



UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE
FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH



EUROPEAN UNION



URUGUAY

**Supporting the Arms Trade Treaty Negotiations
through Regional Discussions and Expertise Sharing**

**Regional Seminar for Countries
in the Americas and the Caribbean**

**27–29 April 2011
Montevideo, Uruguay**

SUMMARY REPORT

Table of contents

Introduction	1
Seminar proceedings	2
Findings and recommendations	4
Comprehensive and well-defined scope.....	4
Human security considerations and wider impacts of transfer criteria to be considered.....	5
Primary responsibility of States to implement the ATT	6
International system to support implementation.....	7
National reporting and other transparency measures	8
Continuous search for emerging areas of convergence	9
Outcome and impact	10
Next steps	10
Annex A. Agenda.....	11
Annex B. List of participants	17
Annex C. Seminar press coverage.....	23

Introduction

From 27 to 29 April 2011 the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) held a seminar for countries in the Americas and the Caribbean to “Support the Arms Trade Treaty Negotiations through Regional Discussions and Expertise Sharing”.¹ This regional seminar was the third of its kind, following similar events held in Kathmandu, Nepal, on 10–12 November 2010 for countries in Southern and Central Asia, and in Casablanca, Morocco, on 2–4 February 2011 for countries in Central, Western and Northern Africa. It is part of the project that UNIDIR has been implementing for the European Union since July 2010. The project consists of a series of regional events organized in different parts of the world to support the negotiations on the future Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), scheduled for 2012, by ensuring that the process is as inclusive as possible and that states will be able to make concrete suggestions and recommendations on the elements of the future Treaty. It also supports states in developing and improving their national and regional arms transfer control systems.²

The seminar held in Montevideo brought together close to 70 representatives from Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Interior and Defence and the armed forces from 28 of the 35 states in the region (see list of participants in annex B). In addition, several representatives of international and regional organizations, United Nations entities and civil society were invited to make presentations and contribute to the discussions.

This event was divided into two parts (see agenda in annex A). The first half concentrated on the ATT negotiations, with an overview of the process and the elements of the future Treaty. Given the stage of the negotiation process at the United Nations, special focus was placed on its future implementation. Participants had the chance to share their national and regional views on the ATT and its possible implementation system, both in the plenary sessions and in working groups. The second half of the seminar was more technical and practice-oriented, and discussions included existing arms transfer control systems, challenges in their implementation, and possibilities to improve existing practices by increasing transparency and coordination to ensure effective implementation of the future ATT.

The following report presents a summary of the seminar proceedings as well as a collection of its main messages and recommendations. It is not intended to be a consensus document. Rather, it reflects the impressions and views of the organizers at UNIDIR. It therefore does not necessarily represent the views of all seminar participants.

¹ The states invited were Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States, Uruguay and Venezuela.

² The project is a follow-on activity to a previous series of regional meetings organized by UNIDIR for the European Union in 2009–2010, entitled “Promoting Discussion on an Arms Trade Treaty”. It was established by a decision of the EU Council entitled “EU activities in support of the Arms Trade Treaty, in the framework of the European Security Strategy” (2010/336/CFSP), on 14 June 2010. Reports, presentations and audio documentation of both projects can be found at <www.unidir.org/att>.

Audio files and documents of the presentations made at the seminar are available at <www.unidir.org/bdd/fiche-activite.php?ref_activite=609>.

Seminar proceedings

The Montevideo event consisted of two parts, which were aimed at different types of participants. The first half was targeted at diplomatic personnel responsible for national policies vis-à-vis an ATT, including national delegates participating in the ATT Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings in New York. During this part, the ATT process and related instruments were discussed with special focus on the implementation aspects of the future Treaty, in preparation for the next PrepCom meeting to be held in July 2011. In the discussions, participants were asked to present their views, concrete ideas and recommendations for the ATT process. The second half was aimed at technical licensing, security and law-enforcement personnel. It discussed transfer controls and the ATT from a more practical point-of-view, for example by presenting national practices and by examining a fictitious case study from the EU perspective.

On 27 April, the seminar was officially opened by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, H.E. Mr. Luis Almagro, who in his remarks underlined the commitment of Uruguay towards the ATT-related international processes. He noted the importance of regional approaches to support international processes, especially in security and disarmament matters that are of common concern to all states. Chaired by Dr. Christiane Agboton-Johnson, Deputy Director of UNIDIR, the session also included statements from H.E. Mr. Geoffrey Barrett, Head of the EU Delegation to Uruguay, and Ms. Susan McDade, the UN Resident Coordinator in Uruguay. In her remarks, Dr. Agboton-Johnson gave an overview of the project of which the seminar is part, and noted that, as an autonomous research institute of the United Nations specialized in disarmament and security matters, UNIDIR promotes creative thinking and dialogue on today's and tomorrow's challenges. For UNIDIR, seminars as this one are important in deepening discussion and raising questions about the proposed ATT and giving an open space to a variety of stakeholders. These thoughts were echoed also by Ambassador Barrett, who also underlined the commitment of the European Union towards a truly global, effective ATT, negotiated and developed through a genuine participatory process. The opening session heard two presentations about the ATT: a general overview of developments within the United Nations by Ms. Amanda Cowl of the UN Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development, and a discussion of civil society's role in the ATT process in the region by Ms. Folade Mutota of the Caribbean Coalition for Development and the Reduction of Armed Violence.

The aim of the first working session was to take a brief look at the different aspects of the ATT currently under discussion at the United Nations. Chaired by Ambassador Roberto García Moritán of Argentina, who is chairing the PrepCom process, the session first heard a presentation on the remaining questions on the Treaty's possible scope, delivered by Ms. Anne-Charlotte Merrell Wetterwik of the Center for International Trade and Security, University of Georgia. It then proceeded to discuss the possible parameters of the future Treaty. First, the Executive Director of the Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress, Mr. Luis Alberto Cordero, gave a presentation stressing human security considerations related to the ATT's transfer criteria, bringing the ATT

back to its roots with reference to President Arias and the Group of Peace Laureates who first initiated the idea of a global code of conduct for conventional arms transfers. The session also heard from Mr. Øistein Thorsen of Oxfam about his organization's views regarding the possibilities and importance of including developmental concerns into the ATT's transfer criteria and its links with security sector reform. The last presentation of the session was an introduction to the main theme of the seminar: implementing the future Treaty. Some considerations on this were presented by Dr. Roberto Dondisch from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, and were followed by a discussion.

The second and third sessions of the seminar were devoted to national and regional views on the implementation of the Treaty, with presentations from regional organizations and participating states. Chaired by Mr. Frederico Perrazza from the Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the United Nations in New York, it heard regional overviews and briefings from the Organization of American States (OAS), by Mr. Abraham Stein, and from the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), by Ambassador Noel Sinclair. The European Union also gave its perspective on the ATT process and aspects of its implementation. The last session of the day was chaired by Ambassador Donatus St. Aimee, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia to the United Nations in New York, and heard contributions by participants from Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba and Saint Kitts and Nevis. The presentation of these national views about the ATT's implementation revealed many common views and ideas about the Treaty but also some specific national priorities, reservations and challenges.

The morning of day two was devoted to three simultaneous working groups, where participants were asked questions specifically related to the implementation of the proposed ATT. Questions included participants' views on the minimum requirements for an effective national export control system under an ATT, and whether they were already in place. Participants were also asked which international implementation mechanisms/measures for an ATT they support, and how compliance with the Treaty could be measured/monitored. Further, working groups discussed the possible mechanisms of information exchange and transparency, peer review, dispute settlement and consultancy mechanisms. Finally, groups were asked about the role of international assistance and cooperation in implementing the ATT.

After the working groups, the rapporteurs of the different groups presented to the plenary the outcomes of their discussions, including recommendations for the ATT process, which are presented in this report's section on findings. The first part of the seminar was brought to a close with statements by Dr. Agboton-Johnson and Ms. Elli Kytömäki of UNIDIR, Mr. Fabio Della Piazza from the European External Action Service, and Mr. Raul Pollak from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, who briefly summarized the proceedings and thanked participants for their active participation.

After lunch, the second part of the seminar commenced with an overview of the ATT and a short briefing on the discussions of part one. Mr. Pablo Arrocha of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico spoke about the implementation discussions and Ambassador Sinclair of CARICOM highlighted some regional considerations related to the ATT. The session continued with an overview of national and regional systems to regulate the conventional arms trade, with presentations on arms brokering controls in the Americas

and the Caribbean with regard to the ATT, presented by Mr. Mark Bromley of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, on Argentina's experience in implementing arms transfer controls, by Lucia Gomez Consoli from the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights of Argentina, and on the EU Common Position on conventional arms exports by Ms. Mariann Mezey from the Hungarian Trade and Licensing Office. The session concluded with a general discussion and an exchange of views.

The final session of the day, chaired by Mr. Della Piazza, looked deeper into establishing effective national and regional arms transfer control systems, both from state point-of-view, in a presentation by Mr. Fernando Villena Sánchez from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Spain, and from the viewpoint of the defense industry, in a presentation on "Industry's experiences in arms transfer controls—working under effective national regulations", by Mr. Francis Bleeker from Colt Canada.

The last day commenced with a session on improving the accountability and transparency of conventional arms transfers with presentations on the role and functioning of UN transparency mechanisms, most notably the UN Register of Conventional Arms, by Ms. Kytömäki, on the EU annual export reports, by Ms. Mezey, and on Canadian experiences in export and import controls of conventional arms including the use of electronic systems, delivered by Mr. Paul Galveias of the Canadian Export and Import Controls Bureau. The second session of the day was devoted to a practical case study that presented a hypothetical case of a potential export of aircraft from the European Union to a third country. Participants, led by Mr. Abel Duarte de Oliveira of the Ministry of Defence of Portugal, discussed different scenarios and issues to be taken into account in the transfer. After this, participants were divided into three working groups to further discuss practical aspects of export controls. The issues raised included minimum elements of a national arms transfer control system, national priority issues in ensuring effective national controls of arms transfers, challenges and strategies in implementing transfer controls, as well as possible assistance needs.

The seminar ended with a session bringing together the results of the working groups, and with a formal closing session. The closing session was chaired by Dr. Agboton-Johnson, and heard summary remarks on the full seminar by Ms. Kytömäki, as well as official closing remarks by H.E. Mr. Barrett and H.E. Mr. Nelson Chaben from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay.

Findings and recommendations

Comprehensive and well-defined scope

Finding a suitable list of items to be controlled in an ATT is one of the most important and challenging issues that states have to address in the lead-up to the 2012 Conference. The views expressed about the possible scope of the Treaty have developed significantly in the past year, and areas of commonality among state views are growing. The majority of states are advocating a comprehensive scope that would go beyond the seven categories of the UN Register of Conventional Arms.³ The discussions during the seminar reflected this move away from and beyond the Register, which in itself was

³ The "7+1+1" model.

seen as a useful instrument, with the possible addition of categories of SALW and ammunition, as many states called for a more comprehensive approach to the issue of scope. As argued by one presentation made during the seminar, a comprehensive scope for a robust Treaty would probably have to address the issue of international transfers of conventional arms as a whole. It will not be possible to copy lists from other non-proliferation instruments that were created for different purposes and perspectives. Nevertheless, many participants seemed to be in favour of a list approach (as an annex to the Treaty text), to make the ATT more easily interpretable and implementable at the national level. According to one presenter, “lessons can be learned for how the categories under the UN Register of Conventional Arms have been used, but they can provide only one source of inspiration for the ATT process and there are so many more”.

As in previous regional events, the importance of SALW as a specific category to fall under an ATT was highlighted by most participants, as were ammunition and technological developments by others. In addition, it was noted that parts and components as well as technology and equipment, which were seen as separate but equally important categories, should be further analyzed with regard to their possible inclusion in the Treaty. Categories covering items such as explosives, armour and equipment for military and law enforcement, or internal security equipment, have yet to be addressed in detail in order to ascertain how implementable and realistic their inclusion would be.

In terms of concrete control lists for the Treaty, the possibility of having different specifications and detail for import and export lists was also suggested. This would probably help reduce the burden, particularly on small states that primarily import weapons, but would risk blurring the transparency mechanism under the Treaty by making comparisons between export and import statistics more cumbersome, if not impossible.

While aiming for a comprehensive scope for the ATT, it was noted that the control list of the future Treaty has to be manageable to remain relevant for states in their future national implementation efforts. How to do this concretely in the Treaty, and which control list(s) could possibly be used as its basis, will need further discussions in the months between now and the ATT Conference.⁴

Human security considerations and wider impacts of transfer criteria to be considered

The seminar also discussed the possible parameters that should be included in the transfer criteria under an ATT. Special focus was placed on human security considerations, which in many ways were the leading reasons for starting the ATT process in the 1990s. It was noted that illicit and uncontrolled flows of especially small arms and light weapons pose various problems to states in the Americas and the Caribbean, from increased crime rates to other forms of social violence and armed conflicts. Mr. Cordero from the Arias Foundation stressed these aspects and noted that the under-regulated global trade in conventional weapons operates in direct opposition to human security principles. He also pointed out that the human cost of under-regulated

⁴ For an in-depth discussion, see Anne-Charlotte Merrell Wetterwik, “Possible Scope of the Future ATT and the Implications of the Different Options”, <www.unidir.org/pdf/activites/pdf11-act537.pdf>.

arms trade is measured not only in lives lost, but also in its innumerable indirect impacts that threaten economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security. Many participants called for an ATT to establish transfer criteria that would help address these problems and for their part improve human security in the region. Some said that the ATT will be most beneficial to human security if it does not seek to be something that it is not (i.e. a disarmament treaty), nor lose sight of its noble objective, but reconciles these two factors of feasibility and aspiration within a broad scope and strong, legally binding criteria. Some speakers raised wider considerations related to an ATT's parameters, such as their links with security sector governance and reform, assistance programmes and capacity-building. Corruption and diversion were also noted as acute problems in the region and something that an ATT should seek to address. Corruption poses a significant threat to the effectiveness of all arms control mechanisms, including the ATT, as it undermines states' abilities to ensure compliance with control measures and prevents the diversion of arms from their authorized end user. Finally, criteria to prevent transfers of arms where they would seriously impair poverty reduction and development efforts were noted to be of direct concern to human security in the region.

Primary responsibility of states to implement the ATT

In addition to discussing the principles, objectives, scope and parameters of the ATT, determining the Treaty implementation modalities is a crucial aspect that will largely determine its success and effectiveness. Negotiating an international, legally binding treaty that would establish the highest possible common international standards for the transfer of conventional arms will require the participation of all relevant parties at the national, regional and international levels. This was evident throughout the seminar presentations, which brought out different aspects of ongoing efforts at all the levels and highlighted areas of convergence and complementarity. Despite the three-tier approach necessary for the ATT, the primary role of national-level action, both in the lead-up to the negotiations and later in implementing the Treaty, was underlined by many participants, who also noted that sovereign decision-making should in no instance be sacrificed under the Treaty. Many echoed the necessity to put in place the essential legal, administrative and organizational national structures. Some called for international cooperation and assistance to support states in these efforts, as many states currently have relatively underdeveloped national arms transfer control systems and would find it difficult to immediately meet their ATT obligations. For example, with regard to some Caribbean island states, it was noted that their border control systems and maritime patrolling should be strengthened, preferably with the support of international capacity-building projects.

For its part, the hypothetical case study highlighted the complexities related to arms transfer control systems in an increasingly international environment. It also showed the wide variety of controls that are necessary to ensure responsible and well-informed transfers, no matter which type of state is in question: an importer, an exporter, or a transit state. In addition, participants touched upon the need to ensure not only the establishment of the necessary systems but also the enforcement of transfer controls under these structures, in line with their obligations under the Treaty.

Coordination among different national actors as well as outreach to external partners were mentioned by many participants as key to effective arms transfer controls. The

need to improve inter-agency coordination was also highlighted. On this topic, the examples presented by international experts were welcomed and provoked active discussion. It was noted that as the future Treaty will bring together a range of states that have different capacities and needs with regard to transfer controls, it should not aim at finding a “one size fits all” solution but rather should determine the necessary elements for effective controls and other critical factors that are of relevance to the Treaty and its implementation. The ATT should remain flexible both with regard to different national approaches to transfer controls and to future developments in trade and technologies. It should also not set a ceiling for controls but should allow states to introduce stricter national controls than specified in the Treaty, should they so wish.

International system to support implementation

In addition to various national systems, practices and challenges, considerable time was devoted, especially during the first two days of the seminar, to possible international mechanisms that could or should support the implementation of the ATT. Almost all interventions seemed to support having some kind of institutional follow-up system as part of the Treaty, as this would help assess the level to which the Treaty was functioning, assist all parties in meeting their commitments, increase transparency on arms transfers in general, and develop shared understandings about the standards of acceptable practice.

The possibility of having an international Secretariat or an Implementation Support Unit (ISU) was discussed. Participants exchanged views on the potential role, structure and financing of such a body, expressing different views regarding its suitable tasks, which ranged from mainly a depositary organ that would function as the institutional memory of the Treaty and facilitate information exchange, to a more proactive role of a Secretariat in monitoring the Treaty’s implementation, seeking clarifications and conducting analyses. Possible tasks that participants listed for an ISU/Secretariat included collection of national reports and other information related to the Treaty’s implementation, coordination of assistance and cooperation efforts and matching needs with resources, coordination of efforts among regional organizations and arrangements, providing administrative support for Treaty implementation (organization of meetings of states parties and Review Conferences, maintaining a website), and providing general advice to governments regarding joining and implementing the Treaty.

Participants’ views diverged over whether the possible ISU or Secretariat should be established as an independent body, or whether parties should seek to place implementation support within a pre-existing structure, such as the United Nations. The UN Office for Disarmament Affairs and its regional centres were specifically mentioned. The supporting role of regional organizations was also noted and it was suggested that the links between an ISU/Secretariat and regional bodies could be formalized through memoranda of understanding to avoid the duplication of effort and to ensure the best possible utilization of resources.

Meetings of states parties and Review Conferences to facilitate implementation were also discussed, together with possible mechanisms of dispute settlement, peer review systems and continuous Treaty review and development. Further, links between existing regional structures and the future ATT’s implementation were explored, mostly through presentations by regional organizations. It seems that meetings of states parties were

mostly supported as annual or biennial events, complemented with more substantial Review Conferences every five years.

The ideas related to committees of experts and peer review mechanisms seemed to evoke mixed responses and mostly critical or sceptical views.

With regard to agreeing on the modalities of the international implementation support system or structure, some noted that in the interest of time and effectiveness the Treaty could perhaps firstly establish a general umbrella structure or elements, which could later be further specified and modified in a Treaty's follow-up meetings and through practical implementation efforts.

National reporting and other transparency measures

In addition to aspects of institutional follow-up systems to support implementation of the future Treaty, one prominent theme throughout the seminar was transparency. This theme was touched upon in the exchange of national practices as well as in the context of the ATT's future implementation. The importance of regular (annual) national reporting as a means to increase transparency in conventional arms transfers was stressed as crucial by many participants, and information exchange in the form of national reports was noted in all group discussions as a central building block for an implementation system. The nature of the reports, their content, frequency and level of detail were discussed. Some noted that the reporting system should be made compulsory for all Treaty parties, while others were firm in their view that any possible information exchange mechanism should rather be kept general and voluntary in nature. An area where views seemed diverse was also on the question of denial reporting and its possible details and timing.

Further, delegates expressed differing views regarding the nature of reporting in terms of items and types of information to be covered, as well as the frequency of reporting. It was also suggested that the information exchange system could be made relative to a state's volume of imports or exports of conventional arms, either through making reporting compulsory only once a state's transfers reach a certain annual level, or that, for example, larger exporters or importers would have to report more frequently than states whose transfers are lesser. Many participants mentioned the problem of multiple, partially duplicate reporting requirements and said that the reporting mechanism under the ATT should seek to ease, not to add to, the reporting burden of states. The role of an ISU or a Secretariat as discussed above was also brought up with regard to national reporting as the desirable body to function as the depositary of this information.

Echoing the discussion on the possibility of including ammunition, parts and components, and other types of material and equipment in an ATT, it was noted that the Treaty's scope should not be seen as uniform in its future transparency function. An ATT could cover materials for which states would exchange more information, and others with regard to which this information exchange would be less frequent or more limited in terms of detail (for example in the form of annual aggregated data on the number or value of granted licenses). Some information under the Treaty could be made publicly available over the internet, whereas other information could be released only to Treaty parties, or be exchanged bilaterally. Some of the larger exporting states in particular have been advocating for the exchange of aggregated data instead of detailed

import or export figures, given the number of licenses granted each year and the sheer amount of raw data. Many participants also raised questions related to the sensitive nature of the information to be exchanged and called for a balance between transparency and national defence needs in terms of confidentiality of strategic information.

In addition to periodic national reporting on exports and imports of conventional arms, many speakers stressed the need to exchange other types of information. It was noted that this could include, for example, reporting on national arms transfer legislation and systems, information about national points of contact, and implementation challenges or assistance needs. Some suggested that this kind of background information, which would also serve as an indication of a state's capacity and efforts to implement an ATT, could be exchanged on a one-off basis and updated only when necessary, as opposed to the exchange of statistical information about transfers, which could be conducted on an annual basis.

Further, in relation to transparency and information exchange, participants also mentioned the possibility of holding bilateral consultations regarding arms transfer decisions to coordinate and network with colleagues both domestically and abroad. This type of information exchange could be done more in real-time than national reporting, which would likely be exchanged with a delay of one to two years at a minimum. This kind of system would help states to assess their Treaty implementation and efforts, as it would establish a right to raise queries or concerns and codify procedures for dealing with problematic or complicated transfer cases. It was also noted that there are limits to the detail with which we can discuss these issues at this stage. Many stressed the importance of national reporting as a transparency mechanism and that this goal should be kept in mind when deciding upon the detail and nature of information to be expected, while others highlighted considerations of national security and sensitivities which will set limits to the information exchanged.

Continuous search for emerging areas of convergence

Exchanges of opinion advanced several different ideas, suggestions and diverging views. However, some strong national positions about the Treaty's details aside, there was a firm feeling of convergence regarding the Treaty and its goals. Many participants stressed the need to continue working together in different formats and at different levels, to seek solutions to the remaining issues on the table and to learn from each other. The interaction between diplomatic representatives and experts working on practical aspects of export controls, either in national administrations or in private defence companies, was particularly welcomed and it was noted that the negotiation process should seek to benefit from the experience of those who have first-hand expertise in transfer licensing, law enforcement and border controls.

There were ultimately many issues in which wide areas of commonality already existed, even though the vocabulary employed still differs in some cases. The regional-level support for disarmament, security and arms control initiatives in the Americas and the Caribbean is noteworthy, and participants called for the maximum utilization of these presently existing structures and instruments in building the ATT.

Outcome and impact

The third regional seminar of the project followed its predecessors in fully meeting its goals by resulting in an active exchange of views and expertise, and by being able to identify areas of convergence as well as issues on which further discussions are necessary. It attracted a good level of participation from countries in the Americas and the Caribbean, as well as from host state Uruguay. High-level participation on the part of the host state, the United Nations and the European Union further contributed to the success of the seminar and helped attract broad media attention. Both parts of the seminar had close to 100 participants from 28 countries in the region, in addition to international experts, all of whom actively participated in the discussions and many of whom also contributed by making presentations. Interventions by experts were received positively by participants: in the anonymous feedback forms distributed to participants, participants of the first part of the seminar in particular noted that they were quite familiar with the ATT process and the current stage of discussions already before the seminar, but that the exchanges of views helped them in preparing for the Preparatory Committee meeting in July and in the process more generally. Participants in the first part mentioned discussions on the different national positions with regard to the Treaty's future implementation as especially positive. In the second part, feedback revealed that discussions on transparency measures as well as the practical EU case study were welcomed by the participants. Participants of both parts of the seminar also noted that the event was very useful for them in establishing contacts with colleagues and in improving networking on the subject.⁵

Next steps

UNIDIR is proceeding with the organization of the remaining regional seminars and other activities. The next project activity will be the seminar organized for countries in Eastern Asia and the Pacific, which will be held in Bali on 6–8 June 2011. The results of the Americas and Asia seminars, especially with regard to the ATT's implementation aspects, will be brought to the attention of wider set of stakeholders during the next meeting of the Preparatory Committee in a side event on 13 July 2011 in New York.

In late 2011/early 2012, further regional seminars will be held for countries in Eastern and Southern Africa, the Middle East and Wider Europe. In accordance with the contract, UNIDIR is also continuing with the commissioning of background papers, in close cooperation with the services of the EU High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. These studies, together with the summary reports of the regional seminars and presentations made during the project events, are made available on UNIDIR's website.

⁵ The return rate of the feedback forms during the event was quite low, so the forms were sent to everyone also after the event. As we are still waiting for some returns, the feedback presented here is not comprehensive.

Annex A. Agenda

PART I

For diplomatic and military personnel responsible for national policies vis-à-vis the ATT

Tuesday, 26 April 2011

During the day: arrival of participants of part I

DAY 1

Wednesday, 27 April 2011

08:30–09:00 **Registration**

09:00–09:30 **Opening Session, part I**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, Deputy Director, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

Opening remarks:

H.E. Mr. Luis Almagro
Minister of Foreign Affairs, Uruguay

H.E. Mr. Geoffrey Barrett
Head of the EU Delegation in Uruguay and Paraguay

Susan McDade
UN Resident Coordinator in Uruguay

09:30–09:45 Coffee break

09:45–10:45 **Opening Session, continued**

Presentations:

ATT—recent developments at the United Nations and in the region
Amanda Cowl, UN Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development
in Latin America and the Caribbean

Civil Society's Contribution to the ATT process in the Americas and the Caribbean
Folade Mutota, Caribbean Coalition for Development and the Reduction of
Armed Violence

10:45–13:00 **SESSION I: ATT and its different aspects**

Chair: H.E. Mr. Roberto García Moritán
Ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Argentina

Presentations:

Towards 2012: remaining questions regarding the Treaty's possible scope
Anne-Charlotte Merrell Wetterwik, CITS, Georgia University

Considerations on the proposed Treaty's transfer criteria – human security considerations

Luis Alberto Cordero, Executive Director, Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress

Including developmental concerns to the Treaty's transfer criteria
Øistein Thorsen, Oxfam

Implementing the future ATT: some key considerations
Roberto Dondisch, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mexico

Discussion

13:00–14:30 Lunch at conference venue

14:30–15:45 **SESSION II: From negotiating to implementing an ATT: regional views**

Chair: Federico Perazza, Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the UN, New York

OAS and the ATT initiative
Abraham Stein, Organization of American States

ATT's relevance to the CARICOM region
H.E. Mr. Noel Sinclair, Permanent Observer of CARICOM to the United Nations, New York

The ATT process: EU's perspective
Fabio Della Piazza, EU External Action Service

Discussion

15:45–16:00 Coffee break

16:00–17:30 **SESSION II: Continued – national views on implementing an ATT**

Chair: H.E. Mr. Donatus St. Aimee, Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia to the UN, New York

Presentations:

National contributions from Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba and St. Kitts and Nevis

Discussion

19:00–20:30 Reception for all participants (Part I and Part II), Palacio Santos, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay

DAY 2

Thursday, 28 April 2011

09:00–09:30 **Summary of discussions from Day 1**

09:30–11:00 **SESSION III: Parallel working group sessions on aspects related to the Treaty's implementation, cooperation and assistance**

11:00–11:30 Coffee break

11:30–12:15 **SESSION IV: Conclusions and next steps:
Compiling working group recommendations**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

Presentation of results from the working groups

Discussion

12:15–13:00 **Closing Session of Part I**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

Brief summary of the outcomes and recommendations from the first part
Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

Closing remarks:

Fabio Della Piazza, European Union, External Action Service

Raul Pollak, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Uruguay

13:00-15:00 Lunch at conference venue

PART II

For technical and law-enforcement personnel

Wednesday, 27 April 2011

During the day: arrival of participants

Thursday, 28 April 2011

13:00-15:00 Lunch at conference venue

15:00–15:45 **Opening Session**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

Opening remarks:

Fabio Della Piazza, European Union, External Action Service

Fabian Brufau, Ministry of Defense, Uruguay

Introduction to the ATT initiative and its recent developments in the region and briefing from Part I

Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

Selected national representatives from Part I

15:45–16:45 **SESSION I: Overview of national and regional systems to regulate conventional arms trade**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

Presentations:

Arms transfer systems in the Americas and the Caribbean: Arms Brokering Controls and a Future ATT

Mark Bromley, SIPRI

Argentinean experience in implementing arms transfer controls

Lucía Gómez Cónsoli, Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, Argentina

EU Common Position on conventional arms exports: implementation aspects from an EU Member State's perspective

Mariann Mezey, Hungarian Trade and Licensing Office

Discussion

16:45–17:00 Coffee break

17:00–18:00 **SESSION II: Establishing effective national and regional systems**

Chair: Fabio Della Piazza, European Union, External Action Service

Presentations:

Legal aspects of establishing and enforcing comprehensive controls

Fernando Villena Sánchez, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Spain

Industry's experiences in arms transfer controls – working under effective national regulations

Francis Bleeker, Colt Canada

Discussion

DAY 3

Friday, 29 April 2011

09:00–10:30 **SESSION III: Improving accountability and transparency of conventional arms transfers**

Chair: Federico Perazza, Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the UN, New York

Presentations:

Role and functioning of UN transparency mechanisms
Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

Annual export reports of the European Union
Mariann Mezey, Hungarian Trade and Licensing Office

Canadian experiences in export and import controls of conventional arms, including the use of electronic systems
Paul Galveias, Canadian Export and Import Controls Bureau

Discussion

10:30–10:45 Coffee break

10:45–13:00 **SESSION IV: Conventional arms trade and an ATT—practical implications**

Chair: Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service

Presentations:

Colombia's practices on marking and tracing of weapons
Col Carlos Velasquez Pelaez, Military Industry, INDUMIL, Colombia

Practical case study from the EU
Abel Duarte de Oliveira, Ministry of Defence, Portugal

Discussion

13:00–14:30 Lunch at conference venue

14:30–15:45 **SESSION V: Parallel working group sessions on practical aspects of export controls**

15:45–16:00 Coffee break

16:00–16:45 **SESSION V: Continued**

16:45–17:15 **SESSION VI: Bringing together the results**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

Presentation of results from the working groups: practical lessons learned and recommended next steps

17:15–17:30 **Closing Session**

Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

Summary of the seminar outcomes and recommendations
Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

Closing remarks:

H.E. Mr. Geoffrey Barrett
Head of the EU Delegation in Uruguay and Paraguay

H.E. Mr. Nelson Chabén
Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Uruguay

Annex B. List of participants

Antigua and Barbuda	<p>Ms. Gillian Joseph First Secretary Permanent Mission of Antigua and Barbuda to the UN, New York</p> <p>Mr. Michael Murrell Police Officer Royal Police Force of Antigua and Barbuda</p>
Argentina	<p>Mr. Jorge Mariano Jordan Counsellor Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Lucia del Carmen Gómez Cónsoli Director, National Registry of Arms Ministry of Justice and Human Rights</p>
Bahamas	<p>Ms. Charice Rolle Assistant Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Damien Robinson Sergeant Royal Bahamas Police Force</p>
Bolivia	<p>Col. Guido Gonzalez Paz Chief of the Department of International Organizations Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
Brazil	<p>Ms. Larissa Schneider Calza Third Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Lt Col Jose Queiroz Armed Forces</p>
Canada	<p>Ms. Kimberly-Lin Joslin Senior Policy Officer Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade</p> <p>Mr. Paul Galveias Senior Export Control Officer Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Trade</p>
Chile	<p>Mr. Ivan Jose Vejar Second Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Col Ricardo Burle Delva Chief, Arms and Munitions Department Ministry of Defense</p>

Colombia	<p>Amb. Miguel Ruiz Blanco Deputy Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of Colombia to the UN, New York</p> <p>Col Carlos Velasquez Pelaez Commercial Sub-Director Military Industry, INDUMIL</p>
Costa Rica	<p>Amb. Christian Guillermet-Fernandez Deputy Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of Costa Rica to the UN, Geneva</p>
Cuba	<p>Ms. Marieta Garcia Jordan Counsellor Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Yadira Ledesma Hernandez Permanent Mission of Cuba to the UN, New York</p>
Dominican Republic	<p>Ms. Katherine Urbacz Minister Counsellor Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic to the UN, Geneva</p>
Ecuador	<p>Mr. Fernando Luque Marquez First Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Col Edwin Oswaldo Lara Chief, Arms Control Department Armed Forces</p>
El Salvador	<p>H.E. Dr. Vladimiro P. Villalta Ambassador Permanent Representative of El Salvador in Uruguay</p> <p>Col Salvador Gonzalez Quezada Director, Logistics Ministry of National Defence</p>
Grenada	<p>Mr. Marlon Glean Legal Officer Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Jessman Prince Superintendent of Police Royal Grenada Police Force</p>
Guatemala	<p>Mr. Carlos Hugo Avila Deputy Director, International Humanitarian Law Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>

	<p>Mr. Erick Lopez Dominguez Chief, Juridical Department General Directorate of Arms and Ammunitions Control</p>
Guyana	<p>Ms. Donnette Odessa Streete Foreign Service Officer II Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
Jamaica	<p>Ms. Sheree Chambers First Secretary Permanent Mission of Jamaica to the UN, New York</p> <p>Mr. Lincoln Allen Director, Protective Security Ministry of National Security</p>
Mexico	<p>Dr. Roberto Dondisch Glowinski Policy Advisor to the Undersecretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Pablo Arrocha Olabuenaga Third Secretary Permanent Mission of Mexico to the UN, New York</p>
Paraguay	<p>Ms. Lourdes Miranda Jordan Acting Manager, Specialized Agencies Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Oscar Villagra Rodriguez Chief, National Arms Register Directorate of Military Material, Armed Forces</p>
Peru	<p>Mr. Alexis Aquino Albengrin Cousellor Permanent Mission of Peru to the UN, New York</p> <p>Col Josip Markovinovic Ramos Joint Command, Armed Forces</p>
Saint Kitts and Nevis	<p>Lt Col Patrick Wallace Commander Defence Forces</p> <p>Mr. Kennedy De Silva Assistant Controller Customs and Excise of St. Kitts and Nevis</p>
Saint Lucia	<p>Amb. Donatus St. Aimee Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of Saint Lucia to the UN, New York</p>

	<p>Mr. Herman St. Helen Controller of Customs and Excise Government of Saint Lucia</p>
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	<p>Mr. Mozart Carr Foreign Service Officer Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Consumer Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Michael Charles Superintendent of Police Ministry of National Security</p>
Suriname	<p>Ms. Kitty Sweeb Counsellor Permanent Mission of Suriname to the UN, New York</p>
Trinidad and Tobago	<p>Ms. Adelle Rahamut Legal Officer Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Melissa Charles Research Information Officer II Ministry of National Security</p>
United States	<p>Mr. Robert Anderson Embassy of USA</p>
Uruguay	<p>Amb. Nelson Chabén Secretary-General Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Amb. Luis Sica Director, Multilateral Affairs Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Amb. Diego Zorrilla Director, Protocol Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Tomas Vera Director, Press Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Raul Pollak Minister, Deputy Director Directorate General for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Ramona Franco Counsellor, Deputy Director Directorate General for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>

	<p>Mr. José Luis Rivas Cousellor, Chief of Secretariat Directorate General for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Gustavo Somma Cousellor Deputy Director, Multilateral Affairs Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Boris Svetogorski Minister, Deputy Director Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Arturo Villarreal Cousellor, Chief, Ceremonial Cervices Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Federico Perazza Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the UN, New York</p> <p>Ms. Lia Bergara Secretary of External Services, Directorate General for Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Juan Andres Mottola Secretary of External Services, Multilateral Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Ms. Karen Meyer Secretary of External Services, Protocol Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Mr. Gustavo Fernandez Commissary, Department of Arms, Ammunitions and Policing Equipment Ministry of Interior</p> <p>Lt. Col Edgar O. Mendez Chief, National Registry of Arms Ministry of Defence</p> <p>Dr. Fabian Brufau Legal Advisor, National Registry of Arms Ministry of Defence</p> <p>Mr. Andres Perrone National Directorate for Intelligence</p> <p>Dr. Enrique Andreoli Legal Advisor, National Directorate of Customs Ministry of Economy and Finance</p> <p>Dr. Gabriela Merialdo Supreme Court of Justice</p> <p>Mr. Diego Fernandez</p>

Venezuela	Mr. Wilmer Mendez First Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs Mr. Jesus Ronaldo Toro First Secretary Permanent Mission of Venezuela to the UN, New York
-----------	--

Annex C. Seminar press coverage

ULTIMA HORA (PARAGUAY) | 29/04/2011 | <http://www.ultimahora.com/notas/424585-America-Latina-y-el-Caribe-van-con-dificultades-hacia-control-de-armas>

América Latina y el Caribe van con dificultades hacia control de armas

EL DEBER (BOLIVIA) | 29/04/2011 | Link: <http://www.eldeber.com.bo/2011/2011-05-01/vernotainternacional.php?id=110430185458>

La ONU impulsa un tratado para controlar la venta ilegal de arma

NOTICIAS 123 COLOMBIA | 29/04/2011 | http://noticias.123.cl/noticias/20110429_fab8c0500f42b83beb9657956973f962.htm

Avanzan Con Dificultades Hacia El Control De Armas

RETAIL (CHILE) | 29/04/2011 | <http://retailchile.blogspot.com/2011/05/america-latina-y-el-caribe-avanzan.html>

América Latina y el Caribe avanzan, aunque con dificultades, hacia la concreción el próximo año de un tratado de comercio de armas

EL VINCULO DIGITAL (| 30/04/2011 | LINK: <http://www.elvinculodigital.com/2011/04/30/latinoamerica-ue-y-la-onu-quieren-regular-el-control-de-armas/>

Latinoamérica, UE y la ONU quieren regular el control de armas

Representantes de 35 países debatieron con el fin de regular el comercio de armas convencionales en el mundo

CRONICAS | POLITICA | 29/04/2011 | Pag. 3

Problemática de Uruguay y la región. Intentan evitar que armas caigan en manos de terroristas y delincuentes

LA DIARIA | POLITICA | 28/04/2011 | Pag. 2 Volver

Con el dedo en el gatillo.

Almagro destacó avances de la región en materia de control de armas convencionales

LA REPUBLICA | POLITICA | 28/04/2011 | Pag. 4 | Link: <http://www.larepublica.com.uy/politica/449610-tratado-de-comercio-de-armas>

Tratado de Comercio de Armas. Debate en Montevideo

ABC (PARAGUAY) | PORTADA | 28/04/2011 | <http://www.abc.com.py/nota/paises-latinoamericanos-debaten-sobre-tratado-de-comercio-de-armas-de-la-onu/>

Países latinoamericanos debaten sobre tratado de comercio de armas de la ONU

MONTEVIDEO. El aumento mundial del comercio de armamento y del tráfico ilícito de armas no escapa a los países de América Latina y el Caribe, que desde el martes debaten en Montevideo qué alcance debe tener el Tratado de Comercio de Armas que la ONU planea alcanzar el año próximo.

INFOBAE (Argentina) | PORTADA | <http://america.infobae.com/notas/23884-Latinoamerica-inicia-el-debate-sobre-la-regulacion-de-la-venta-de-armas>

Latinoamérica inicia el debate sobre la regulación de la venta de armas

EL DEBER (BOLIVIA) | POLÍTICA | <http://www.eldeber.com.bo/2011/2011-04-27/vernotaahora.php?id=110427180136>

Países latinoamericanos debaten sobre tratado de comercio de armas

EL SISTEMA (BOLIVIA) | CONFIDENCIAL | http://elsistema.info/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4624:latinoamerica-debate-sobre-regulacion-de-la-venta-de-armas&catid=8:factor-confidencial&Itemid=3

Latinoamérica debate sobre regulación de la venta de armas

PRENSA LIBRE (Guatemala) | INTERNACIONALES | http://www.prensalibre.com.gt/internacionales/America-Latina-Tratado-Comercio-ONU_0_470353146.html

América Latina debate sobre Tratado de Comercio de Armas

EL TELEGRAFO DE PAYSANDU | INFORMACION NACIONAL | 28/04/2011 | Pag. 1 Volver
DEBATEN SOBRE EL TRÁFICO DE ARMAS

PORTAL X | INFORMACION | 28/04/2011 | Pag. 1 Volver

Debaten sobre tratado de comercio de armas de la ONU

PORTAL 180 | POLÍTICA | LINK: http://www.180.com.uy/articulo/18564_Latinoamerica-debate-sobre-el-Tratado-de-Armas-en-Montevideo

Latinoamérica debate sobre el Tratado de Armas en Montevideo