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1. INTRODUCTION

The range of OSCE activities to prevent and combat the illicit trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) in all its aspects is a reflection of the Organization’s comprehensive approach to security and a product of its broad acquis in arms control, disarmament and conflict prevention. It also reflects the OSCE’s wide geographic coverage\(^1\), including major producer and exporter States, and States negatively affected by the proliferation of SALW.

OSCE’s Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) is a decision taking body of the organization that includes representatives of all OSCE participating States and meets on a weekly basis. According to its mandate, FSC is tasked to conduct negotiations on, inter alia, arms control, disarmament and confidence building. SALW issue has been on the OSCE’s agenda since 1999.

The OSCE Document on SALW (FSC.DOC/1/00, adopted on 24 November 2000 and reissued as FSC.DOC/1/00/Rev.1 on 20 June 2012) committed States to a comprehensive set of norms, measures and principles to control each stage of life of a small arm. It also paved the way for the Organization’s broad response to these problems, and gave participating States the primary responsibility for the implementation of its commitments.

In the course of the Document’s follow-up implementation, the OSCE participating States have agreed on a number of SALW related decisions and developed a set of best practices known as Handbook of Best Practices on SALW. The issue of conventional ammunition, including SALW ammunition, has also become a vital part of the OSCE activities in this domain.

The OSCE SALW Document and relevant supplementary decisions serve as a solid base to ensure comprehensive control on SALW. The review process launched at the OSCE identified that the future OSCE course of action should be double tracked and focus on further enhancement of SALW controls in parallel to the efforts aimed at the full implementation of existing measures.

This Report shows how the Organization has implemented the UN Programme of Action (PoA) on SALW between July 2010 and July 2012. For previous reports and a general overview of OSCE normative commitments and activities in the field of SALW, please see http://www.osce.org/fsc.

\(^1\) OSCE includes 56 participating States and is comprised of countries of Europe, Central Asia and Northern America.
2. OBJECTIVES
This report is intended to provide an overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments on SALW as well as the contribution to the implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW. It also describes the progress in the implementation of OSCE-related SALW assistance projects. It is primarily designed to serve as a basis for determining the status of implementation of the OSCE and UN commitments on SALW and to highlight the most challenging issues to be addressed in the future.

3. OSCE PLAN OF ACTION ON SALW
Ministerial Council Decision 15/09 requested the Forum for Security Co-operation to develop an OSCE Plan of Action on SALW by May 2010, taking into account suggestions made at the OSCE Meeting to Review the OSCE Document on SALW and Its Supplementary Decisions (September 2009). In line with that request, the FSC negotiated the Plan of Action and adopted it in May 2010 (FSC Decision 2/10).

The Plan of Action on SALW sets out a comprehensive roadmap for the OSCE’s future action on the issue. The document’s two pillars focus on improvement of the implementation of existing measures and review of the implementation of principles, norms and measures in order to improve capacity and efficiency. Furthermore, it identifies concrete measures and sets deadlines for their implementation.

The implementation of the Plan is continuously reviewed and assessed at the meetings of the FSC and its working group A, as well as in the context of the Informal Group of Friends on SALW.

4. SPECIAL FSC MEETING ON SALW
On 28 September 2011, the Kazakhstan FSC Chairmanship organized a Special FSC Meeting on SALW. The meeting focussed on the implementation issues, with particular emphasis on brokering and export controls.

During the meeting, the CPC presented an overview of national replies with regard to the information exchange on controls of brokering activities on SALW prepared in line with FSC Decision 17/10 (FSC.GAL/95/11, dated 1 September 2011). In addition, a template for an end-user certificate was presented by an expert from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), who had been hired by the CPC for the project. The template is for voluntary use by participating States and could facilitate the implementation of FSC Decision 5/04 on standard elements for an end-user certificate.

The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) presented the efforts of the UN directed towards curbing the proliferation of illicit SALW, with particular emphasis on the results of the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Illicit Brokering in SALW and the recent study conducted on the national systems for end-use certification. UNODA also recalled the conference to negotiate the Arms Trade Treaty in July 2012, and updated the Forum about the ongoing co-operation and co-ordination efforts between UNODA and the OSCE with regard to facilitating the full implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW and the OSCE Document on SALW.

The Small Arms Survey presented an analysis of the OSCE commitments on SALW export and brokering controls, identifying areas for further work.
5. MEETING TO REVIEW OSCE PLAN OF ACTION ON SALW AND EXPERT LEVEL SESSION ON SALW STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT, SURPLUS REDUCTION AND DESTRUCTION

In order to facilitate the implementation of the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW two specialized meetings were organized back-to-back on 22-24 May 2012 with the participation of over 150 national officials, representatives of other international organizations and selected NGOs. The Meeting to Review the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW (22-23 May 2012) aimed to assess the rate with which the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW has been fulfilled and look at how the future OSCE action could best complement international efforts without duplicating them. The meeting also looked into the OSCE contribution to the UN SALW process and the way forward.

The meeting has shown that substantial results have been achieved in some areas related to the implementation of the Plan of Action. However, it also demonstrated the need for further efforts to boost the implementation of the norms, measures and principles agreed in the Plan of Action. In this regard, the Forum will update the Plan of Action in the fall 2012 with a view to reflecting the suggestions from the meeting to be incorporated into its future work plan.

The Expert Level Session on SALW Stockpile Management, Surplus Reduction and Destruction (24 May 2012) provided for an expert level discussion focusing on the best national practices employed in the OSCE region for the management of stockpiles, reduction of surpluses and destruction of SALW, also in light of OSCE and international best practices, common challenges and the recommendations for follow-up work. Particularly, the meeting addressed the possibility to build up OSCE training capabilities on stockpile management and security. Case studies from OSCE assistance projects and other examples focused the discussion on issues of potential commonality with other OSCE pS.

The detailed report of the two meetings is attached at Annex A.

6. NORMATIVE ASPECTS

The OSCE Document on SALW refers mainly to the norm-setting base and establishes an OSCE framework for the development and implementation of national legislation, rules and procedures. The review of these norms and the development of supplementary and/or complementary decisions by the FSC constitute a core issue of the FSC's regular work. The work in 2010 and 2011 centred on the following issue:

6.1 Information Exchange with regard to OSCE Principles on the Control of Brokering in SALW

Ministerial Council Decision 15/09 requested the FSC to take steps to review the implementation of Ministerial Council Decision No. 11/08 with regard to the establishment or reinforcement of a legal framework for lawful brokering activities within the national jurisdiction of participating States by the end of 2010.

In order to implement the request, on 24 November 2010, the Forum adopted FSC Decision 17/10 on an information exchange with regard to OSCE principles on the control of brokering in SALW. In the decision, the participating States agreed to conduct a one-off information exchange on their present regulations concerning brokering activities with regard to SALW no later than 30 June 2011. Furthermore, the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) was tasked
with producing a summary report on the replies by 1 September 2011 and posting it on the
public website.

By 20 July 2012, 47 participating States\(^2\) had provided national replies in accordance with
FSC Decision 17/10. The CPC circulated an updated summary report on the implementation
on 3 August 2012.\(^3\)

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING COMMITMENTS

7.1 Information exchanges on SALW
The OSCE Document on SALW commits the participating States to a number of standards,
which, if fully implemented, will assist States in their efforts to abide by many of the
paragraphs on national implementation in the UN Programme of Action on SALW. Among
others, the OSCE Document established a mechanism of transparency measures aimed at
raising confidence and security as well as further promoting trust among OSCE participating
States.

The OSCE participating States exchange annual and one-off information on various aspects
related to transfer controls in respect of SALW and conventional arms more generally. These
information exchanges are confidential between the OSCE participating States, and are
regularly discussed at FSC meetings, special seminars and conferences. The general level of
implementation in 2010-2011 was significantly lower, and less compliant in timing, than in
previous years. The FSC Chair’s Announcing and Reminding Mechanism was extensively
employed.

OSCE information exchanges relevant to SALW transfer controls include:
- Information exchange on conventional arms transfers (FSC.DEC 13/97 and FSC.DEC
  8/98);
- Questionnaire on conventional arms transfers (FSC.DEC 20/95);
- Information exchange on small arms exports to, and imports from, other participating
  States during the previous calendar year (FSC.DOC/01/00Rev.1, Section III, (F)1).

In addition, the participating States have agreed to provide each other with updates, as
follows, when necessary:
- Information exchange on national marking systems used in the manufacture and/or import
  of small arms and light weapons (FSC.DOC/01/00/Rev.1, Section II, (D)1);
- Information exchange on national procedures for the control of manufacture of small
  arms and light weapons (FSC.DOC/01/00/Rev.1, Section II, (D)1);
- Information exchange on national legislation and current practice in small arms export
  policy, procedures, documentation and brokering controls (FSC.DOC/01/00/Rev.1,
  Section III, (F)2).

7.1.1 One-off information exchanges
Under the OSCE Document on SALW, the participating States agreed to share and submit
updated information, when necessary, on national marking systems; national procedures for
the control of manufacturing; national legislation and current practice in export policy,

\(^2\) The national responses can be found at: [http://www.osce.org/fsc/76254](http://www.osce.org/fsc/76254).
\(^3\) The full Updated Summary Report can be found at: [http://www.osce.org/fsc/92596](http://www.osce.org/fsc/92596).
procedures and documentation, and control over brokering; small arms destruction techniques; and small arms stockpile security and management programmes.

FSC Decision 11/08 tasked the participating States with exchanging information on national practices related to preventing the spread of SALW through illicit air transport.

FSC Decision 12/08 requested the participating States to provide a sample format of their national end-user certificate and/or other pertinent documents.

Detailed information about the number of participating States that exchanged one-off information can be found in Annex B.

In April 2010, the CPC produced a report comparing the OSCE model answer for one-off information exchanges on SALW and the UN guidelines for reporting on the implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW (FSC.GAL/50/10). The purpose of the report was to identify similarities/differences in the information requested under the OSCE Document on SALW and the UN Programme of Action on SALW. The report recommended, *inter alia*, jointly aligning or harmonizing exchanges of information submitted to the UN and the OSCE in order to improve their numbers and quality with possible input from other regional arrangements (e.g. Wassenaar Arrangement).

In line with the recommendation of the report, in March 2011, the CPC issued a revised template for reporting one-off information on SALW with the suggested start of the reporting on 30 June 2011, in accordance with the deadline for reporting updated in the OSCE Document on SALW. The revised template contains standardized questions and is fully harmonized with the new UN reporting template. The revised reporting template is aimed at reducing the reporting burden on participating States, while making information more comparable and comprehensive. By 17 August 2012, 26 participating States had provided updated inputs to the one-off information exchange on SALW in the new format.

7.1.2 Annual information exchanges

In addition to exchanging information about existing norms and regulations, the OSCE Document requires the participating States to exchange data annually on exports to, and imports from, other OSCE participating States, as well as on small arms identified as surplus and/or seized and destroyed on their territories in the previous calendar year. An overview of this information exchange is displayed in Annex C.

According to the data exchanged, during the period from 2001 to 2011, OSCE participating States destroyed 14,419,264 items of SALW. Details are contained in Annex D.

7.2 End-user certificate template

In order to facilitate the implementation of FSC Decision 5/04 on standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports, the CPC, with the help of consultancy from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), developed an electronic template for an end-user certificate. The template was presented during the Special FSC Meeting on SALW held on 28 September 2011.

The template is based on the criteria outlined in FSC Decision 5/04 and is also in line with the International Small Arms Control Standard on end-user certification (2011). The electronic template aims at raising standards for end-user certificates among the OSCE
participating States. The template contains mandatory and optional elements and can be voluntarily adopted for use in participating States either in full or only in part.

7.3 **SALW reference guide**
In an effort to facilitate the implementation of OSCE commitments on SALW, in June 2011, the CPC issued a reference guide. The guide included all the principles, norms and measures on SALW that the OSCE had adopted since 2000.

7.4 **Reissue of SALW Document**
In line with the tasking of the Ministerial Council Decision Nr. 6/11 and in order to promote the full implementation of the agreed commitments, in June 2012, the FSC reissued the OSCE Document on SALW consolidating it with all relevant decisions that have been taken since the adoption of the initial Document in 2000.\(^4\) Having the extensive OSCE SALW documentation in a single instrument will facilitate its implementation by policy-makers in the OSCE capitals.

7.5 **Awareness-raising**
In 2010-2012, the Informal Group of Friends on SALW continued to assist the FSC Chairmanship on matters related to the implementation of the OSCE Document on SALW, as well as of FSC decisions related to SALW. In particular, the Chair of the Informal Group of Friends on SALW assisted the FSC Chair in negotiating and implementing the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW. Several presentations on SALW were given as part of the FSC's Security Dialogue. Furthermore, the OSCE organized a number of training events and workshops. An overview of these activities as well as other activities related to the promotion of OSCE SALW initiatives is attached as Annex E. OSCE officials also participated in a number of external events in order to promote OSCE work on SALW and establish synergies with other international organizations. The detailed account of participation in external events can be found at Annex F.

8. **PRACTICAL ASSISTANCE ON SALW**

8.1 **Overview**
Implementation of the elements in the OSCE Document on SALW which deal with requests for assistance from participating States to tackle the issues of destruction, management and security of stockpiles of SALW remains an essential part of the efforts of the Forum for Security Co-operation in this field.

Since 2003, the OSCE has received 46 requests for assistance from 16 countries relating to enhancement of the management and security of stockpiles of SALW and of conventional ammunition, including mélange, or destruction of surpluses of them. The requests from participating States for assistance in tackling the issues of destruction, management and security of stockpiles of SALW remain an essential part of the FSC’s efforts in this field. In particular, assistance projects in Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Kyrgyz Republic can be seen as examples of these activities in 2010-2012. The full account of donors’ contributions for such practical assistance projects can be found at Annex G.

\(^4\) The reissued OSCE Document on SALW can be found at: [http://www.osce.org/fsc/20783](http://www.osce.org/fsc/20783).
8.2 National co-ordination bodies
In 2008, the FSC adopted decision No. 4/08 establishing an OSCE Directory of Points of Contact (POC) on SALW and SCA as an additional tool for co-operation and co-ordination among the participating States on assistance projects relating to SALW and SCA. In line with the decision, the CPC has established and maintained an aggregate database of points of contact provided by OSCE participating States and other parties to the directory. During 2010-2012, the CPC provided updated information on projects on SALW and SCA via the Directory of Points of Contact. However, communications between States and/or to the CPC via the points of contact remain at a low level.

8.3 Assistance projects

8.3.1 Republic of Belarus
Based on the Memorandum of Understanding between the OSCE Secretariat and UNDP, the OSCE and UNDP continued the implementation of the joint project on capacity-building for SALW in Belarus, addressing issues of the physical security and stockpile management of 13 State-held SALW storage sites. The first phase of the programme, designed to enhance the capacity of the Ministry of Defence of Belarus to safely guard SALW at five storage sites, was successfully completed in the summer of 2010. Also the number of sites addressed within the project was reduced to thirteen in favour of concentrating SALW at larger storage sites. Currently, UNDP, which is serving as the implementing agency for this project, together with the Ministry of Defence, is implementing the second phase of the project, focussing on two large storage sites, in Gomel and Kolosovo, and two smaller sites, in Baroūka and Zaslonava.

The status update and work plan for 2012-2013 were presented to the FSC by UNDP and the Ministry of Defence in the context of the Security Dialogue in October 2011.

8.3.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina
In March 2011, BiH requested assistance from the OSCE in enhancing the security and stockpile management of Ministry of Defence storage sites containing their conventional ammunition (five sites) and small arms and light weapons (two sites). In order to evaluate the safety and security of the existing SALW and conventional ammunition, as well as to determine the parameters of a potential assistance project, the OSCE conducted an assessment visit from 20 to 24 June 2011. The assessment confirmed the need for assistance in enhancing security and stockpile management of SALW and SCA storage sites.

In line with the recommendations of the assessment team a project plan has been developed. The plan includes the refurbishment of the SALW storage sites at Teufik, Buza and Rabic to enhance the current levels of safety and security, so as to bring them into compliance with the OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on SALW, and the refurbishment of the conventional ammunition storage sites at Kula I and Krupa to bring them into compliance with the OSCE Best Practice Guide on Procedures for Management of Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition. Given the involvement of other international actors in various aspects of SALW and SCA issues, activities are closely co-ordinated with other actors.

In May 2012, the post of the Security Co-operation Adviser who will act as a regional co-ordinator of the OSCE SALW and SCA projects in Albania, BiH, Montenegro and Serbia was established. Furthermore, the detailed plan for installation of new doors at four prospective locations/ammunition storage sites has been developed and approved by the BiH
Minister of Defence. According to the plan, the doors for all four locations should be installed by the end of November 2012.

8.3.3 Kyrgyz Republic

In February 2008, the Kyrgyz Republic submitted a request for assistance to the FSC for enhancing the management and security of stockpiles of SALW and conventional ammunition in the southern part of the country, where an increase in the activity of radical extremist groups is putting the current storage facilities at risk. Kyrgyzstan suffers from excess stocks of outdated ammunition left behind after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Safety and security measures need to be significantly updated at the SALW and conventional ammunition storage sites, and coupled with the instability of some of the ammunition, the situation poses a serious danger to the civilian population, since some storage sites are located close to populated areas. Moreover, some of the storage buildings are in poor condition and in some cases are not weatherproof, thus leading to a risk that residues from decaying ammunition could contaminate the soil around the storage sites.

In July 2008, the request was substantiated by the questionnaire that provided detailed information about the type of assistance requested. During the period from 14 to 18 March 2011, a second assessment visit was carried out by the OSCE team in order to evaluate the safety and security of stockpiles of SALW and conventional ammunition and the scope of possible assistance, and to define the technical requirements of the future assistance project. As a follow-up to the assessment an assistance project has been developed to assist the government of Kyrgyzstan in the following areas:

- Training on management and security of stockpiles of SALW and conventional ammunition;
- Construction and refurbishment of ammunition storage sites; and
- Destruction of surplus and unserviceable SALW, including MANPADS.

In 2010, the Kyrgyz authorities requested the assistance of the OSCE in collecting SALW looted during riots in the spring and summer of 2010 to supplement national efforts that had been undertaken up to that time. In response, the OSCE, jointly with UNDP, initiated an assessment visit to the country from 7 to 12 February 2011 to evaluate the situation on the ground and assess the feasibility and the scope of a future assistance project. The assessment recommended:

- Conducting a comprehensive survey of SALW and security; and
- Designing an amended SALW collection programme.

Currently, the OSCE and UNDP are in the process of initiating the survey in consultation with the authorities of the Kyrgyz Republic.

9. OUTREACH AND CO-OPERATION

Co-operation and co-ordination of efforts are of utmost importance to the OSCE in order to achieve maximum effectiveness with the lowest cost while complementing existing or planned initiatives. To this end, the OSCE has made a number of formal and informal co-operation arrangements with other international organizations.

9.1 Operational support and information exchange

The OSCE Secretariat holds annual staff talks with the UN to share information about the latest developments and new initiatives, both on the setting of norms and standards and on practical assistance in respect of SALW.
In 2010, the CPC initiated informal regular consultations with the UN Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA), which consists of over 20 relevant UN agencies and programmes that deal with SALW issues, including the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the UN Development Programme, the UN Institute for Disarmament Research and others. Since December 2010, regular consultations (via videoconference) have been held to exchange information about ongoing and planned initiatives, co-ordinate action and seek synergies.

Furthermore, the OSCE Secretariat conducts biannual staff talks with NATO. Issues related to the implementation of projects on SALW and conventional ammunition are discussed in detail. Such talks serve to share information and lessons learnt, avoid duplication of effort, establish possible synergies and increase the effectiveness of projects.

Finally, the OSCE Secretariat holds bi-annual staff talks with the EU to exchange information and discuss a wide range of issues. In 2010-2012, the OSCE and the EU have explored the possibilities for EU financial support for SALW projects, in order to be able to ensure longer-term financing and to make possible the implementation of projects for which funding is lacking.

The CPC exchanges information on OSCE project activities, as well as on normative achievements in the area of SCA, with other international organizations, including UNDP, NATO/NAMSA, EU and SEESAC. Since 2008, informal meetings have been organized with other international organizations to enhance co-ordination of efforts with regard to projects on small arms and light weapons and stockpiles of conventional ammunition. The purpose of the meetings is to take stock of the projects relating to SALW and SCA being implemented by international organizations, to exchange lessons learnt and best practices, and to co-ordinate ongoing and future activities. Such meetings are organized in line with the following modalities:

- The one-day informal co-ordination meetings are held twice a year;
- When applicable, the scope of such meetings may be expanded to accommodate relevant projects and issues outside the field of SALW and SCA.

In 2010-2012, the co-ordination meetings were held in Belgrade and Tirana.

### 9.2 Partnership and co-operation agreements with other international organizations

#### 9.2.1 Memorandum of Understanding with UNDP

In line with the UN Programme of Action on SALW, which encouraged regional organizations to co-operate, and to develop and strengthen partnerships for sharing resources to combat illicit SALW, the OSCE developed a general framework for technical co-operation with the UN Development Programme (UNDP). A Memorandum of Understanding signed in 2006 provides a non-exclusive framework for technical co-operation for the implementation of SALW and conventional-ammunition projects. Since 2007, five large joint projects were launched in the framework of the Memorandum, in Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro and Serbia.
9.2.2 Joint Action Plan with UNODC

In order to improve synergies in the activities of the two organizations, in October 2011, a Joint Action Plan was signed by the OSCE and UNODC. The Plan specifically foresees joint development of policy and programmes in the following areas:

- Avoiding duplication of their work in various regions in the area of countering trafficking in firearms/SALW;
- Conducting expert-level consultations on issues related to fighting illicit firearms/SALW and keeping each other abreast of major plans and developments in the area;
- Inviting relevant experts from the other Party to events on countering the illicit trafficking of SALW and where appropriate will consult with each other in order to ensuring that newly elaborated initiatives are reviewed jointly;
- Co-operating in the awareness-raising and implementation of the relevant instruments and documents on firearms/SALW in areas, including the Caucasus, Central Asia, Eastern Europe and South Eastern Europe;
- Improving national capacities of OSCE participating States to effectively tackle the non-proliferation of SALW through, inter alia, joint workshops and joint development of training curricula.

Under the Joint Action Plan, in March 2012, the OSCE, jointly with UNODC and the German Federal Export Control Agency (BAFA), initiated an expert level visit to Moldova to review export control legislation for dual-use and military goods, including SALW, and to review the implementation of the UN Firearms Protocol. Both organizations also invited each other to various events on SALW.

9.3 Participation in the Open-Ended Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the Programme of Action on SALW, focussing also on the International Tracing Instrument

From 9 to 13 May 2011, an Open-Ended Meeting of Governmental Experts was held by the UN to address key implementation challenges relating to the UN Programme of Action on SALW. The meeting focussed on marking, record-keeping, tracing and international assistance and co-operation. The FSC Chairmanship made a statement at the meeting, outlining the OSCE’s efforts directed towards contributing to the full implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW and the ITI with regard to marking, tracing and record-keeping.

10. ENSURING EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARMS EMBARGOES

The OSCE has furthered the implementation of existing arms embargoes. In relation to the OSCE embargo, the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre has regularly provided information to OSCE participating States as well as other international organizations on the status and the level of its implementation. The issue of responsible transfers is included in a number of OSCE documents, such as Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers (1993) and most recently the OSCE Principles on Control of Brokering, discussed in Section 3 of the report.

In addition, the OSCE regularly provides updates on the relevant OSCE export control activities to the UN officials responsible for sanctions and arms embargoes implementation, including Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities. Furthermore
relevant OSCE training workshops always include encouragement to follow UN arms embargoes, including those imposed against Al-Qaeda.

11. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION
The OSCE, as a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, is dedicated to sharing SALW and Ammunition related information and documents produced within the OSCE with the United Nations. According to the FSC decisions the following documents have been provided to the UN: OSCE SALW Document, Model Answers, OSCE Handbook of the Best Practice Guides and Standard Elements of End-User Certificates and Verification Procedures for SALW Exports.

12. REGIONAL POINT OF CONTACT
The OSCE Document on SALW designated the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) as the point of contact on SALW issues. The FSC Support Section in the CPC has taken on this function, and acts as the repository of data collected under the information exchanges, and as the liaison with other international, regional and sub-regional organizations. The CPC also provides advice and expertise to OSCE bodies, institutions and field missions on SALW-related issues and projects, and fosters the implementation of OSCE commitments among participating States through the organization of seminars and training courses on request. Finally, the CPC maintains an informal roster of experts and administers extra-budgetary contributions for SALW related activities.

The regional point of contact on SALW and the implementation of the UN Programme of Action is:
FSC Support Section/Conflict Prevention Centre
OSCE Secretariat
Wallnerstrasse 6; 1010-Vienna
Austria
Tel. + 43 1 514 36 0
Fax. + 43 1 514 36 96

National Co-ordination Bodies
In 2008, the FSC took a decision to establish an “OSCE Directory of Points of Contact on SALW and SCA” to be an additional tool for co-operation and co-ordination among participating States on assistance projects relating to SALW and SCA. The primary purpose of the directory is to facilitate information-sharing between participating States on issues related to SALW and SCA projects.
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OSCE MEETING TO REVIEW THE OSCE PLAN OF ACTION
ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS
The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC),

Recalling the commitment by the OSCE participating States to combat illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons (SALW) in all its aspects, as laid down and detailed in the OSCE Document on SALW (FSC.DOC/1/00, 24 November 2000),

Reaffirming the commitment by the OSCE participating States to the full implementation of the OSCE Document on SALW and the supplementary decisions taken by the FSC,

Recalling the OSCE Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (FSC.DEC/2/10, 26 May 2010), in which participating States agreed conduct an experts’ meeting to review the implementation of the Plan no later than in May 2012,

Determined to continue playing an active role in international efforts based on the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects (2001),

Decides:

1. To organize an OSCE meeting to review the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW on 22 and 23 May 2012, in Vienna, with the participation of relevant international governmental and non-governmental organizations and in accordance with the programme, indicative timetable and organizational modalities annexed to this decision;

2. To task the OSCE Secretariat to support the organization of this meeting;

3. To invite the OSCE participating States to consider providing extrabudgetary contributions for the above-mentioned event.
OSCE MEETING TO REVIEW THE OSCE PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

Vienna, 22 and 23 May 2012

I. Programme and indicative timetable

Monday, 21 May 2012

Arrival of external participants
(Possibilities for informal discussions amongst participating States)

Tuesday, 22 May 2012

10–10.30 a.m. Opening session
– Opening statement by the FSC Chairperson
– Opening address by the OSCE Secretary General

10.30 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session I: Conformity, transparency and practical assistance
(with a coffee break)

(Ref. Plan of Action on SALW, Section I, paragraphs 1 and 2)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of conformity, transparency and practical assistance;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to conformity, transparency and practical assistance.

1–3 p.m. Buffet lunch

3–6 p.m. Working session II: Export and brokering controls (with a coffee break)

(Ref. Plan of Action on SALW, Section II, paragraphs 1 and 2)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of SALW export and brokering controls;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to export and brokering controls.
Wednesday, 23 May 2012

10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session III: Stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing (with a coffee break)

(Ref. Plan of Action on SALW, Section II, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing of SALW;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing.

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

3–4.30 p.m. Working session IV: Way forward on the Plan of Action and OSCE contribution to the UN processes

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Remarks by panellists;
– Discussion on the way forward with regard to the Plan of Action on SALW:
  – What is the implementation rate of the Plan of Action?
  – What issues of the Plan require further implementation efforts?
  – Are there additional aspects of the Plan of Action implementation identified by participating States on which the OSCE should focus its efforts?
  – How can the OSCE SALW processes further contribute to global efforts?
– Discussion of the OSCE contribution to the UN Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action on SALW.

4.30–5 p.m. Closing session

– Chairperson’s closing remarks

II. Organizational modalities

Background

The OSCE Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (FSC Decision No. 2/10) requested the FSC to conduct an expert’s meeting to review the implementation of the Plan of Action on SALW no later than May 2012. This meeting is to build upon the relevant provisions in the OSCE Document on SALW as well as on the extensive OSCE acquis in respect of SALW, developed since 1999. It is also to take into account the
contributions and proposals made by experts on SALW and relevant NGOs in the context of the FSC’s work, in particular during its SALW review meeting in 2009.

The meeting is to take full advantage of the Final Outcome Document of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW (BMS-4) as well as the results of the 2011 Experts Group meeting that dealt with marking, record-keeping and tracing.

The meeting, based on a thematic approach, is to discuss further OSCE action with regard to the implementation of the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW, to address specific problems in the OSCE area and is to identify gaps which would require further action by the FSC.

Organization

The FSC Chairmanship will chair the opening and closing sessions.

Each working session will have a moderator and a rapporteur. The rapporteurs will assist the moderators in the preparation of their respective working sessions. Each rapporteur will provide a written summary report, which will become a part of the Chairperson’s report.

Each working session will be introduced by the moderator, after which up to four presentations will be given on specific aspects of the topic, either by the moderator or by other experts. The introduction and the presentations are to be in line with point-papers to be distributed via the moderator prior to the meeting. The introductions and the presentations at the working sessions are to be brief, so as to allow maximum time for discussion, and should therefore highlight only the most important elements of the point-papers so as to provide information and set the scene for the discussion.

The Rules of Procedure of the OSCE will be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, at the meeting. Also, the guidelines for organizing OSCE meetings (PC.DEC/762) will be taken into account.

Interpretation from and into all six working languages of the OSCE will be provided at the opening, working and closing sessions.

The FSC Chairperson will provide a report on the meeting not later than 22 June 2012, including a summary of suggestions and recommendations made during the meeting.

The OSCE Secretariat will assist the FSC Chairperson in all matters concerning the organizational modalities of the meeting.

Participation

The participating States are encouraged to ensure the participation of experts involved in the SALW controls, especially those involved in the licensing process, marking and tracing. The OSCE institutions will participate in the meeting. The Parliamentary Assembly and the Partners for Co-operation will also be invited to participate.
Other relevant international and regional organizations that are involved in SALW activities, such as the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the UN Development Programme, the UN Institute for Disarmament Research, the European Union and NGOs will also be invited by the FSC Chairperson.

The deadline for registrations will be 8 May 2012.

**General guidelines for participants**

Prior circulation of briefings, overviews or statements is encouraged. To promote interactive discussion, delegations are requested to provide formal statements in writing only. Delegations are requested to limit the length of their oral statements to five minutes.

**Guidelines for keynote speakers and panellists**

To facilitate discussion within the time constraints, the keynote presentation will be limited to 15–20 minutes, introductions and presentations in the working sessions to 5–10 minutes, and interventions/questions from the floor to five minutes.

In their contributions, the speakers at the opening and working sessions should set the scene for the discussion and stimulate debate among delegations by raising appropriate questions and suggesting potential recommendations, and should concentrate on the highlights of their contributions. Speakers should remain present during the entire session they are addressing and should be ready to engage in the debate following their presentation.

In order to promote interactive discussion, formal statements and interventions at the working sessions should be as concise as possible and should not exceed five minutes. The speakers should also contribute to the further substance of the meeting as it evolves and as time permits. Prior circulation of statements and interventions will enhance the possibility for engaging in discussion.

**Guidelines for moderators and rapporteurs**

The moderator will chair the session and should facilitate and focus dialogue among the participants. The moderator should stimulate the debate by introducing items related to the subjects of the opening and working sessions, as appropriate, in order to broaden or refine the scope of the discussion. The moderators may provide input to the Chairperson for the FSC Chairperson’s report.

The rapporteurs should provide written summaries subsequent to the meeting to the FSC chair.

Personal views will not be advanced.

**Guidelines for submitting and distributing written contributions**

Speakers should submit their written contributions to the meeting moderators no later than 15 May 2012.
By 18 May 2012, participating States and other participants in the meeting are invited to submit any written contributions they may have.

By 18 May 2012, international and regional organizations are invited to submit in writing factual information on their organizations that would be useful for the participants. Such information should not be brought to the attention of participants during the meeting.
# PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. IMPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING MEASURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Conformity of participating States’ legislation and procedures with existing OSCE commitments on SALW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Participating States to conduct national evaluation of the implementation of the OSCE SALW commitments and bring it in conformity with agreed norms in accordance with OSCE SALW Document’s Sections II (D), III (F) and IV (E).</td>
<td>Updates to be provided, when necessary, in one-off and/or annual information exchanges.</td>
<td>By June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) FSC to consider establishing a mechanism for continuous assessment of the situation regarding the implementation of FSC-agreed commitments on SALW.</td>
<td>(1) Improvement of announcing and reminding mechanism with regard to SALW.</td>
<td>By December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) The CPC will be tasked to develop a matrix based on existing info exchanges and within existing resources, identifying the detailed implementation of SALW commitments. The matrix will be restricted to participating States only.</td>
<td>By December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) OSCE to further conduct awareness-raising and provide training, as appropriate, to countries in need, upon request.</td>
<td>(1) Participating States will organize seminars and training events.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) CPC will organize seminars in relevant countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d) Projects</td>
<td>(1) FSC, upon request, to provide assistance on developing relevant legislation on SALW in accordance with the OSCE Document on SALW, its supplementary decisions and the OSCE Handbook of Best Practices on SALW.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) FSC, through PC, to explore the creation of a special SALW and SCA Voluntary Fund with the OSCE accountability controls for projects on SALW and SCA.</td>
<td>By January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) FSC to give more consideration to gender aspects of SALW. Possible measures to implement:</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) FSC to explore the application of gender aspects in the development of post-conflict SALW programmes, such as disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration projects; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) FSC to explore a list of recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) FSC to review the implementation of Ministerial Council Decision No. 11/08 with regard to the establishment or reinforcement of a legal framework for lawful brokering activities within the national jurisdiction of participating States by the end of 2010.</td>
<td>(4) Update FSC Decision No. 15/02 on Expert Advice on Implementation of Section V of the OSCE Document on SALW.</td>
<td>Completed – FSC Decision No. 11/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) FSC review</td>
<td></td>
<td>By September 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Transparency measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) FSC to accelerate measures to improve the submission rate of FSC-agreed info exchanges on SALW.</td>
<td>(1) Same as I.1.(b).</td>
<td>By December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) CPC will align, if necessary, questionnaires’ formatting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) FSC to consider making public one-off information exchanges on SALW, as appropriate.</td>
<td>The Secretariat will be tasked to create a public web page for this purpose.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) FSC to consider making public annual information exchanges on SALW, as appropriate.</td>
<td>The Secretariat will be tasked to create a public web page for this purpose.</td>
<td>By June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) FSC to raise awareness on SALW work done by the OSCE.</td>
<td>The Secretariat will be tasked to create a public webpage to reflect different SALW reports, studies, assessments carried out by the CPC and continue other venues of raising public awareness (PRs, side events, etc.).</td>
<td>By July 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLES, NORMS AND MEASURES IN ORDER TO IMPROVE CAPACITY AND EFFICIENCY

1. General
   (a) FSC to review Best Practice Guides on SALW.                              | Continuous                                                 |

2. Export and brokering controls
   (a) FSC to discuss the OSCE’s regulatory framework on SALW transfer criteria. | Continuous                                                 |
   (b) FSC to explore the expansion of contacts with the Wassenaar Arrangements Secretariat, including export and brokering controls as topics. | Continuous                                                 |
   (c) FSC to explore the expansion of the scope of transfer controls to include transfer of technology. | Continuous                                                 |
### PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d) FSC to discuss national experiences and procedures for end-use verification, re-export, post-shipment verification, brokering controls and licensing among participating States.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) FSC to review OSCE Principles on the Control of Brokering in SALW and update them, as appropriate, in light of GGE recommendations, including:</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Description of brokering activities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Record-keeping;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Transparency measures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Penalties;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Co-operation with other international organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Stockpile management and security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) FSC to consider strengthening commitments on stockpile management and security on SALW.</td>
<td>The CPC will be tasked to provide a statistical overview of the information provided by participating States on national procedures related to stockpile management and security of SALW.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLAN OF ACTION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Possible measures to implement</th>
<th>Implementation timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Destruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) FSC to consider ways to strengthen participating States’ commitment to destroy surplus and illicit SALW.</td>
<td></td>
<td>By January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) FSC to discuss means to improve participating States’ capacity for the destruction of surplus and illicit SALW.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Marking and tracing</strong></td>
<td>(1) FSC to identify means to further implementation.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) FSC to take concrete steps to further the implementation of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit SALW.</td>
<td>(2) FSC to consider the integration of the International Tracing Instrument’s 2005 commitments concerning traceability of SALW in its regulatory framework.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) FSC to discuss national experiences in tracing requests and their outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) FSC to explore the needs of OSCE countries to receive assistance on marking in the framework of stockpile management and security assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOTATED AGENDA OF
THE MEETING TO REVIEW THE OSCE PLAN OF ACTION ON
SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS (SALW)

Vienna, 22–23 May 2012

Tuesday, 22 May 2012

10–10.30 a.m. Opening session

Chairperson: Ambassador G. Apals (Latvia)

– Opening statement by Ambassador G. Apals, Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation
– Opening address by Mr. L. Zannier, OSCE Secretary General

10.30 a.m.–1 p.m. Working Session I: Conformity, transparency and practical assistance (with a coffee break)

(Ref.: Plan of Action on SALW, Section I, paragraphs 1 and 2)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of conformity, transparency and practical assistance;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to conformity, transparency and practical assistance.

Moderator: Mr. L. Schultz, United States of America, Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Rapporteur: Ms. D. Taneva, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Bulgaria to the OSCE

Efforts undertaken by the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre to improve the implementation of existing SALW measures by Ms. M. Brandstetter, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre

Analysis of national methodologies for compiling OSCE annual information exchanges on SALW imports and exports by Mr. M. Bromley, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

The role of women in promoting a gun-free culture and implementing international SALW commitments by Ms. C. Agboton Johnson, SALW expert

1–3 p.m. Buffet lunch
3–6 p.m. Working session II: Export and brokering controls (with a coffee break)

(Ref.: Plan of Action on SALW, Section II, paragraphs 1 and 2)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of export and brokering controls;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to export and brokering controls.

Moderator: Mr. V. Pavlov, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus
Rapporteur: Lt. Col. S. J. Macrory-Tinning, United Kingdom Delegation to the OSCE

Proliferation of SALW: the mechanisms for diversion of weapons
by Mr. J. Bevan, independent consultant

New challenges to export control: SALW transfers to private security companies
by Ms. C. Topp, Bundesamt für Wirtschaft und Ausfuhrkontrolle (BAFA), Germany

Eurocontrol support to investigations of illicit trafficking of SALW by air
by Mr. A. Leggat, European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation (Eurocontrol)

SIPRI support to investigations of illicit trafficking of SALW by air
by Mr. H. Griffiths, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

Wednesday, 23 May 2012

10 a.m.–1 p.m. Working session III: Stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing (with a coffee break)

(Ref.: Plan of Action on SALW, Section II paragraphs 3, 4 and 5)

– Introductory address by the working session moderator;
– Presentations on aspects of stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing of SALW;
– Discussion on the OSCE Plan of Action with reference to stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing.

Moderator: Col. P. Chaudhuri, Ministry of Defence of Switzerland
Rapporteur: Maj. C. Aguado Valladares, Permanent Mission of Spain to the OSCE
Interpol’s firearms programme and opportunities for OSCE/Interpol complementary efforts
by Ms. T. Hite, Interpol

Lessons learned from the Regional Approach to Stockpile Destruction initiative
by Mr. P. Gobinet, Small Arms Survey

Towards universal standards on SALW and conventional ammunition: consequences for OSCE best practice guides
by Mr. D. Prins, Conventional Arms Branch, UNODA, and Dr. P. McCarthy, ISACS Project Co-ordinator, United Nations Co-ordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA)

Ongoing projects by Germany on stockpile management and security, record-keeping, destruction, marking and tracing
by Lt. Col. A. Nehring, Ministry of Defence of Germany

Presentation on the SALW record-management software application developed in the framework of the OSCE-UNDP-MOD of Belarus Capacity-Building Programme on SALW
by Mr. V. Baranov, Ministry of Defence of Belarus, and Mr. A. Martyniuk, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre

1–3 p.m.
Lunch break

3–4.30 p.m.
Working session IV: Way forward on the Plan of Action and OSCE contribution to the UN processes

— Introductory address by the working session moderator;
— Remarks by panellists;
— Discussion on the way forward with regard to the Plan of Action on SALW;
  — What is the implementation rate of the Plan of Action?
  — What issues of the Plan require further implementation efforts?
  — Are there additional aspects of the Plan of Action implementation identified by participating States on which the OSCE should focus its efforts?
  — How can the OSCE SALW processes further contribute to global efforts?
— Discussion of the OSCE contribution to the UN Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action on SALW.

Moderator: Col. A. Byrén, Permanent Delegation of Sweden to the OSCE
Rapporteur: Mr. V. Krška, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the OSCE
Panel discussion with the participation of:
- Mr. D. Prins, Conventional Arms Branch, UNODA
- Ms. S. Grassi, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC
- Mr. P. McCarthy, ISACS Project Co-ordinator, United Nations Co-ordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA)
- Mr. M. Geertsen, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre
- Mr. G. MacDonald, Small Arms Survey

4.30–5 p.m.  Closing session

- Chairperson’s closing remarks
Mr. Secretary General,
Distinguished permanent representatives,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me today to open the Meeting to Review the Implementation of the Plan of Action on SALW and to welcome the large number of representatives from capitals, international organizations and NGOs who have travelled to Vienna to contribute to our discussions over the next two days. Your attendance is a testament to the importance of this work, both in relation to the OSCE, and in the wider global context.

The problem of SALW proliferation is not new to the OSCE agenda. Yet, the negative effects of illicit SALW continue to pose serious threats to safety and security in the OSCE region and globally. Thousands of people are killed every year with small arms, leading to the deterioration of security, escalation of violence, slowdown of economic development and other factors constituting the framework for regional, national and individual security.

The OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons adopted in 2000 created the necessary framework for the Organization to fight the proliferation and diversion of weapons. While the Document on SALW established a comprehensive base for addressing the issue in the OSCE area, globalization and the worldwide spread of small arms require a global response. The development of the UN Programme of Action on SALW in 2001 provided this so much needed answer.

Over a decade has passed since the adoption of these two important documents. While we have identified the “what” of the problem and the “where” in terms of concrete outcomes, the “how” needed to be elaborated and developed for each region based on its priorities and challenges. The OSCE’s answer to this question was the Plan of Action on SALW. Adopted in 2010, within a remarkably short time frame, the Plan sets out the OSCE road map to fight illicit SALW and contribute to global efforts. The Plan is quite ambitious and, no doubt, requires continuous and serious engagement on the part of the FSC and the participating States, as its implementation goes hand in hand with the implementation at the national level and in the OSCE framework.

The FSC has actively taken up the Plan in its work. A number of concrete initiatives have been launched to address many points of this document. While our primary focus remains on the OSCE area, we have also looked to partners working outside the OSCE region, in order to balance our work so as to fit into international concerns. Co-operation and co-ordination have become increasingly important and have been systematically developed over the past years.
Just three months before the UN Review Conference on the Programme of Action on SALW, it is ever more important to compare notes and look at the OSCE’s efforts in light of the overall implementation of the UN Programme of Action to ensure that the OSCE contribution will be timely and effective and not duplicate already existing initiatives.

Finally, all initiatives require proper preparation and need sufficient financial resources in order to take place. Therefore, I would like to express gratitude to the Government of Germany for providing a generous financial contribution to support the conduct of this important event.

This meeting provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of our work and seek out the challenges that remain. We have substantial work ahead of us, and I think that we have an opportunity to shape our regional and global contribution to dealing with the wide range of issues associated with SALW, to contribute substantively to the UN process on SALW, and to enhance the OSCE’s reputation in this field.
Mr. Chairperson,
Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure to address the opening session of this important meeting. I am particularly glad to do so, given my close involvement on this issue both as an Italian delegate actively engaged in the negotiations of the 2000 OSCE Document on SALW, and later on, as Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre, in the dissemination of that document and the Best Practices Guides and in the development of relations with other regional actors – the UN first of all – on all aspects of SALW activities.

The illicit trade in small arms is a serious concern for the OSCE. This stands to good reason. The OSCE region includes major producers and exporters of SALW. Ninety per cent of illicit traffic is diverted from the legal market. Internationally accepted norms, measures and standards, along with co-operation at the regional and global levels, are essential for establishing effective control over the entire cycle of SALW and stopping their diversion.

With this in mind, the OSCE participating States have declared their willingness to develop an effective regulatory framework in this field. The Organization has worked since the 1990s at the forefront of international efforts to curb illicit trade in SALW and to develop effective national and regional practices in respect of control of SALW.

The adoption of the 2000 Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons has established the pioneering role of the Organization and has firmly placed SALW on the agenda of the OSCE. The Forum for Security Co-operation has since worked to further enhance this comprehensive instrument for tackling the risks arising from small arms. The subsequent adoption of specialized decisions to facilitate effective export control and make it possible to provide voluntary assistance to States on destruction and stockpile management and security, in order to tackle the specific regional concerns, has underpinned the OSCE’s special role in contributing to individual, regional and international security.

In doing so, the OSCE carefully crafts the balance between meeting the needs of its own region while managing to complement and stimulate action in the framework of the United Nations. The contribution of the Organization plays a vital role in global processes of fighting illicit proliferation – first, by contributing to more effective legislative controls in the OSCE area, and second, by strengthening the implementation of the UN Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (PoA). We should recall that effective action at the regional level paved the way to the adoption of the UN PoA.

The adoption of the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW in 2010 laid out a road map for action at both the national and the regional levels identifying priority areas. The implementation of existing norms constituted one of the two pillars of the Plan of Action and remains a key area for future work. I congratulate States on the substantial work done in this
area, resulting in concrete achievements in both the legislative and practical assistance spheres. However, in order to fully assess the implementation and guarantee the long-term success of such endeavours, we need to develop implementation benchmarks. Such benchmarks would measure the achievements and the remaining loopholes in setting up an effective control system related to every stage of the life of a small arm. The initial steps have already been taken in the revised OSCE and UN reporting templates. However, they should be developed further, with the close engagement of participating States.

Given the OSCE’s comprehensive approach, we should also further strengthen practical links between the issue of illicit SALW and other domains of the OSCE’s work, such as the conflict cycle and transnational threats. Such a pragmatic approach would enhance the impact of our activities.

Finally, during a time of scarce resources, we need to seek ways to make our activities even more effective and efficient without duplicating similar action elsewhere. Therefore, we need to intensify the dialogue with counterparts from other international organizations. In this respect, I am pleased to note that, currently, we are discussing with the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) a proposal for a memorandum of understanding on SALW to further improve co-ordination, planning and joint activities in a practical manner, complementing similar agreements we have already reached with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Much hard work remains ahead of us. An estimated 875 million small arms remain in circulation around the world, killing up to half a million people every year. The impact of such a loss on the livelihood of women, children and men who are dependant on those who are killed is beyond measure. The stakes are high.

I look forward to your discussions over the next two days. This Meeting is important, because it will make it possible to take stock of work done until now and to look into new areas where the OSCE could provide complementary value in curbing the illicit proliferation of small arms. The OSCE has proven its ability to effectively contribute to these efforts. This should be consolidated and developed further.

Thank you.
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Wednesday, 22 May 2012

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

Conformity, transparency and practical assistance

Working session I of the OSCE Meeting to Review the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW was devoted to the significance of conformity, transparency and practical assistance in fulfilling the commitments stemming from the OSCE Document on SALW and the Plan of Action.

In his opening remarks, the moderator of the session, Mr. Larry Schultz, United States Defense Threat Reduction Agency, underlined the importance of combating all aspects of illicit trafficking of SALW. There were controls in place at both the global and the regional levels, including in the OSCE, to counter the illicit spread and destabilizing accumulation of SALW. He drew attention to the decreasing number of participating States responding to the annual information exchange on SALW. In 2011 alone, only 49 participating States had submitted reports. In addition, in-depth analysis of the data provided identified serious discrepancies, the reasons for which should be carefully studied and addressed by proper measures in order to make the data reported comparable to the data submitted. With regard to practical assistance, he stressed the need for more attention to be paid to fulfilling obligations in areas such as marking and tracing, detailed record-keeping, training, assistance in developing relevant national legislation on SALW, and financing of SALW projects. He also reminded the participants that consideration should be given to gender aspects of SALW, particularly the role of women in raising awareness, promoting a gun-free culture and implementing SALW commitments. Finally, he drew the attention of the forum to the capabilities of the Multinational Small Arms and Ammunition Group, which assisted participating States in implementing the measures contained in the OSCE Best Practice Guide, with the aim of improving safety, security, and accountability in respect of State-controlled stockpiles of SALW and conventional ammunition.

Ms. Maria Brandstetter, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), provided an overview of efforts undertaken by the CPC in the past two years to facilitate the implementation of existing commitments on SALW, including those contained in the Plan of Action. The Centre was focusing on the issues of transparency, export controls, co-operation with other international organizations and practical assistance projects.

With regard to transparency, the focus of the CPC work had been to help States improve the quality of their SALW-related reporting while reducing the reporting burden. Two initiatives had been implemented: (1) a standardized reporting template harmonized with the UN template; and (2) a study on information exchanges on imports and exports of SALW. The in-depth study of the national methodologies used in compiling States’ submissions on imports and exports of SALW had been launched following a CPC internal analysis in 2011 which had showed that less than five per cent of the data provided matched.

With regard to export controls, the CPC’s activities had focused on the topics of end-user certificates, brokering, legislative assistance and capacity-building.
In 2011, together with the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), an electronic end-user certification form had been developed for voluntary use by participating States, and the CPC stood ready to provide the necessary assistance in tailoring the template to national legislation and procedures. In the 2011 information exchange on brokering controls of SALW, 28 participating States had reported having a definition of the “brokering activity”; three participating States had reported no national legislation on brokering; five participating States had reported having enacted new legislation; and two participating States had reported on cases of prosecution on grounds of illicit brokering.

With regard to legislative assistance activities, in 2011, a country-specific dialogue had been initiated with Moldova at the request of that country, jointly with the German federal export control agency (BAFA), UNODC, UNODA and UNDP; it covered the whole spectrum of export controls, both military and dual-use, including those covered by UN Security Council resolution 1540 (2004). The project highlighted the importance and mutual benefit of co-operation among various international organizations in the field. The CPC would continue co-ordination and co-operation with its various partners (UNODA, UNODC, UNDP, EU, NATO, BAFA, the Wassenaar Arrangement, UN CASA), in both formal and informal frameworks, aiming to avoid duplication while placing emphasis on the OSCE’s comparative strengths and advantages in the field of SALW controls. With regard to practical assistance projects, he noted that adequate funding remained a serious challenge.

Mr. Mark Bromley, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, presented an analysis of States’ submissions on exports and imports of SALW under the OSCE Document, and the methods States used for collecting and reporting data. The goal of the project was to get a clearer understanding of national methodologies for collecting data in order to reduce the rate of mismatches in the information provided.

The analysis concluded that there was a declining trend in the match rate for small arms from seven per cent in 2009 to four per cent in 2011. He suggested three possible explanations for the low level of correlation in States’ submissions, namely, differences in reporting templates, differences in sources of information used to collect data and differences in the coverage of States’ submissions. The recommendations included sharing of practices in the compilation of data on deliveries; discussion of transfers bilaterally before reports were issued; clarification of the coverage of the OSCE Document on SALW; and harmonization of the UN Register of Conventional Arms and OSCE reporting templates.

Finally, Dr. Christiane Agboton Johnson, an independent SALW expert, spoke about the role and the potential of women in the promotion of a gun-free culture and in the implementation of the instruments to counter illicit SALW. The necessity of an increased participation of women in all SALW-related processes was strongly stressed, given the present complex global environment, in which there had been significant developments, both in the types of individuals who used armed violence and in the circumstances in which arms were used.

In many regions of the world, women were involved in SALW programmes through participation in awareness-raising campaigns; disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes; and peacekeeping operations. However, the results were not always commensurate with the magnitude of the task. Examples given in that regard related to the role of women in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Convention
on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the UN Programme of Action, where women were generally relegated to second place, or disappeared altogether in the course of implementation.

The conventional approach to security was a major cause of women’s under-representation. In order to overcome that situation, concerted efforts were needed, such as targeted programmes for security-sector reform, taking the composition of the security forces into consideration from a new angle. The gender approach was essential – involvement of women at all levels, and specifically in the structures responsible for implementing national, regional and international instruments to counter illicit SALW.

A “human” approach to security could well serve the purpose, as it would encourage the involvement of other parties concerned, such as civil society (and therefore women). In addition, further attention should be paid to the implementation of existing instruments, including Security Council resolution 1325 (2000).

Women should take advantage of their role in the primary socialization of children, since the issue of arms had aspects other than those linked to cultures that placed a value on weapons. Women could also make a contribution in relation to new threats linked to the Internet, and to violence committed by young people, and thus could help to transmit values conducive to a culture of peace.

The presentations were followed by several interventions.

One delegation commented on its experience with regard to its efforts to avoid discrepancies in national reporting; it attempted to match data with those of counterparts prior the publication of the reports. In addition to the reasons mentioned by SIPRI in its analysis, that delegation shared its own observation that data often did not match because some transfers were divided over calendar years. Furthermore, the same delegation inquired whether the CPC took the necessary measures and precautions to guarantee the confidentiality of sensitive national data when access to it was given to outside consultants for analysis purposes, as in the case of the study conducted by SIPRI. The CPC gave information on the precautionary measures taken to ensure the confidentiality of information, such as non-disclosure forms.

One delegation expressed dismay over the fact that only four per cent of the annual information on SALW exports and imports matched, and advocated measures to increase the match rate. In addition, it strongly supported increasing the role of women in implementing the various agreements on SALW. As a positive example, it pointed to the participation of women in particular demining activities and SALW assistance projects.

One delegation presented the steps undertaken in the past few years to strengthen its national export-control legislation and to further build the capacity of the respective national authorities, including customs and border controls.

One delegation suggested that more information with regard to OSCE initiatives on SALW, including national reports and SALW projects, should be made available on the OSCE website so that it would be readily accessible to experts in capitals when needed. In reply, the CPC outlined the steps undertaken to raise the profile of OSCE activities on SALW.
One delegation inquired about procedures aimed at facilitating the implementation of reporting commitments. In response, the CPC gave a detailed description of all the established procedures and mechanisms.

One delegation pointed to the need for further work to identify categories of weapons in order to increase the match rate of data reported.
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Export and brokering controls

The moderator opened the session by introducing his food-for-thought paper. The focus of the session was emphasized as the control of exports and brokering to prevent the illicit transfer of SALW and the creation of destabilizing accumulations. Moreover, the session might provide potential inputs to both the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and the review of the United Nations Programme of Action.

The first presentation, by Mr. James Bevan, company Conflict Armament Research, described the most common forms of “diversion” of SALW and ammunition. Using case studies, the speaker showed how flows of illicit SALW could quickly lead to destabilizing accumulations across broad regions. Having outlined the causes of diversion, he also proposed some solutions, including enhanced export controls, improved stockpile management, and better enforcement activities.

Ms. Claudia Topp, German Bundesamt für Wirtschaft und Ausfuhrkontrolle (Federal Office for Economic Affairs and Export Control) (BAFA), set out her Government’s response to the new challenge of licensing Private Security Service Providers operating in the counter-piracy role. New regulations and processes will be introduced to help German-flagged vessels deal with the threat of piracy. She emphasised the challenge of combining the objectives of export control and this new task. However, she acknowledged that, owing to the complexities of the field, a great deal of policy development and work remained to be done in order to refine and improve policies. She also related how other countries have adopted different approaches and were co-ordinating their efforts.

Mr. Anthony Leggatt, Eurocontrol, outlined his organization’s capabilities in the monitoring and recording of all air movements within the 39 member States; Eurocontrol’s activities facilitate the identification of patterns of potentially illicit trafficking of SALW by air. The service could be used as an early warning mechanism relating to suspicious aircraft or operators, which could give a State or international organization a cue for an interdiction.

The final speaker, Mr. Hugh Griffiths, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), described an EU-funded project that had developed risk-assessment software designed to identify suspicious aircraft operations. He outlined how the software could be used in conjunction with Eurocontrol flight data and other mechanisms, in support of the enforcement of embargos and other export or transfer controls. Noting the strong correlation between movements of illicit SALW by air and conflict, he suggested that the tool could be used by participating States or the OSCE both in the control of SALW and in conflict-prevention activities.

A comprehensive open forum discussion followed. Questions for the panel and interventions by various participating States went into greater depth on topics which included prevention of maritime trafficking; controlling re-exports of SALW; manufacture of weapons...
under invalid or expired license, which are susceptible to diversion; strengthening of export control decision-making, including taking account of stockpile management and security; the risks of diversion to terrorists, insurgents and regions of instability; destruction as the favoured means of disposal; and the efficacy and verification of end-user certificates (EUCs). On the specific question of using Eurocontrol flight plan data and EU risk-assessment software to help identify illicit activity, individual participating States, or indeed the OSCE, were encouraged to consider that possibility.

A summary of measures for further work derived from working session II could therefore include:

– Developing measures to minimize the risk of SALW being diverted following their legitimate use by licensed Private Security Service Providers;\(^6\)

– Introducing a mechanism to prevent illicit trafficking in the maritime environment, drawing upon recent guidance from the International Maritime Organization;

– Improving national legislation and/or the use of aspects of a Wassenaar Arrangement document within the OSCE to better control re-exports;

– Achieving greater supplier vigilance though improvements to end-user certificates; more dynamic verification, monitoring and enforcement procedures; and a thorough assessment of stockpile management and security;

– Broadening the assessment of the receiving State’s suitability by conducting a more in-depth and networked analysis of regional stability to further enhance export controls;

– Using the correlation between movements of illicit SALW by air and instability for the OSCE’s work on early warning and Trans-National Threats.

\(^5\) The EU will apparently pay for the provision of the software and training for any participating State/organization that requests it.

\(^6\) There is also scope to link this subject to discussions on the Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security on 11 July 2012.
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Stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing

Working session III examined the issues covered by Section II (paragraphs 3, 4 and 5) of the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW, addressing stockpile management and security, destruction, marking and tracing of SALW. The session was opened by the moderator, Colonel Prasenjit Chaudhuri, Ministry of Defence of Switzerland, who introduced the session by recalling the continuous efforts to improve implementation of international standards and best practices in order to counter the destabilizing accumulation and illicit transfer of SALW as well as to avoid unplanned explosions in ammunition depots with their devastating effects. He welcomed the trend during the past decade in the world of SALW towards a co-operative approach. The relevance of that approach was demonstrated by the successful implementation of SALW and ammunition projects in the framework of the assistance mechanism, which sustainably strengthened the OSCE SALW regimes.

Ms. Tracy Hite, Interpol, provided an overview of Interpol’s Firearms Programme ("Interpol’s Firearms Programme and opportunities for OSCE/Interpol complementary efforts"), stressing its operational focus. The programme consisted of four operational tools to assist countries in the mining of available intelligence in respect of firearms used in crime, the Interpol I 24-7 Secure Global Communications Network being the gateway through which to access all of Interpol’s databases and tools. In that regard, four elements were presented:

– The Interpol Firearms Trace Request, which allowed the ownership history of a firearm used in a crime to be requested from the country of origin or legal import. That tool would be replaced by the Interpol Illicit Arms Record and Tracing Management System (iARMS);

– The Interpol Firearms Reference Table (IFRT), which enabled investigators to identify a firearm correctly before submitting a trace request to another member country;

– The Interpol Firearms Identification online training, which provided users with a basic understanding of the function, assembly, markings and identification elements necessary for tracing;

– The Interpol Ballistic Information Network (IBIN), which provided a global platform for the centralized collection, storage, cross comparison, and analysis of ballistic images.

She noted that an opportunity for enhanced co-operation between Interpol and the OSCE might be afforded by ensuring expanded access to Interpol’s I 24-7 among participating States. In addition, Interpol might support a broad use of the OSCE standardized template for an end-user certificate. Another possibility for interaction between the two
organizations might be the iARMS system, which, complementary to the OSCE’s brokering and export control initiatives, could be the central repository for the reporting of small arms diverted from legal commerce.

Mr. Pierre Gobinet, Small Arms Survey, presented the lessons learned from the Regional Approach to Stockpile Reduction (RASR) Initiative, whose main goal was the encouragement of participating governments of South-Eastern Europe to develop a proactive, co-ordinated and regional approach to small arms/light weapons and conventional munitions surplus management and destruction. The presentation examined the initiative covering those domains in which the RASR Initiative might facilitate greater co-ordination among regional actors, namely, national and regional policy; infrastructure; training, education and capacity-building; sharing of information and best practices; and standardization.

Referring to the challenges, Mr. Gobinet highlighted the difficulty of finding synergies owing to the disparity in stockpiles, differences in national capacities to destroy or demilitarize, variations in national policies and legislation, and owing also to the lack of domestic and regional co-ordination among government stakeholders. Logistics, which absorbs 50 per cent of the finance of demilitarization projects, and environmental legislation, were also important challenges.

Regarding the way ahead, Mr. Gobinet identified a number of specific approaches that could be adopted: more involvement by political decision-makers as well as industry contractors; formulation of concrete implementation goals; invitation of other South-east European countries as observers; possibilities of transfers to other regions; and the search for alternatives to the current “funding-driven” approach.

Mr. Daniel Prins, United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), and Mr. Patrick McCarthy, UN Co-ordinating Action on Small Arms mechanism, provided UN views through the presentation entitled “Towards Universal Standards on SALW and Conventional Ammunition: Consequences for OSCE Best Practice Guides”.

Mr. Prins presented the development of the technical guidelines for the stockpile management of conventional ammunition, commonly known as the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG). Those guidelines were based on the most comprehensive and highest existing standards and had been developed using a three-tiered approach which would allow a progressive attainment of the standards. He also noted the living nature of those guidelines, which were reviewed and amended every five years.

Mr. Prins made reference also to the UN SaferGuard Programme, which oversaw and promoted the implementation of the IATG. The Programme, which had three key components (UN SaferGuard Ammunition Board, roster of experts and Global Trust Fund), and the IATG provided a framework for open dialogue and co-operation between the UN and international organizations such as the OSCE. He encouraged OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation to nominate experts to the roster, and also to support the Global Trust Fund. Referring to the OSCE Best Practice Guides (BPG), he also suggested that a continuous co-ordination with the IATG might help to develop the OSCE BPGs further. He concluded his presentation by calling for further co-operation between the UN and OSCE.

Mr. McCarthy reflected on the role that the OSCE had played in helping to develop the International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) that would be launched at the end of August 2012. The purpose of ISACS would be to provide clear, comprehensive and
practical guidance to SALW policymakers and practitioners on a broad range of SALW control issues. He described the framework and foundation of the ISACS. The presentation focused on the consequences of ISACS for the OSCE Best Practice Guides, reflecting on the interaction between international and regional standards. It was also noted that ISACS would not diminish the BPGs, since the OSCE standards and guidelines, due to the Organization’s regional scope, would be more attuned to and focused on the specific needs and capacities of the participating States. Rather, ISACS would act as a global reference which would encourage regional efforts to achieve the desired convergence. In that regard, the OSCE electronic template for end-user certificates was mentioned as an example of the co-operation between the UN and OSCE.

He pointed out that the ISACS would be a living document and could always be improved with the inputs and assistance of regional organizations such as the OSCE.

Lieutenant Colonel Andreas Nehring, Ministry of Defence of Germany, spoke on the topic of “Ongoing Projects by Germany on Stockpile Management and Security, Record-keeping, Destruction, Marking and Tracing”. He analysed the challenges posed by SALW in the current security environment, emphasizing the need to tackle the problem at its root, since it was a key element in crisis prevention. In that regard, he noted that the issue exceeded the national scope and the co-ordination role played by the UN and the OSCE should be enhanced. Specifically, the serious threat posed by man-portable air-defence systems (MANPADS) was highlighted.

He stressed Germany’s commitment to SALW control and reported on the country’s contribution to several projects in that field, with special attention to those in South Sudan, Ivory Coast and Libya. The three elements that played a crucial role in their activities were awareness-raising, institution-building and training of experts. In that field, the OSCE was the country’s main partner in Europe and it would continue supporting the Organization’s activities. In conclusion, he suggested that the German view was that transparency was one of the areas that needed to be increased.

Colonel Vladimir Baranov, Ministry of Defence of Belarus, and Mr. Anton Martyniuk, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre, delivered a presentation on the topic “SALW Record-Management Software Application Developed in the Framework of the OSCE-UNDP-MoD of Belarus Capacity-Building Programme on SALW”.

Colonel Baranov introduced his presentation by recalling the historical problem that Belarus had faced with regard to the accumulation of SALW and SCA after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the consequent need to improve its security with modern systems. The presentation followed the development of the SALW and Conventional Ammunition Inventory Management Application from its initial requirements to the final design of the software, and outlined its possibilities.

Mr. Martyniuk supplemented the presentation by updating the participating States on the way ahead for the project with regard to rolling out the electronic inventory management system on SALW to other interested States, including technical adjustments, hardware and software requirements, as well as training.

The presentations were followed by discussion.
After the presentations and before opening the floor for questions and discussion, the moderator closed the first part of the working session by saying that significant results had been achieved in co-ordinating the activities and initiatives of different organizations; however, there still was a clear need for further work in the area of project co-ordination, as well as synchronization of international procedures, standards and best practices.

One delegation provided information about keeping in storage over 350,000 tons of surplus conventional ammunition, 70 per cent of which represented a threat to nearby residential areas. Since 2003, a joint project on SCA had been implemented with the OSCE that comprised three main components: establishment of a digital database, destruction of ammunition and restoration of an SCA testing laboratory. While the first two areas had been successfully implemented, the project relating to a test laboratory had not yet been realized due to lack of resources. A mobile facility for destruction of conventional ammunition was an important tool, which facilitated the destruction of ammunition near the storage sites.

One delegation referred to some of the presentations. With reference to the RASR presentation, it was in agreement. The delegation also stressed the need for greater attention at the policy level. There was a need to link the RASR work to concrete projects, since that would measure the success of the RASR Initiative. That delegation also referred to two specific issues: the increasing number of unplanned explosions at munitions sites and the important challenge posed by uncontrolled MANPADS, which it also looked upon as a priority.

Mr. Gobinet, Small Arms Survey, concurred with the comments of the previous delegation and stressed that physical security would remain an issue, confirming also the relevance of unplanned explosions at munitions sites. The Survey’s research showed that, unfortunately, measures were taken after the unplanned explosions and not before.

Mr. Prins, UNODA, highlighted two points. First, in the present financial situation, the cost factor should not be underestimated, considering that the maintenance of stockpiles of ammunition was normally very expensive. The argument that it was cheaper to destroy the surpluses and buy new ammunition later on if needed might be used to pursue ammunition destruction awareness. The second point related to MANPADS, since a trend could be seen towards singling out the MANPADS as a standalone category and trying to exclude it from the SALW package and therefore from the UN Programme of Action on SALW.
The subject of working session IV was a discussion of the way forward with the OSCE Plan of Action on SALW and the OSCE contribution to the Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action. Two food-for-thought papers were distributed by the moderator before the session. The moderator opened the session by pointing at the role of the Plan of Action, and said that it was time to consider in which direction the OSCE wanted to continue the work on SALW. The OSCE had been a successful forerunner, and now needed to decide how to optimize the parallel OSCE-UN processes, and especially what to do in respect of the Plan of Action.

Panellist Mr. Daniel Prins, UNODA, opened by raising the issue of the UN - OSCE coordination and the challenge for regional organizations of properly aligning their work with the actions they decide on at the global level. He suggested that the OSCE could align its meeting cycle more closely to the UN six-year cycle with its biennial meetings. That would effectively make regional follow-up action possible on how the global commitments would translate best for the region; whereas it would also allow for a more structured regional input in global meetings. This is a message the UN conveys to all regions, and it is increasingly being picked up. He supported the idea of updating the OSCE Plan of Action only after the UN Programme of Action Review Conference has been concluded, precisely to take fully into account the possible new global commitments in the future work of OSCE on the issue. Regarding national reports, he stressed that each OSCE participating State had reported on its implementation of the UN Programme of Action at least once in the past, and 93 per cent of OSCE participating States had communicated their contact points.

Panellist Mr. Diman Dimov, United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC), pointed out that there were more UN processes to consider, including those under the UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime (UNTOC) and the Protocols Thereto. The UN Firearms Protocol is the only legally binding treaty on firearms. The UNODC and the OSCE have worked closely for years in the area of firearms control. Their co-operation has been based on mutually agreed policy documents, for example, the current joint OSCE-UNODC action plan. The agreed co-operation was also implemented in practice. A recent example is the joint country visit to the Republic of Moldova in March 2012. The UNODC would like to continue looking for new areas for co-operation with the OSCE. If the Conference of the Parties adopts in October 2012 the review process in respect to the UNTOC and the Protocols Thereto, the UNODC and the OSCE could discuss the possibility for the OSCE to facilitate the process of collecting information about the implementation of the Firearms Protocol. The OSCE has provided such support in the past. As a result, the highest response rate on the UNODC’s questionnaire came from the States from the OSCE area. Another field for possible cooperation is the preratification support for States from the OSCE area that had signed the UNTOC but had not ratified the Firearms Protocol. Finally,
the organizations have also discussed the possibility for joint programme planning and fundraising.

Panellist Dr. Patrick McCarthy, UN Co-ordinating Action on Small Arms mechanism, said that he saw the consideration by the FSC of the possibility of making information exchanges public through a website as appropriate; that could lead to an enhancement of compliance with the commitments and could encourage public interest. A summary report on replies by participating States on the control of brokering in SALW had already been launched publicly and was serving as a good example. In addition, a UN-OSCE joint template already existed. Negotiations on an Arms Trade Treaty could have implications for the Plan of Action and concerning the Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action; the issues to focus on during the next six years could also be chosen by the OSCE so as to make a coherent contribution to the debate. The template for end-user certificates had advanced that issue and, if supplemented to ensure accuracy of content and prevent falsification, would advance it even further. The best practices guide on marking was a good starting point, but co-operation could be intensified and the OSCE could consider developing a template for the information to be marked when manufacturing weapons and for the parts to be marked. The OSCE framework on SALW was already broad and comprehensive, but there was scope for stepping up the co-operation, especially on concrete technical issues related to end-user certification and marking. He noted that he very much valued the fact that the OSCE had recently taken the gender dimension of the SALW into account.

Panellist Dr. Glenn McDonald, Small Arms Survey, said further attention should be paid to updating or fine-tuning OSCE norms in some areas—such as brokering and marking, record-keeping and tracing—in light of new developments at the UN and elsewhere. The key challenge for the OSCE was, however, to strengthen the implementation of existing norms. To address discrepancies in reporting on exports and imports, one could develop common templates and common definitions. Information exchanges could be analysed to better target assistance efforts. One could also explore ways of making the results of such exchanges public, while safeguarding national commercial and security interests. The OSCE could expand its work on the assessment of diversion risks at the transfer licensing stage and on post-delivery verification. These efforts did not necessarily cost anything. It was also important to increase the participation of women in the development and implementation of small arms measures. Last but not least, there were opportunities for broadening cooperation with other international organizations and for recognizing linkages with other aspects of OSCE work, such as security sector reform. Generally, it was important to ensure that OSCE small arms norms were kept up to date and to ensure the full and effective implementation of existing OSCE measures.

Panellist Mr. Mathew Geertsen, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), pointed to the Plan of Action as an FSC road map for continuing its activities in fighting the proliferation of illicit SALW and recalled several achievements, e.g., the participating States’ success in exchanging information about brokering activities, the increasing quality and quantity of national reporting, the joint SIPRI-OSCE development of a template for the end-user certificate, the harmonized OSCE-UN reporting template and the study on national methodologies for reporting imports and exports. For the UN Review Conference, the CPC had offered to the FSC an OSCE report and a side event. He concluded that significant progress had been achieved with the Plan of Action, but some priorities had also shifted since the adoption of the Plan, and the OSCE could benefit from it in its early warning efforts. The Plan of Action should be responsive to changing realities, and in order to take assessments
and proposals from the meeting into account in a structural manner, consideration should be given to discussing an amendment or a review of the Plan.

The panellists’ remarks were followed by a discussion. One participating State was deeply concerned about the practice of manufacturing SALW using expired licences and making economic use of the products by exporting them, and about re-exports of SALW without the primary exporting country being formally notified. According to the delegate, some immediate measures and a multilateral approach against illicit trafficking were urgently needed, preferably under the leadership of the UN, where all States were represented and whose documents, including concrete steps, were legally binding, in order to stop the market, hidden tolerance and perceived double standards.

One participant acknowledged the outstanding work on SALW done by the OSCE and proposed that a greater visibility of the significant achievements should be striven for and promoted. The first simple step might be just linking the relevant websites. Also, a stronger communication between the CPC and gender organizations and subsequent integration of gender issues into the action on SALW might bring additional added value. Concerning marking and tracing, she suggested making use of contemporary developed technology.

Another delegation drew attention to the basic conditions for a prosperous multilateral co-operation, namely, enhancement of transparency and compliance, harmonization of templates and formats, sharing of information and open exchange of information. A risk assessment carried out by one participating State should be shared with others. It was equally important that each participating State make financial contributions to SALW projects according to its capacity. The delegate also stressed the link to other dimensions.

The next delegation noted that sometimes some participating States gave the impression of competing, rather than co-operating. There was a real need to co-ordinate donors, recipients, international organizations and governments. Moreover, duplication of work or non-co-ordinated holding of meetings in different organizations should be avoided. The delegation also stressed that a legal framework was missing and the possibility of a roster for SALW should be looked into.

One delegation mentioned that the Wassenaar Arrangement had recently made some progress with its document entitled “Elements for Objective Analysis and Advice Concerning Potentially Destabilising Accumulations of Conventional Weapons”, and suggested that the OSCE should consider embodying parts of the Wassenaar Arrangement document into its procedures. It considered that, the OSCE SALW Document also required participating States to take into account the stockpile management and security procedures of a potential recipient country when making export control decisions, but the Document provided no guidance on how that should be done or what standard should be applied. It asked the panel whether any such guidance existed, and especially whether any was contained in the recently published UN International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG).

The last delegation stressed the need for more implementation, rather than more meetings. Regional organizations could focus on implementation of global commitments at the regional level. It stressed the importance of co-operation, not competition or duplication, and of the avoidance of overlapping meetings such as the Plan of Action Review Meeting and the Firearms Protocol meeting that was taking place simultaneously.
The moderator concluded that the Plan of Action was pointing in the right direction for the SALW work of the OSCE, but it should be a living document; it should be revised and the outcome of the UN processes in 2012 should be taken into account. Furthermore, many areas that could be added to the Plan had been discussed during the Meeting, including transparency measures, gender aspects, revision of the best practices, licensing issues and tracing. The norms should be fine-tuned or updated and implementation should be strengthened. Summing up, the moderator also said that current co-ordination between the OSCE, the various UN agencies and other organizations appeared to be significant and should continue. Moreover, regional actions should be effectively connected to the global processes in order to achieve the best results, including alignment of the work cycles. The regional level could contribute to the global level, e.g., by development of the end-user certificate, since technical issues were probably easier to move forward on. SALW had a link to more than politico-military areas, also geographically, and projects were still a central part of the concrete OSCE work. Finally, the SALW work of the OSCE needed to be given more visibility so as to attract more attention and support from capitals.
SURVEY OF SUGGESTIONS

Conformity/Transparency

Annual information exchange on SALW transfers

– Share best practices among States in compiling data on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year in order to improve the matching rate in the information reported by participating States (Reference: FSC.DEL/40/12);

– Encourage States to discuss bilaterally transfers and the mechanisms by which they gather information on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year before submitting their responses to the OSCE (Reference: FSC.DEL/40/12);

– Establish a working group in the FSC to discuss types of transfers that should be included in the information exchange on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year (Reference: FSC.DEL/40/12);

– Improve clarity on the sources used and coverage of submissions in compiling information exchange on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year (e.g. export licenses, production reports, customs date, etc.) (Reference: FSC.DEL/40/12);

– Harmonize the templates used for the submission of data to the UN Register on Conventional Arms and OSCE reporting on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year to reduce the reporting burden on States and increase the number of matches in the national submissions (Reference: FSC.DEL/40/12);

– Consider improving the definitions of categories of SALW types in order to improve reporting on SALW exported/imported during the previous calendar year.

One-off information exchange on SALW

– Extend information exchange to other normative issues, such as enforcement of national legislation on brokering controls;

– Optimize the framework for the overview of the implementation of OSCE commitments in the field of SALW.

Public information

– Improve public information on the OSCE work on SALW. Particularly, enable easier access to information exchange and reporting, by making all relevant FSC decisions on SALW accessible on the website of the OSCE.

Assessment of implementation of agreed commitments

– Develop concrete benchmarks to make it possible to measure implementation of the agreed commitments on SALW, the achievements and the remaining loopholes in
setting up an effective SALW control system (References: SEC.GAL/119/12 and FSC.DEL/62/12);

– Strengthen practical linkages between SALW and other domains of the OSCE work, such as the conflict cycle and transnational threats (References: SEC.GAL/119/12 and FSC.DEL/62/12).

Export and brokering controls

Trafficking by air

– Reinforce the OSCE early warning function by making use of Eurocontrol’s flight data in the OSCE area and the related risk-analysis software designed by SIPRI (Reference: FSC.DEL/41/12).

End-user verification

– Reinforce end-user verification procedures relating to the exporting of SALW;

– Develop international mechanisms for the verification of end-user certificates to combat diversion of SALW.

Re-export

– Share best practices on re-export control in respect of SALW; develop a best practices guide on the topic within the OSCE framework;

– SALW re-export should be governed by a legal framework agreed in a multilateral setting;

– Strengthen post-export verification by carrying out longer-term end-user risk assessment, since often little information on the end recipient is available and onward diversion represents one of the main risks for the proliferation of SALW.

Export criteria

– Update the export criteria listed in the OSCE Document on SALW based on the Wassenaar Arrangement’s Updated Elements for Objective Analysis and Advice Concerning Potentially Destabilising Accumulations of Conventional Weapons;

– Broaden the assessment of the receiving State’s suitability by conducting a more thoroughgoing analysis of regional stability to further enhance export controls.

Other

– Take action on weapons that are produced in third countries without manufacture licenses of the original exporter;
– Develop measures to minimize the risk of SALW being diverted following receipt by legitimate private security-service providers (Reference: FSC.DEL/42/12/Rev.1);

– Complement existing OSCE norms on trafficking by air with standards to prevent trafficking by sea;

– Use Interpol’s I 24-7 tracing system for exchanging end-user certificates issued, in order to facilitate the authentication process.

Stockpile management and security

– OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation are invited to nominate experts to the UN SaferGuard roster of experts;

– Participating States are also invited to support the UN global trust fund for ammunition stockpile management to mitigate the risks of explosion and diversion around the world.

Marking and tracing

– Develop harmonized regional marking requirements, including the elements that should be included in a marking as well as the parts and the weapon parts that should be marked;

– Extend support to Interpol’s I 24-7 tracing system for police who investigate firearms-related crime to ensure its wide access and use (Reference: FSC.DEL/42/12/Rev.1);

– Use Interpol’s iArms system for identifying and tracing SALW diverted from legal trade (Reference: FSC.DEL/42/12/Rev.1).

OSCE Plan of Action

– Develop concrete tools and objectives in the framework of the Plan of Action with a view to strengthening the gender aspect in SALW control, inter alia, by increasing the representation of women at all decision-making levels in security sector institutions dealing with SALW-related issues (Reference: FSC.DEL/62/12);

– Further develop and review best practices guides on SALW in close co-ordination with other international organizations, including the UN, working in the field of SALW (Reference: FSC.DEL/48/12);

– Link OSCE SALW initiatives to other aspects of the OSCE work, such as security-sector reform;
– Review the Plan of Action to include updating of norms to make them coherent with those adopted at the global level (i.e., the definition on brokering, marking and tracing, and record-keeping);

– Make SALW information exchanges public in order to contribute to transparency on the issue;

– Make use of international norms and standards on SALW when reviewing OSCE best practices, on brokering, export control and end-user certification.

**OSCE contributions to the UN Process**

– Harmonize OSCE definitions on SALW with the definitions adopted at the United Nations;

– Examine how the OSCE could further reinforce the UN Programme of Action, which remains the main political and legal framework for international action in the field of SALW (Reference: FSC.DEL/62/12);

– Align the planning of meetings at the regional level with that of meetings at the global level, to make the meeting cycles coincide;

– Consider a targeted intervention under the agenda item “regional implementation” during the upcoming UN Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action on SALW;

– Offer pre-ratification support to participating States that have not yet ratified the UNODC Firearms Protocol;

– OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation are invited to nominate experts to the UN SaferGuard roster of experts;

– Participating States are also invited to support the UN global trust fund for ammunition stockpile management to mitigate the risks of explosion and diversion around the world.

**Other**

– Elaborate measures to enhance the role of women in SALW-related issues by, *inter alia*, increasing the representation of women at all decision-making levels in the security sector dealing with SALW-related issues;

– Broaden the focus from military security to human security when applying gender aspects of SALW (Reference: FSC.DEL/62/12);

– Improve co-ordination between different actors, including international organizations involved in SALW, and improve the flow of information among them.
OSCE EXPERT LEVEL SESSION ON SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT, SURPLUS REDUCTION AND DESTRUCTION
The Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC),

Reaffirming their commitment to the full implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) (FSC.DOC/1/00, 24 November 2000) and its supplementary decisions,

Recalling Ministerial Council Decision No. 15/09 tasking the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) to develop a plan of action on SALW, taking into consideration suggestions made at the OSCE Meeting to Review the OSCE Document on SALW and Its Supplementary Decisions, by May 2010,

Determined to fully implement the OSCE Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (FSC.DEC/2/10) in an effort to enhance further controls to effectively counter the uncontrolled spread and destabilizing accumulation of illicit small arms and light weapons,

Mindful of the OSCE’s important contribution to the full implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (December 2001) and the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit SALW (2005),


Decides to:

– Conduct a special session of the FSC devoted to an expert-level discussion and training session on the topics of stockpile management, surplus reduction and destruction of small arms and light weapons;
– To hold the meeting of the FSC devoted to this topic on 24 May 2012;
– Pursue the following agenda for the expert-level discussion and training session.
AGENDA

Thursday, 24 May 2012

Morning session

9 a.m.–1 p.m. Introduction (30 min): CPC

– Importance of donor programmes
– Rationale of conducting an Expert-Level Best Practices session
– How the training supports the SALW Plan of Action

Initiating a programme (60 min): CPC and host nation commentary

– Creating an actionable request from a host government
– Evaluating a request – needs, capabilities, expectations
– Funding decision
– Positive examples of requests for support – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

Conducting an effective assessment (60 min): United States of America and Kyrgyzstan

– Kyrgyzstan case study
– Country/assessment visit reports
– Lessons learned (short, mid, long range implementation)

Virtual tour (30 min): United States of America

– Risk assessment and prioritization/planning exercise
– Cost-benefit analysis to maximize assistance funds

Afternoon Session

3–6 p.m. Planning a project (45 min): Austria, Sweden, Switzerland

– Project plan, MOU, objective, milestones
– Co-ordination
– Host nation performance and local ownership
– Exit strategies
Executing a project (60 min): Germany, United States of America

- The 2nd order effect of training – capacity building
- Co-ordination
- Demilitarization versus destruction
- Managing expectations

Donor roundtable (30 min): United States of America

- Positive experiences with SALW country visits
- Lessons learned
ANOTATED AGENDA OF
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Vienna, 24 May 2012

Morning session

10 a.m.–1 p.m. Introduction (30 min): CPC
– Importance of donor programmes
– Rationale of conducting an Expert-Level Best Practices session
– How the training supports the SALW Plan of Action

Mr. M. Geertsen, Senior FSC Support Officer

Initiating a programme (60 min): CPC and host nation commentary
– Creating an actionable request from a host government
– Evaluating a request – needs, capabilities, expectations
– Funding decision
– Positive examples of requests for support – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia

Mr. A. Martyniuk, CPC FSC Support Section

Conducting an effective assessment (60 min): United States of America and Kyrgyzstan
– Kyrgyzstan case study
– Country/assessment visit reports
– Lessons learned (short-, mid-, long-range implementation)

Lt. Col. S. Peterson, United States of America, Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Col. M. Sultanbekov, Kyrgyzstan

Moderator: Mr. A. Dogan, Croatia
Rapporteur: Lt. Col. M. Shiaelos, Cyprus

Afternoon Session

3–6 p.m. Virtual tour (30 min): United States of America
– Risk assessment and prioritization/planning exercise
– Cost-benefit analysis to maximize assistance funds
Lt. Col. S. Peterson, United States of America, Defense Threat Reduction Agency

Planning a project (45 min): Austria, Sweden, Switzerland

– Project plan, MOU, objective, milestones
– Co-ordination
– Host nation performance and local ownership
– Exit strategies

Col. P. Chaudhuri, Switzerland
Col. R. Kraus, Austria
Mr. E. Lindmark, Sweden
Special Officer (Captain) V. Choffat, Switzerland (EUFOR/MTT)

Executing a project (60 min): Germany, United States of America

– The 2nd order effect of training – capacity-building
– Co-ordination
– Demilitarization versus destruction
– Managing expectations

Lt. Col. S. Gundlach, Germany
Mr. R. Robideau, United States of America

Donor roundtable (30 min): United States of America

– Positive experiences with SALW country visits
– Lessons learned

Mr. L. Schultz, United States of America, Defense Threat Reduction Agency

Moderator: Ms. B. Gare, United Kingdom
Rapporteur: Ms. N. Pluta, United States of America
REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS
The morning working session had been provided with a food-for-thought paper circulated on 21 May 2012. It was opened by the moderator, Mr. Andrej Dogan, Croatia.

This session focused on the following main themes.

1. **Introduction: CPC**

   Mr. Mathew Geertsen, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre, noted the importance of the assistance provided by the OSCE to participating States in the area of SALW and Conventional Ammunition stockpile management, as well as handing their surpluses, having in mind the political changes, reductions in military forces and the cuts in defence budgets that had taken place. Mr. Geertsen mentioned that the FSC has a mechanism, under which participating States can request assistance to collect and destroy small arms and ammunition, and to improve stockpile management and security. The OSCE projects are mainly funded from one source: extra-budgetary contributions. The success of the implementation of projects is based on the voluntary contributions of the participating States. In absence of predictable multi-year funding strategies for the SALW and SCA projects by participating States, effective fundraising remains a core challenge. In this sense, a more focused and multi-year donor program would be beneficial and instrumental in better planning and implementing the respective projects.

   A representative of the Multinational Small Arms and Ammunition Group (MSAG), United States of America, said that the exchange of best practices and the creation of a platform of experiences between actors operating in the area of SALW reduced the risk of accidents. He also referred to the importance of the standardization of the MSAG instructions, since the standards in international assistance were very important.

2. **Initiating a Programme: CPC and host nation commentary**

   Mr. Anton Martyniuk, OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre, said that compliance with OSCE standards and best practices in respect of SALW and stockpiles of conventional ammunition security and management were much less costly than dealing with the consequences of a potential storage site’s explosion. Thus, preventive measures were of the highest importance. Since 1998, out of 347 accidents recorded by SIPRI in 80 countries, 116 had occurred in 49 OSCE participating States. To successfully deliver assistance to avoid such accidents, close co-ordination among the OSCE, the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency, the EU and UNDP is a must, while joint project activities bring further benefits and highly desirable. Projects in Albania and Tajikistan were successful examples. Further
consideration should be also given to the integration of the newly established assistance framework under the UN International Ammunition Technical Guidelines in the realm of assistance activities in the OSCE area.

The assistance most wanted from the OSCE related to disposal, stockpile management and security, clean-up of explosive remnants of war (ERW), and training programmes. The assistance provided was financial or technical or involved the provision of experts (latest example: Cyprus). He also explained the normative base of OSCE assistance and mentioned the countries that had applied for assistance. He cited statistics concerning the above-mentioned assistance since 2003, (40 requests submitted by 16 participating States, with 31 relating to CA and nine to SALW).

Project steps and the proper justification of assistance were presented in the context of the case study of Tajikistan and the stockpiles of weapons and ammunition in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He described ammunition condition-coding concerning the risk of unplanned explosion and priority for disposal (more than 20 years old: high; more than 15 years old: moderate; and less than 15 years old: low), and he showed cases of high-risk poor ammunition storage conditions and unsafe handling and transportation practices. He further mentioned the key principles of physical security of stockpiles and the involvement of host countries with regard to crucial factors such as a realistic request for assistance, transparency and openness and political will at all levels.

In conclusion, the OSCE, with 10 years of experience, could provide precious assistance to participating States if donor-funding was available. Donor co-ordination was also very important, because it permitted the OSCE to undertake different projects and de-conflict with bilateral assistance programmes.

3. Conducting an effective assessment: United States of America and Kyrgyzstan

Lieutenant Colonel Steve Peterson, United States Defence Threat Reduction Agency, and Colonel Medetbek Sultanbekov, Kyrgyzstan, described the OSCE Assessment Case Study in Kyrgyzstan, March 2011. Their conclusions were that, for a project to be successful the requesting participating State must be co-operative and transparent; the people who can answer the technical questions need to be available; and the right mix of technical expertise must be assembled in the assessment team. Lastly, the speakers appealed for funding so that the project could be completed.

One delegation suggested that a project should cover long-term needs in respect of stockpiles of conventional ammunition (CA), and not be confined to short-term needs. On the other hand, another delegation called attention to the importance of having different types of expertise and practical experience represented in the OSCE team so that requests by participating States could be responded to. Along the same lines, another delegation stressed the necessity of good co-operation by the host country with international partners, and the advisability of keeping experts on CA-SALW in place. Finally, one delegation referred to the important role of capacity-building in the long term and mentioned Bosnia and Herzegovina as an example.
The afternoon expert-level session focused on the planning and execution of projects between donor and host countries. Captain Vincent Choffat (Switzerland) emphasized the importance of clearly-defined objectives in the project planning process to prevent a duplication of efforts. He noted that integrating with local support and involving the highest level of government were important for maintaining continuity and achieving successful fulfilment of the project goals. Mr. Erik Lindmark, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, drew attention to co-ordination as a critical part of project planning, the aim being to establish a common goal and mutual trust so that there was a basic understanding of needs and resources. Colonel Robert Kraus, Ministry of Defence of Austria, described some issues that had made for an unsuccessful experience during assessment visits, including corruption, unqualified personnel, and misguided host country capacity versus actual performance.

One participating State referred to a problem that was distinct from that of the storage sites, namely, a large number of illicit arms left over from the last Balkan war. It proposed a possible sale of those weapons to help out the current economy of the country. Another participating State asked how it could be ensured that a receiving State was in a position to implement all the procedures and recommendations made during the country visits. A donor participating State responded that training programmes by the lead country and the political will of the host country to accept responsibility were helpful in that process. The CPC suggested that the current host-and donor-country questionnaires could be further developed so that host countries and donors would be better informed of capabilities and expectations.

A donor participating State addressed some of the challenges that had arisen during an assessment visit to a host country and suggested a comprehensive approach consisting in transferring knowledge and skills to the host country to build capacity and successfully implement projects. Lieutenant Colonel Stefan Gundlach, Ministry of Defence of Germany, added that success in any project was easier to achieve when the two parties shared both the same expectations and accountability. Additionally an evaluation and an impact assessment should be a fix part of any project. Next, Mr. Rodney Robideau, Department of State, United States, explained how funding was decided for the SALW reduction projects and noted that the more transparency and detail there were, the more confidence was built up among the donor States to find funding for more projects. He added that one experience in a donor State had been successful because the United States had access to all the information it needed for effectiveness and efficiency. Conversely, funding requests had been denied because countries were less open to sharing the necessary information. One participating host country described how it had launched internal procedures to reduce SALW and build a safe storage facility based on successful assessment visits. Another participating State also expressed support, referring to its SALW programmes that had allowed it to reduce large quantities of stockpile.
The session ended with comments by Mr. Larry Schultz, United States Defence Threat Reduction Agency, regarding the OSCE Best Practices Guide. He expressed the view that the Guide should be used more extensively as an instruction manual. One donor participating State concluded that the recipient’s feedback was important and illustrated a common culture for an inclusive approach, as specified in the SALW documents. There was still much concern that States were pulling back from projects or shifting priorities and funds. Another donor State appealed to others to continue contributing to the Multinational Small Arms and Ammunition Group. Another donor participating State applauded those recipients that had asked for continued engagements with SALW programmes in their countries, and emphasized the appeal for work to continue even if the players engaged in SALW management issues changed.
Annex B: **Overview of the one-off information exchange on marking, export controls, stockpile management and destruction procedures in respect of SALW, as well as on brokering, samples of end-user certificates and illicit air transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (paragraph)</th>
<th>Citation regarding implementation measures</th>
<th>Current status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II, (D)1</td>
<td>The participating States agree to conduct an information exchange on their national marking systems used in the manufacture and/or import of small arms.</td>
<td>Exchanged to date: 54 participating States, Updates in 2011: 16 participating States, Updates in 2012: 13 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II, (D)1</td>
<td>The participating States agree to exchange with each other available information on national procedures for the control of the manufacture of small arms.</td>
<td>Exchanged to date: 54 participating States, Updates in 2011: 19 participating States, Updates in 2012: 16 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III, (F)2</td>
<td>The participating States will exchange with each other available information on relevant national legislation and current practice on export policy, procedures, documentation and on control over international brokering in small arms in order to spread awareness of “best practice” in these areas.</td>
<td>Exchanged to date: 54 participating States, Updates in 2011: 17 participating States, Updates in 2012: 14 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV, (E)2</td>
<td>The participating States will exchange information of a general nature about their national stockpile management and security procedures. The FSC will consider developing a best practice guide, designed to promote effective stockpile management and security.</td>
<td>Exchanged to date: 54 participating States, Updates in 2011: 17 participating States, Updates in 2012: 16 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV, (E)3</td>
<td>The participating States agree to exchange information on their techniques and procedures for the destruction of small arms. The FSC will consider developing a best practice guide of techniques and procedures for the</td>
<td>Exchanged to date: 53 participating States, Updates in 2011: 14 participating States, Updates in 2012: 14 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC Decision</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07 (by 25 January 2008)</td>
<td>The FSC requests participating States to exchange information on their present regulations concerning brokering activities with regard to small arms and light weapons.</td>
<td>48 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08 (by 30 June 2009)</td>
<td>The FSC decides that the participating States shall provide, as an update to the one-off information exchange established by Section III, part F, paragraph 2, of the OSCE Document on SALW, additional information on national practices.</td>
<td>45 participating States, 3 participating States, 2 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08 (by 27 March 2009)</td>
<td>The FSC requests participating states to provide a sample format of their national end-user certificate and/or other pertinent documents.</td>
<td>49 participating States, 2 participating States, 1 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10 (by 30 June 2011)</td>
<td>The FSC requests participating States to exchange information on their present regulations concerning brokering activities with regard to SALW.</td>
<td>n/a, 39 participating States, 14 participating States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C: Overview of annual information exchange on export-import of SALW, surplus SALW and/or SALW seized and destroyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (paragraph)</th>
<th>Citation regarding implementation measures</th>
<th>Status by 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section III, (F)1</td>
<td>The participating States agree to conduct an information exchange among themselves about their small arms exports to, and imports from, other participating States during the previous calendar year. They also agree to study ways to further improve the information exchange on transfers of small arms.</td>
<td>44 participating States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV, (C)1</td>
<td>The participating States agree that the preferred method for the disposal of small arms is destruction. The participating States agree to share available information on the category, sub-category and quantity of small arms that have been identified as surplus and/or seized and destroyed on their territory during the previous calendar year.</td>
<td>40 participating States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D: Destruction of SALW in the OSCE Area

It should be noted that, in cases where a participating State has not differentiated between surplus and seized weapons, the statistics are reflected as surplus.
Annex E: Meetings, seminars and conferences on SALW organized by the OSCE from December 2009 to July 2012

Combating Illicit Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons in Central Asia: Regional Follow-Up Meeting
The Conflict Prevention Centre and the OSCE Centre in Astana, jointly with the Government of Kazakhstan, organized a regional follow-up meeting on combating illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons in Central Asia. The meeting took place on 16 and 17 September 2010, in Almaty, Kazakhstan, and brought together representatives from relevant agencies of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. Also, a number of expert speakers from other international organizations, participating States and NGOs took part in the event. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to examine the main achievements and challenges in implementing effective SALW controls, using reporting as a self-assessment tool, and to discuss how to make the best use of international best practices and assistance offered by the international community to combat illicit trafficking in small arms.

Regional Workshops on Customs Procedures and Licensing Issuance: Integrating the National Processing of Dual-Use Goods and Conventional Weapons Through Information Sharing
The OSCE organized a series of three regional workshops from October 2011 to March 2012 for licensing officers and customs agencies for South-Eastern European, Central Asian countries as well as OSCE Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation. The Workshops brought together over 100 national representatives from 21 countries. Experts from international organizations and academia also took part in the Workshop. During the three days of each event, licensing and customs experts exchanged experiences and information with a view to facilitating risk assessment and detection in order to prevent illicit transfers of controlled and dual-use goods, including SALW. The final event of the series of these regional workshops will be held in October 2012 for the countries of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus.

Other events

Presentations related to SALW in the context of the Security Dialogue of the FSC
FSC Chairpersons regularly invite guest speakers to address the Forum, also on issues related to SALW. In 2010-2011, the presentations on topics related to SALW included the following briefings:

- Presentations by Mr. Daniel Prins, Chief, Conventional Arms Branch, United Nations Office on Disarmament Affairs, on national efforts in the preparation for the Biennial Meeting of States (BMS) on the UN Programme of Action on SALW; and on initiatives on SALW by the UN and the OSCE;
- Presentations by Ambassador Sune Danielsson, Head of the Secretariat of the Wassenaar Arrangement, on the activities of the Wassenaar Arrangement;
- Presentation by Mr. Patrick McCarthy, Project Co-ordinator, UN Co-ordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) Mechanism, on International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS);
- Presentation by Glenn McDonald, Senior Researcher at the Small Arms Survey, on international transfer and brokering controls: continuing challenges;
Presentation by Paul Holtom, Programme Director, Arms Transfers Programme, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, on the launch of the OSCE template for the end-user certificate for SALW;

Presentation by Mrs. Valentina Stalyho, UNDP Programme Manager in Minsk, on the SALW project in Belarus: progress and constraints; and by Colonel Vladimir Baranov, Ministry of Defence of Belarus, Chief of Department, National Co-ordinator of the OSCE-UNDP SALW project, on the OSCE-UNDP project on capacity building in respect of SALW stockpile management and security in Belarus.

Presentation by Mr Zoran Sajinovic, Assistant Minister of Defence of BiH, BG (Ret) Victor von Wilcken, Director of Department for Security and Co-operation, OSCE Mission to BiH, Mr Yury Padun, Arms Control Implementation Officer, OSCE Mission to BiH and Mrs Amna Berbic, National Program Co-ordination, UNDP.

Presentation on the implementation of the OSCE-UNDP Montenegro Demilitarization Programme (MONDEM)

Exhibitions at the High-Level Military Doctrines Seminar and the Annual Security Review Conference

On the margins of the High-Level Military Doctrines Seminar, on 24 and 25 May 2011 and the Annual Security Review Conference, on 26-28 June 2012, the FSC Support Section presented a photo exhibition reflecting FSC assistance projects on SALW and conventional ammunition. The exhibitions displayed different stages of project assessments and implementation in countries in which assistance had been provided, including Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Tajikistan and Ukraine.
Annex F: Participation in events organized by other international organizations and in jointly organized events

The OSCE continued its active external co-ordination and co-operation with other regional and international organizations and civil society, including participation in events organized by other actors.

In 2010-2012, representatives of the CPC continued to promote the OSCE’s outreach activities by participating in events organized by other international and regional organizations. Seminars and workshops at which presentations were given are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19 February 2010</td>
<td>UN Regional Seminar on Enhancing International and Regional Cooperation to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate Illicit Brokering in SALW in East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24 March 2010</td>
<td>NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency Symposium on System Dismantling and Disposal of Military Equipment and Ammunition</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June 2010</td>
<td>Meeting on co-ordination with other international organizations in respect of projects on SALW and SCA</td>
<td>Belgrade, Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-18 June 2010</td>
<td>Fourth Biennial Meeting of States on the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW</td>
<td>New York, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 November 2010</td>
<td>Regional Approach to Stockpile Reduction (RASR) Workshop on Conventional Weapons and Munitions</td>
<td>Sarajevo, BiH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16 November 2010</td>
<td>Shaping, Fine-Tuning and Finalizing International Small Arms Control Standards</td>
<td>Geneva, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December 2010</td>
<td>UNIDIR seminar on the implementation of the Programme of Action on SALW</td>
<td>Geneva, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>EU Working Group on Global Arms Control and Disarmament (CODUN) meeting</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25 May 2011</td>
<td>Regional Approach to Stockpile Reduction (RASR) Workshop on the Regional Approach to Stockpile Reduction</td>
<td>Ljubljana, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23 September 2011</td>
<td>NATO Structured Information Exchange on Projects on SALW and SCA</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29 February 2012</td>
<td>Meetings with UNDP and the MoD on the SALW project to be held on 28-29 February 2012 in Minsk, BY. Participation in a working session of SALW Illicit Trafficking by Air</td>
<td>Minsk, Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 March 2012</td>
<td>SIPRI meeting on illicit trafficking of SALW by air</td>
<td>Kiev, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 April 2012</td>
<td>Export control seminar for CIS countries</td>
<td>Moscow, Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 April 2012</td>
<td>UNIDIR Arms Trade Treaty Regional Seminar.</td>
<td>Belgrade, Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11 May 2012</td>
<td>Saferworld seminar &quot;Preparing for the ATT: Key Implementation Priorities and Challenges&quot;.</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 June 2012</td>
<td>5th International Export Control Seminar</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex G: Donors to SALW projects

The table below indicates pledges of financial support made by delegations towards the implementation of projects on SALW received from 2005 through July 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Funds pledged (EUR)</th>
<th>Country assisted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>In kind (secondment of chief technical adviser)</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I (SALW and conventional ammunition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>170,575</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>In kind (physical security and stockpile management course)</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2005:</strong></td>
<td>504,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>55,331</td>
<td>Belarus, OSCE-UNDP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>In kind (secondment of chief technical adviser)</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II (SALW and conventional ammunition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Belarus, OSCE-UNDP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>524,846</td>
<td>Belarus, OSCE-UNDP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>Belarus, OSCE-UNDP project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>In kind (physical security and stockpile management course)</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>235,800</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2006:</strong></td>
<td>1,370,977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Funds pledged (EUR)</td>
<td>Country assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>309,006</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Secondment of chief technical adviser</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (through UNDP)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2007:</strong></td>
<td><strong>659,006</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Tajikistan, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2008:</strong></td>
<td><strong>452,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>213,253</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2009:</strong></td>
<td><strong>438,253</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan, training in physical security and stockpile management, and destruction of SALW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Belarus, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2010:</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>100,500</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan, training in physical security and stockpile management, and destruction of SALW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2011:</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2005 - 2011:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,615,311</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>