views with regard to time frames are derived from our individual perceptions as to the unfolding scenario which we strive for.

3.3   The setting of time frames cannot be done in a mechanistic way without regard to the above. Accordingly, to allow the present situation to continue would only lead to confusion and serve to delay the processes of Codesa.

4   ## A Possible Way Forward.

There are various options to resolve this crisis.

4.1   We could disband the various task groups and carry out our work in the sub-committee plenary. In this regard, it is suggested that we revert to the initial argument put forward that we should divide the issues identified into two categories; namely, levelling the playing field and establishing a democracy. Once this is done, we should then obtain broad agreement as to the sequence of processes being discussed in the other working groups. Here, we would have to be careful not to allow debate and discussion into the substantial issues which are already being discusses elsewhere as that is not within our terms of reference. having obtained such agreement, we should then request each delegation on the morning of every session to arrive with their submissions as to the agreements identified in the minutes of the other working groups and then to set out time frames accordingly.

4.2   Alternatively, we could retain the four task group whose assignment should be no more than to glean the points of agreement. This would then be conveyed to the plenary of the sub-committee which would then set time frames.

4.3   It is submitted that the first option should be accepted as it involves a much more efficient method of arriving at agreements.