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SUMMARY REPORT
Introduction

The fourth regional seminar of the project “Support the Arms Trade Treaty Negotiations through Regional Discussions and Expertise Sharing” was organized for countries in Eastern Asia and the Pacific and held in Bali, Indonesia, on 6–8 June 2011. The seminar was part of the project that UNIDIR has been implementing for the European Union since July 2010. This project consists of a series of regional events organized in different parts of the world to support the negotiations on the future ATT, scheduled for summer 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. The project also aims at supporting all UN Member States to develop and enforce their national and regional arms transfer control systems.

The Bali seminar brought together over 40 representatives from Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Interior and Defence, and the armed forces from 14 of the 23 states invited from the region (see list of participants in annex B). Several international expert representatives from the United Nations and regional organizations as well as civil society participated in the meeting by making presentations and contributing to the discussions.

The event was divided into two parts. The first part concentrated on the ATT negotiations, with an overview of the process and the elements of the future Treaty, placing special emphasis on different issues related to the Treaty’s future implementation. Participants had the chance to share their national views on the ATT and its possible implementation system and hear the views of other states, regional organizations and independent experts. The second part of the seminar was more technical and practice-oriented, and discussed practical arms transfer control systems in the regions in question, challenges in their implementation, and possibilities to improve current systems through coordinated capacity-building and assistance measures.

In this report, UNIDIR presents a summary of the seminar proceedings as well as a collection of its main messages and recommendations. The report is not intended to be a consensus document. It therefore does not necessarily represent the views of all seminar representatives but rather UNIDIR’s understanding of the main outcomes.

Audio files and documents of the presentations made at the seminar are available at <www.unidir.org/bdd/fiche-activite.php?ref_activite=621>.

---

1 The states invited were Australia, Brunei, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, the Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. In addition, host state Indonesia extended the invitation to all remaining Association of Southeast Asian Nations member states.

2 The previous regional seminars of the project were held in Kathmandu, Nepal, on 10–12 November 2010 for countries in Southern and Central Asia; Casablanca, Morocco, on 2–4 February 2011 for countries in Central, Western and Northern Africa; and Montevideo, Uruguay, on 27–29 April 2011 for countries in the Americas and the Caribbean.
**Seminar proceedings**

The Bali event was a three-day activity divided into two parts. The first part was targeted at diplomatic personnel responsible for national policies vis-à-vis the ATT, including national delegates participating in the ATT Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings, while the second part was aimed at technical licensing, security customs and law-enforcement personnel. Unlike in some other seminars, most participants of the Bali event attended for all three days and hence were able to explore both the ATT process and related instruments and concrete national transfer control practices. The main focus of the first half was on the implementation aspects of the future ATT, to support states’ preparations for the July 2011 PrepCom meeting. In the discussions, participants were asked to present their views and come up with concrete ideas for the ATT process.

The seminar’s opening session was chaired by Dr. Christiane Agboton-Johnson of UNIDIR and it heard official opening remarks by Ambassador Dominicus Supratikto, Deputy Director General for Multilateral Affairs from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. In her statement, Dr. Agboton-Johnson welcomed all to Bali and thanked host state Indonesia for its outstanding support for the seminar. In his remarks, Mr. Supratiko echoed his state’s commitment to multilateral processes within the United Nations and underlined Indonesia’s interest in negotiating a truly multilateral and effective Arms Trade Treaty that would bring about a more equal, universal arms trade system. The session also included a statement from H.E. Mr. Julian Wilson, the Head of the EU Delegation to Indonesia, who underlined the importance of regional action in support of international processes, and mentioned specifically the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as a potential framework for further discussions.

The session also heard two presentations about the ATT process itself. Mr. Taijiro Kimura, the Director of the UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD) presented a general overview of developments in the ATT within the United Nations, and Mr. Fred Lubang of the Control Arms Campaign talked about civil society’s contribution to the process in the region.

The first working session of the seminar moved to discussing in more detail the different aspects of the ATT. Chaired by Mr. Ted Knez of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Australia, the participants first heard a presentation on the remaining questions on the Treaty’s possible scope, delivered by Mr. Thomas Wheeler of Saferworld. Both Mr. Wheeler’s presentation and the following discussion underlined the importance of including small arms and light weapons (SALW) as a specific category of weapons under the ATT, to combat their illicit trade and diversion and to ensure the Treaty’s relevance to states that are not engaged in the trade of larger conventional arms. After Mr. Wheeler, Ms. Nathalie Weizmann of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) presented some considerations regarding the proposed Treaty’s transfer criteria and different elements that, in the ICRC’s view, should be considered when negotiating this part of the Treaty in 2012. Many participants underlined the right of states to self-defence and self-determination, and noted that the Treaty’s transfer criteria should be clear, focused, feasible and objective. The last presentation of the session was an introduction to the main theme of the seminar: implementing the future Treaty. Some key considerations on this, especially from the point of view of Japan, were presented by Mr. Masaru Aniya of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
The second and third sessions were devoted to national and regional views on the implementation of the Treaty, with presentations from regional organizations and participating states. Chaired by Mr. Daniel Tumpal Simanjuntak of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, it heard a presentation from the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF), delivered by Ms. Lorraine Kershaw. Mr. Fabio Della Piazza of the European External Action Service (EEAS) presented some outstanding issues and the overall EU perspective on the future implementation mechanism of the ATT. Presentations were followed by a question-and-answer session and general discussion. ASEAN in particular was brought up as a potential platform for regional cooperation in security policy-related matters.

The last session of the day was chaired by Mr. George Hoa’au from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Solomon Islands. During the session, participants from China, Fiji and the Philippines shared national views about the future implementation of the Treaty and highlighted some priority areas and key concerns regarding the practical functioning of the proposed ATT.

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

The purpose of the working groups was not to arrive at any commonly agreed outcomes but rather to exchange views, concerns and experiences and to make suggestions. After these sessions, the results of the discussions were presented to the plenary, where the rapporteurs of the separate groups expressed some main conclusions, including recommendations for the ATT process. The first part of the seminar was brought to a close with statements by Dr. Agboton-Johnson and Ms. Elli Kytömäki of UNIDIR, Mr. Della Piazza, and Mr. Simanjuntak.

The second part of the seminar was more practice-oriented and examined some current and possible future arms transfer control systems at the national, regional and international levels. With brief introductory remarks from the chair, Mr. Kimura of the UNRCPD, the seminar proceeded directly to an overview of regional systems in Asia and the Pacific to regulate the conventional arms trade, with a presentation on the PIF Secretariat’s mechanisms to promote security and arms transfer controls in the Pacific. A second presentation was delivered, again from the European Union’s point-of-view, by Mr. Henrik Brethauer of the German Federal Office of Economics and Trade. The session concluded with general discussion and an exchange of views.

The final session of the day, chaired by Mr. Febrian A. Ruddyard of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, looked deeper into establishing effective national and regional arms transfer control systems, both from the state and industry points-of-view.
First, Ambassador Paul Beier of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden talked about general legal aspects of establishing and enforcing comprehensive controls. Then, Mr. Feng Wang of the State Administration of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defence of China introduced his state’s national arms transfer control practices. Finally, the session heard a presentation on “Industry’s experiences in arms transfer controls—working under effective national regulations”, delivered by Mr. Adik Avianto Soedarsono, the President Director of PINDAD Indonesia. In the evening, Indonesia hosted a dinner for all seminar participants, accompanied by a cultural programme.

The final day commenced with a session on improving accountability and transparency of conventional arms transfers. Chaired by Ambassador Beier of Sweden, the session heard presentations about the role and functioning of UN transparency mechanisms by Mr. Kimura, about the annual export reporting of the European Union by Mr. Brethauer, and about the experiences of the Republic of Korea in transfer controls of conventional arms, delivered by Mr. Hyungeun Ko of the Defence Acquisition Programme Administration of the Republic of Korea. Most of the final day was then devoted to examining three hypothetical case studies, prepared and presented by EU experts and UNIDIR. Divided into three groups, participants discussed different scenarios and issues to be taken into account when considering export, import or transit licensing in these different scenarios, which involved exports of SALW, ammunition and other defence materials. Specific aspects covered included proportionality of requests versus states’ legitimate security and defence needs, brokering controls, end-user assurances, problems related to re-export of weapons and technology transfers.

At the last session of the seminar, the results of the case study working groups were brought together by a general run-through of all the cases and a recapitulation of the most central points that were considered in each of them. The formal closing session was chaired by Dr. Agboton-Johnson, and heard summary remarks of the full seminar by Ms. Kytömäki as well as official closing remarks by Mr. Della Piazza, and Mr. Simanjuntak, who delivered the host state’s views on the seminar. All speakers in their closing remarks thanked participants for their active and open input to seminar discussions and underlined the usefulness of the activity, both in terms of raising awareness about the ATT process in the region and in supporting the process towards the Treaty negotiations in 2012, making sure it will be well-informed and inclusive.

Findings and recommendations

Calls for strong national mechanisms and a system of voluntary capacity-building and assistance

Negotiating an international legally binding Treaty, which 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. The primary role of states, whether exporters or importers or both, cannot be overlooked. In addition, in order to be effective, many participants stressed that an ATT should not be seen as an exporter’s Treaty, but that it should instead be relevant to both importer and exporter states, take the equal rights of states into account and be
universally applied. As many of the states in Asia and the Pacific are mostly importing conventional arms, the seminar heard active discussion about practical cases of complicated or problematic transfers, where a more universal platform for discussing arms trade contracts would have been needed, and where, from an importer’s point-of-view, the added value of an ATT could lie.

During the seminar, several presentations were made about existing national arms transfer control systems in different countries in the regions. Many speakers addressed the minimum necessary technical national structures that will have to be put in place and maintained to implement effective transfer controls. Specifically, the second half of the seminar addressed the issues which should be taken into account when exporting, importing, transferring or re-exporting weapons, and concluded that while the main structures, such as a general legislative framework and national control lists, are already in place in most states in Eastern Asia and the Pacific, much more needs to be done. The primary responsibility of states to develop and enforce control mechanisms was underlined, both at present and under the future ATT.

Small island states of the Pacific in particular referred to their limited capacities and their need to develop sophisticated transfer control systems, and it was concluded that the Arms Trade Treaty should not try to establish a “one-size-fits all” solution to transfer controls in any given situation. Rather, the Treaty should be more about what needs to be put in place as minimum controls: what are the necessary structures that should be put in place and what procedures should be followed, irrespective of whether a states is a large importer or exporter of weapons, or is affected by trade through transfers. It was noted that no matter what the details of the Treaty will be, equal rights and responsibilities of all states have to be accounted for. It seemed that the participants cautioned against an ATT which enters into the details of how these necessary structures should be formed. This was largely seen to be an internal issue subject to each state’s national legislation, regulations and needs, and something that should not be dealt with by an international ATT.

While some of the smaller states that participated in the seminar were quite positive and optimistic about their ability to introduce and enforce effective controls based on their particular needs, many also called for an ATT to establish a system of international or bilateral assistance. It seems that the provision of assistance should however remain voluntary. It should always maintain mutual respect of parties involved, aim at building the recipient states’ own capacities and be tailored to each specific case in question. Issues where capacity-building and assistance were noted to be needed in the future under the ATT included updating legislation (especially widening it to include transit controls) and creating model laws, improving stockpile management and modernizing border and customs control systems, which in some cases are currently merged and maintained more for fiscal reasons rather than specifically to control arms. Also, victim assistance was mentioned as a possible area in which the ATT could contribute to fighting the illicit arms trade and its negative consequences, even if this undoubtedly would be difficult. This was noted to be primarily the responsibility of exporting states. The issue of technology transfers was discussed in particular in relation to states’ capacity-building and some participants noted that mechanisms related to this could be used as incentives for developing states to join the ATT.
The role of an international body in facilitating the matching of needs to resources was raised and participants generally seemed positive about such a clearing-house, which could help to channel requests and offers of assistance.

Some also touched upon the issue of compliance, and pointed to the important difference between non-implementation and non-compliance. It was noted that non-implementation of a treaty can depend on several issues, including lack of capacity to fulfil all its requirements or objectives. It should therefore not be seen as the same as non-compliance, that being a deliberate violation. Some thought was also devoted to exploring how an assistance and capacity-building mechanism could be used as an incentive for states to join the Treaty.

Need for a system for dialogue and consultations

In addition to national systems, the seminar also addressed the possible international mechanisms that could or should support the implementation of the ATT. In terms of the institutional system, the possibility of having some kind of mechanism for dialogue or consultation between importer and exporter states was particularly discussed in some detail. Many participants saw the possibility of thus increasing transparency and dialogue through an ATT as one of its most prominent aspects.

During the discussions, views were exchanged as to what a consultation mechanism would mean, how it could function and what the benefits would be. It was noted that this could be a practical system that would allow all involved parties to make well-informed and solid decisions by linking all relevant actors under a common umbrella of the ATT by encouraging networking with colleagues both domestically and abroad. This way, unpleasant cases of transfer denials could also perhaps be avoided through forming more transparent and mutually supported communication structures. It seemed that most participants were in favour of having a more profound bilateral dialogue between trade partners early on in the licensing/purchasing process in order to ensure a smooth and efficient progress of negotiations. Some examples from the recent past were brought forward in which the first importing state in particular felt that it could have benefited from a more thorough and regular information exchange with the exporter, and wishes were expressed that, in being a norm-setting document, the ATT could improve the situation by formalizing these talks. It was observed that a pre-authorization/delivery dialogue would be more efficient and politically sustainable than establishing a formalized platform of post-transfer consultations. The possibility of establishing a forum in which to discuss transfer denials under the ATT was also addressed, with some supporting voices and other remarks of caution. The sovereign right of every state to decide to either grant or refuse licenses was not contested, and this was one of the primary reasons advanced against a formalized forum to contest denied transfer licenses.

Participants also went further in discussing a possible peer review system and a mechanism of dispute settlement, which could form part of the new international arms transfer control framework. Many argued strongly in favour of such mechanisms, as they could provide a platform where concerns or dissatisfaction beyond single transfers could be raised in a public forum. However, as in many of the issues, other participants expressed caution towards such a system, especially with regard to its practical applicability and functioning. Generally, bilateral consultations among importers and
exporters throughout the transfer process were encouraged, and it was noted that the ATT could facilitate such relations, for example through a requirement to establish national contact points.

It was also noted that while the Treaty’s main elements, such as transfer criteria, will have to be defined at an early stage in the negotiations, a follow-on system of consultations and dialogue could help develop its norms de facto by creating supporting guidelines and through establishing good and acceptable practice.

**Implementation Support Unit to help implementation**

Discussions during the seminar concentrated mostly on the implementation aspects of the future ATT. All participants that took part in the implementation discussion seemed to be calling for a practical, effective and implementable ATT. In addressing the possible elements that could be introduced at the international level to facilitate implementation, most participants were also in favour of having some kind of institutional follow-up system—a Secretariat or an Implementation Support Unit (ISU)—as part of the Treaty in addition to a system of dialogue. Many called for such a body, if established, to be strong, independent and efficient. Some discussion was devoted to what duties this body could undertake, what it would be composed of and where it would be based.

Views regarding an ISU’s functions varied from a quite limited supporting role of compiling national reports, assisting in organizing meetings of states parties, or channelling assistance offers and requests, to suggestions of an ISU which would have investigative powers and ensure a non-discriminatory application of the Treaty. While some participants called for the utilization of existing structures such as the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA) as a potential host for an ISU, others cautioned against the risk of overburdening UN Member States through their current fiscal commitments towards assessed contributions for the UN system and called rather for any ISU to be formed as an independent body, funded by the voluntary contributions of Treaty parties. Overall, a review system facilitated by an ISU was very much welcomed as an element of the future Treaty to ensure that it is not something written in stone but instead something that can be modified and developed as situations and technologies change.

**Increasing transparency in the conventional arms trade through an ATT**

In addition to the consultation aspects, one central theme in the discussion on implementation was transparency. This was touched upon most prominently with regard to the possibility of having regular national or regional reporting under the future ATT. Participants discussed both reporting on implementation of the Treaty (steps taken to ensure compatibility and effective functioning of the Treaty requirements at the national level) and statistical reporting about transfers of arms themselves that would fall under the scope of the Treaty. Most participants seemed to favour some kind of national reporting on both these aspects, even though detailed views as to the type of information exchanged and the frequency of information exchange varied. In general, it seems that reporting on implementation steps could be done on a less frequent/ad hoc basis whenever states have some developments to report, whereas statistical reporting on
exports, imports or transfers could be conducted on a regular basis, for example annually.

It was stressed by many that national reporting should be tailored to states’ needs and capacities and, as in many other instruments, reporting fatigue resulting from too frequent, detailed and technical reporting should be avoided, without, however, sacrificing the value that such an information exchange would give to the ATT.

Some noted that reporting under the UN Programme of Action on SALW, the UN Register of Conventional Arms and regional instruments could function as models or sources of inspiration for ATT reporting also. Challenges related to the comparability of data were highlighted, as common reporting categories were seen by many as the basis for a functioning transparency system, but the experience with other instruments has shown that this has many practical and political challenges, ranging from definitions of weapons in national control lists to the time of recording of the relevant data and reporting. Many participants called for some level of standardized reporting to allow for analysis and monitoring of trends in arms trade overall. When discussing what specific information could be exchanged, many also called for the need to balance between national security concerns and the need for transparency. The level of detail, for example, of national reports under the ATT was debated and it seemed that quite general categories of weapons and equipment and aggregated data rather than predetermined detailed categories seemed more acceptable to participants. Possibilities of different types of reporting for different items were also discussed.

While generally in favour of some kind of statistical reporting mechanism, many participants cautioned against exchanging information about the number or details of denied licences, both for political reasons and in order to avoid undercutting. Some did, however, mention that as information on licence denials is important for other exporters’ licensing decisions it could indeed be exchanged, but only among exporters rather than in a universal forum.

Some suggestions were made regarding an electronic system of information exchange, which could facilitate transparency under an ATT and also help states avoid reporting fatigue. Regional reporting or a mechanism whereby regional organizations could facilitate the gathering of data related to issues subject to national reporting were also explored, and some initiatives are currently underway in this regard, for example in the Pacific Islands Forum region. While national reports under an ATT will probably have to be formally submitted by states themselves, regional bodies could, upon states’ request, possibly undertake a larger role in facilitating this information exchange and in coordinating information submitted under different, relevant instruments.

**Outcome and impact**

The Bali seminar was successful in meeting its goals and in securing a good level of participation from the target countries, especially given the wide geographic area which the activity covered. Both parts of the seminar had over 40 participants from 14 countries in the region, together with international experts, all of whom actively participated in the discussions and many of whom also contributed by making presentations.
The high-level participation and strong support of the host state, together with the United Nations and the European Union, further contributed to the success of the seminar and helped attract media attention. Interventions by experts were positively received by participants: anonymous feedback forms were returned by almost all participants, in which an overwhelming number of participants considered the event to have been informative and to have increased their knowledge on various national arms transfer control systems and on the ATT initiative. Participants in the first part mentioned the opportunity to learn about each other’s regulative frameworks and views regarding priority areas in the implementation of the future Treaty as particularly positive. Based on the feedback received, participants in the second part (most representatives took part in both halves of the event) particularly appreciated the opportunity to examine practical arms transfer cases through the three case studies presented by EU experts.

**Media coverage**

The seminar attracted a good level of media attention in Indonesia, as well as in the region more broadly. Both the opening session and the outcome of the event were noted in print and electronic news media (for selected links to press coverage, see annex C). The host state’s active role in the seminar and the attendance of high-level officials were particularly recognized. The participants of the opening session from the host states, the European Union and UNIDIR were interviewed by newspapers and radio programmes.

**Next steps**

Following the regional seminar in Bali, UNIDIR will prepare a side event on the project, to be organized in the margins of the July PrepCom. The lunchtime event, which will be held on 13 July 2011, will present the results of the past two regional seminars to the project’s wider target audience, especially as they relate to the implementation aspects of the future Treaty.

The remaining activities of the project include seminars for countries in Eastern and Southern Africa, the Middle East and Wider Europe, which will be held after the PrepCom. The project will close with a final seminar that will bring together the findings of the whole series of regional events and that will be organized before the ATT Negotiating Conference.

In accordance with its role in bringing substantive knowledge to UN Member States, UNIDIR is also continuing with the commissioning of background papers, in close cooperation with the relevant EU services. These studies, together with the summary reports of the regional seminars and the presentations made during the project events, are made available on UNIDIR’s website once finalized and are also distributed at the project events.
Annex A. Agenda

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

Sunday, 5 June 2011
During the day: arrival of participants of Part I

DAY 1
Monday, 6 June 2011

08:30–09:00 Registration

09:00–10:30 Opening Session

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

Opening remarks:

H.E. Mr. Julian Wilson
Head of the EU Delegation in Indonesia

H.E. Mr. Dominicus Supratikto
Deputy Director General for Multilateral Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Indonesia

Presentations:

ATT—recent developments at the United Nations and in the region
Taijiro Kimura, Director, UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific

Civil Society’s Contribution to the ATT process in the region
Fred Lubang, Control Arms Campaign

10:30–10:45 Coffee break

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

Chair: Ted Knez, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Australia

Presentations:

Towards 2012: remaining questions regarding the Treaty’s possible scope
Thomas Wheeler, Saferworld

Considerations on the proposed Treaty’s transfer criteria
Nathalie Weizmann, ICRC

Implementing the future ATT: Indonesian view
Daniel Tumpal Simanjuntak, Deputy Director for Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia
Implementing the future ATT: some key considerations
Masaru Aniya, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan

Discussion

13:00–15:00 Lunch at conference venue

15:00–16:00 SESSION II: From negotiating to implementing an ATT: regional views
Chair: Daniel Tumpal Simanjuntak, Deputy Director for Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia

ATT’s relevance to the Pacific region
Lorraine Kershaw, PIF Secretariat

Implementation mechanism of the ATT: outstanding issues and the EU perspective
Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service

Discussion

16:00–16:15 Coffee break

16:15–17:30 SESSION II: Continued – national views on implementing an ATT
Chair: George Hoa’au, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Solomon Islands

Presentations:
National contributions from selected participants (China, Fiji and the Philippines)

Discussion

DAY 2
Tuesday, 7 June 2011

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

11:00–11:30 Coffee break

11:30–12:30 SESSION IV: Conclusions and next steps: Compiling working group recommendations
Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

Presentation of results from the working groups

Discussion
12:30–13:00  **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:

H.E. Mr. Julian Wilson
Head of the EU Delegation in Indonesia

Daniel Tumpal Simanjuntak, Deputy Director for Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia

13:00-15:00 Lunch at conference venue

**PART II**

*For technical and law-enforcement personnel*

**Monday, 6 June 2011**

During the day: arrival of participants

**Tuesday, 7 June 2011**

13:00-15:00  Lunch at conference venue

15:00–15:30  **Opening Session**

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

Opening remarks:

Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service

Daniel Tumpal Simanjuntak, Deputy Director for Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia

*Introduction to the ATT initiative and its recent developments in the region and briefing from Part I*
Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

15:30–16:45  **SESSION I: Overview of regional systems to regulate conventional arms trade**

Chair:  Taijiro Kimura, Director, UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific
Presentations:

- *PIF Secretariat’s mechanisms to promote security and arms transfer controls in the Pacific*
  Lorraine Kershaw, PIF Secretariat

- *EU Common Position on conventional arms exports: implementation aspects from an EU Member State’s perspective*
  Henrik Brethauer, German Federal Office of Economics and Export Control

Discussion

16:45–17:00  
Coffee break

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

Chair:  
Febrian A. Ruddyard, Director for International Security and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia

Presentations:

- *Legal aspects of establishing and enforcing comprehensive controls*
  Paul Beier, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden

- *China and arms transfer controls – introduction to national practices*
  Feng Wang, State Administration of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defence of China

- *Industry’s experiences in arms transfer controls – working under effective national regulations*
  Adik Avianto Soedarsono, President Director, PINDAD Indonesia

Discussion

18:00–20:30  
Dinner reception for all participants (Part I and Part II), hosted by Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia (Mr. Febrian A. Ruddyard, Director of International Security and Disarmament Affairs)

**DAY 3**

**Wednesday, 8 June 2011**

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

Chair:  
Paul Beier, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Presentations:

- *Role and functioning of UN transparency mechanisms*
  Taijiro Kimura, UNRCPD

- *Annual export reports of the European Union*
  Henrik Brethauer, German Federal Office of Economics and Export Control

- *Experiences of the Republic of Korea in transfer controls of conventional arms, including the use of electronic systems*
Hyungeun Ko, Defence Acquisition Program Administration, Republic of Korea
Discussion

10:30–10:45 Coffee break

10:45–11:15 **SESSION IV: Parallel working group sessions on practical case studies**
Chair: Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service
Presentation of practical case studies by EU experts

11:15–12:30 **SESSION IV: Parallel working group sessions on practical case studies**

12:30-14:30 Lunch at conference venue

14:30–15:45 **SESSION IV: Parallel working group sessions on practical case studies (continued)**

15:45–16:00 Coffee break

16:00–17:00 **SESSION V: Discussion of results of the working group sessions**
Chair: Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service
Presentation by rapporteurs
Discussion

17:00–17:30 **Closing Session**
Chair: Christiane Agboton-Johnson, UNIDIR

*Summary of the seminar outcomes and recommendations*
Elli Kytömäki, UNIDIR

Closing remarks:

Fabio Della Piazza, European External Action Service

*Host Country Views and Conclusions*
Febrian A. Ruddyard, Director for International Security and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia
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<td>Mr. Masaru Aniya</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Conventional Arms Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Mr. David Treacher</td>
<td>Second Secretary, New Zealand Embassy in Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Mr. Jeffrey Antol</td>
<td>Director, Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Norvert H. Yano</td>
<td>Director, Bureau of Public Safety, Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Mr. Ruben Giusu</td>
<td>Executive Officer to the Commissioner of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Ms. Pauleen Gorospe</td>
<td>Officer in charge, Arms Smuggling, Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>Mr. Jinhee Lee*</td>
<td>Conventional weapons desk officer, Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Hyungkeun Ko</td>
<td>Major (Air Force), Defence Acquisition Program Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Col Chee Leung Yew</td>
<td>Attache, Singapore Embassy in Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Mr. George Hoa'au</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary – UN/Treaties &amp; Americas Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Phan Ho The Nam</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vu Le Thai Hoang</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Group</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Forum</td>
<td>Ms. Lorraine Kershaw Legal Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD)</td>
<td>Mr. Taijiro Kimura Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European External Action Service</td>
<td>Amb. Julian Wilson Head of EU Delegation in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Fabio Della Piazza Chair of Council Working Group on Conventional Arms Export (COARM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European External Action Service</td>
<td>Amb. Paul Beijer Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European External Action Service</td>
<td>Mr. Ales Vytecka Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European External Action Service</td>
<td>Mr. Henrik Brethauer German Federal Office of Economics and Export Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolence International</td>
<td>Mr. Fred Lubang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Mr. Adik Avianto Soedarsono* President Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PINDAD Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Neny Mulyany Sales Manager for Military Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PINDAD Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)</td>
<td>Ms. Nathalie Weizmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Foundation for the Advancement of Women (PACFAW)</td>
<td>Ms. Ema G. Tagicakibau Advocacy/Campaign Coordinator, Peace &amp; Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saferworld</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDIR</td>
<td>Dr. Christiane Agboton-Johnson Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Elli Kytomaki</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Catherine Delice</td>
<td>Associate Project Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>