# A Guide to the Destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons
## The Approach of the
## South African National Defence Force

Sarah Meek and Noel Stott



In the area of small arms, South Africa has been an active participant in efforts to prevent the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and to better regulate the legal use of SALW. In developing its policies on the destruction of surplus weapons, South Africa has reviewed the emerging international practice in weapons collection and destruction, including reports prepared by the United Nations and its agencies. However these reports, while valuable in providing an overview of techniques and practices, did not offer the level of detail necessary to plan and implement a large-scale process of destroying surplus state-owned weapons.

Therefore, the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) developed its own procedures for planning, implementing and verifying the anticipated weapons destruction programmes. The information provided in this guide is based on the experience of destroying 260,000 surplus small arms and is designed for planners and practitioners of weapons collection programmes. The guide attempts to strike a balance between offering generic information that will be of use to a number of countries and providing specific illustrations of the approach adopted by the SANDF. It is hoped that by taking this approach it builds upon earlier work on weapons destruction techniques and adds to the available literature.

UNITED NATIONS

# A Guide to the Destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons

## The Approach of the South African National Defence Force

Sarah Meek and Noel Stott

**NOTE**

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

\*
\*   \*

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Secretariat.

# CONTENTS

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| DDR | Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration |
| DoD | Department of Defence |
| ISO | International Organization for Standardization |
| ISS | Institute for Security Studies |
| SALW | Small Arms and Light Weapons |
| SANDF | South African National Defence Force |
| SAPS | South African Police Service |
| SAS | Small Arms Survey |
| SEESAC | South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedure |
| UN | United Nations |
| UN DDA | United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNIDIR | United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research |
| UNMAS | United Nations Mine Action Service |

# INTRODUCTION

In the area of small arms, South Africa has been an active participant in efforts to prevent the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons (SALW) and to better regulate the legal use of SALW. Thus, when the United Nations report on small arms of 1997 recommended that states should exercise restraint in the transfer of surplus small arms manufactured solely for the possession and use of militaries and police forces, as well as consider the possibility of destroying such surplus weapons,[1] the South African National Conventional Arms Control Committee (NCACC) took the decision to dispose of all state-held redundant, obsolete, unserviceable and confiscated semi-automatic and automatic weapons of a calibre up to and including 12.7mm by destruction. This decision subsequently was ratified by the South African Cabinet and has since been official South African policy.[2] This policy has been implemented by the South African National Defence Force (SANDF), which destroyed 260,000 small arms as part of Operation Mouflon.[3] These destruction efforts were elaborately planned and carefully implemented to ensure that the safety and security of personnel was maintained and the weapons would be rendered unusable.

In developing its policies, South Africa reviewed the emerging international practice in weapons collection and destruction, including reports prepared by the United Nations and its agencies. However these reports, while valuable in providing an overview of techniques and practices, did not offer the level of detail necessary to plan and implement a large-scale process of destroying surplus state-owned weapons. Therefore, the SANDF developed its own procedures for planning, implementing and verifying the anticipated weapons destruction programmes. When the authors of the assessment of the weapons destruction efforts in South Africa were reviewing the material provided by the SANDF they recognized that these procedures could prove valuable to other countries contemplating such programmes.

The information provided in this guide is designed for planners and practitioners of weapons collection programmes. It is developed around the

procedures used by the SANDF. It differs from other handbooks produced (see following section) in that it takes as its approach the collection and destruction of state-owned surplus, obsolete and confiscated weapons, not the collection and destruction of weapons from disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes or post-conflict weapons collection efforts. The guide attempts to strike a balance between offering generic information that will be of use to a number of countries and providing specific illustrations of the approach adopted by the SANDF. It is hoped that by taking this approach it builds upon earlier work on weapons destruction techniques and adds to the available literature.

## BACKGROUND

In September 1999, the United Nations Security Council requested the Secretary-General to "develop a reference manual for use in the field on ecologically safe methods of weapons destruction in order better to enable Member States to ensure the disposal of weapons voluntarily surrendered by civilians or retrieved from former combatants".[4] The subsequent report, *Methods of Destruction of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives (S/2000/1092)* prepared with the assistance of governmental experts (including from South Africa) set out the framework for a resource manual on weapons collection and destruction. The report was designed to "provide guidance for the production of a reference manual for use in the field on environmentally sound methods of small arms and light weapons destruction, including related ammunition and explosives". It focuses primarily on field destruction, largely in post-conflict situations. It specifically does not deal with stockpile management and destruction, i.e. large-scale destruction or demilitarization by national governments.[5]

The Secretary-General's report outlines the advantages and disadvantages of various practical destruction methods for small arms, light weapons, ammunition and explosives currently available. The report provided principles that need to be followed in the planning and execution of a weapons destruction programme. The primary principle is that "safe destruction should be the overriding objective in operations designed to reduce or eliminate weapons, ammunition and explosives collected or rendered surplus for whatever reason. The overall objective is to ensure that weapons can never be used to fire again and that ammunition and explosives are rendered completely inoperable and present no hazard to personel engaged in the destruction process, the population at large and, to the extent possible, the environment."[6] The additional principles that should be followed in these programmes are:

- Equipment: availability, with an assessment of reliability and maintainability is a major factor in deciding on the method of destruction;

3

- Cost: this could include the acquisition of equipment and operational costs. It is essential that cost be considered in relation to the wide range of benefits that flow from a destruction programme. Wherever possible, existing infrastructure should be utilized to the maximum effect;
- Security: from the initial collection of weapons, ammunition and explosives through to their eventual destruction, the security of the items collected must be assured. Storage, transportation and the provision of a security force must be considered;
- Simplicity of operation: the destruction task may be challenged by a lack of ideal resources, trained personnel, the urgency for action and other factors. Methods of destruction must be realistic in the light of the prevailing circumstances on the ground. Simplicity is an important objective;
- Safety: Lack of resources, time pressure and other constraints must never imply that safety would not have the highest priority in any destruction operation.
- Environmental impact: steps must be taken to minimize the impact on the air, the ground and the water environment. Pollution control measures must always be considered in destruction planning. The collection of scrap and residue would assist in minimizing the impact on the environment;
- Accounting: from the initial assessment of the amount of weapons, ammunition and explosives involved in a particular operation through to the actual destruction and disposal, there must be an accurate and detailed account of the material involved, consistent with the operational circumstances;
- Transparency: accounting must be in a form that is understandable by the war-affected population from beginning to end. This is an essential confidence-building measure for civil society.

The report concludes that in planning such programmes, planners should take into consideration cost effectiveness and the availability of existing infrastructure. The principle recommendation of the report was that a reference manual should be prepared and that this manual be supplemented by military and civilians manuals dealing specifically with particular methods of destruction of weapons.[7] Although the Secretary-General's report noted that many supplementary manuals already exist in the form of military and commercial publications, little additional information has been added to the United Nations literature since the publication of the Department for Disarmament Affairs' (UN DDA)

*Destruction Handbook: small arms, light weapons, ammunition and explosives* in 2001.

The UN DDA handbook is aimed at "assisting planners and managers by providing them with a range of possible options".[8] The handbook was published as an expanded version of the Secretary-General's report, containing additional material on, for example, the destruction of ammunition and explosives associated with small and light weapons. The focus of the handbook is to provide the "first step in producing a definitive reference manual to be used primarily in post-conflict situations by planners charged with the recovery and destruction of weapons and ammunition. It is aimed primarily at post-conflict situations and not at systematic stockpile destruction of a nation's surplus or unserviceable small arms and light weapons."[9]



Photo 1: Commercial premises where destruction of weapons occurred. Photo credit: South African Department of Defence.

A third resource manual, published by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), entitled *Safe and Efficient Small Arms Collection and Destruction Programmes: A Proposal for Practical Techniques*

also outlines options for weapons destruction, this time in the context of 'micro-disarmament' programmes and preparation for disarmament, demoblization and reintegration programmes. The UNDP manual also lists principles that are integral to the successful implementation of a weapons destruction programme, including safety, control, transparency, sustainability, replicability and legitimacy.[10]

The UNDP manual also identifies the criteria that need to be assessed in deciding on destruction techniques and technologies. The final decision is often dependent on a number of factors:

- Type of weapons;
- Quantity;
- Available resources and technologies;
- Financial considerations;
- Infrastructure for movement of weapons;
- Security constraints;
- Media awareness needs;
- Final disposal of generated scrap.

The findings of these reports were taken into consideration and reviewed as South Africa started to develop the procedures for its approach. In planning its own small arms destruction programmes, the South African government adopted those elements that fitted with the South African context. The results, presented in this guide, therefore draw on the international standards that have been presented by the United Nations and its agencies. It also illustrates how these have been incorporated into a national approach and reflects the way in which international policy can be incorporated into national practice.

Therefore this guide draws from the procedures used by South Africa and in particular the South Africa National Defence Force (SANDF) in destroying its surplus, redundant and confiscated small arms and light weapons to ensure the safe and efficient destruction of its surplus, redundant and confiscated weapons.

This guide is not written as a set of "Standard Operating Procedures" (SOPS) for weapons collection and destruction. Standard operating procedures are "instructions that define the preferred or currently established method of conducting an operational task or activity".[11] These

procedures reflect local requirements and circumstances and involve national or local rules, instructions and codes of practice. However the guide is based on the South African National Defence Forces' procedures and therefore may provide some ideas or guidance for other countries. The other caveat of this publication is that it cannot replace the use of experienced planners and managers who should develop plans for, and provide oversight of, destruction programmes. Nor is this guide a substitute for local knowledge and expertise. As with other hazardous activities, only trained and qualified personnel should be employed in the supervision and execution of destruction programmes.[12]

The annexes of the guide consist of templates, used in South Africa, for procedures and documentation required for oversight and verification as well as a sample funding contract and sample contract with a commercial scrap metal company. Other appendices consist of a recommended list of material for further reading and a glossary of terms.

Photo 2: Crane removing weapons from container at destruction site. Photo credit: Institute for Security Studies.

IMPLEMENTING A DESTRUCTION PROGRAMME
FOR SURPLUS SMALL ARMS

In order to successfully implement a programme for the destruction of surplus small arms and light weapons, careful planning is required. In line with the proposals set out in United Nations publications on weapons destruction, South Africa planned its destruction programme following a series of steps. These were termed 'phases' and although they are presented in this guide sequentially, in practice one phase may overlap or coincide with another.

This phased approach was developed after the decision had been taken to destroy surplus, redundant and obsolete weapons. Alternatives to destruction that were considered by the government of South Africa included the resale of the weapons (either within South Africa or abroad) and transferring the weapons to other branches of the armed services. The discussions that took place in South Africa that led to the adoption of the national policy on the destruction of weapons are dealt with in detail in the UNIDIR/SAS publication *Destroying Surplus Weapons: An Assessment of Experience in South Africa and Lesotho.*

South Africa's planning followed the phases listed below:

Phase 1: Data gathering;
Phase 2: Investigation of available destruction techniques;
Phase 3: Access to resources;
Phase 4: Execution;
Phase 5: Post destruction verification and audit.


## PHASE 1: DATA GATHERING

### Defining Small Arms and Light Weapons

What is to be destroyed? The first step once the decision has been taken to destroy "small arms and light weapons" is to define what one means by this term. The United Nations Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms defined small arms and light weapons (SALW) as follows:

(a)  Small arms:
– revolvers and self-loading pistols;
– rifles and carbines;

11

- sub-machine-guns;
- assault rifles;
- light machine-guns.

(b) Light weapons

- Heavy machine-guns;
- Hand-held, under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers;
- Portable anti-aircraft guns;
- Portable anti-tank guns and recoilless rifles;
- Portable launchers of anti-tank missiles and rocket systems;
- Portable launchers of anti-aircraft missile systems;
- Mortars of calibres of less than 100 mm.[13]

In order to define the specific weapons for destruction, the SANDF used the following definition:

Small arms and light weapons are all State-held surplus, redundant, obsolete, unserviceable and confiscated semi-automatic and automatic weapons and purpose-built sniper rifles of a calibre up to and including 12.7mm.

## Effective Planning

Consultations and planning meetings that result in a comprehensive plan to destroy the weapons should be held with all relevant authorities, partners and stakeholders.

Stakeholders could include:

- Representatives of the defence force, security force or other government agency authorized to hold SALW, whose surplus is slated for destruction (at national level and at the locations where weapons are held);
- Representatives from the auditor or inspector-general's office;
- Representatives from the relevant intelligence agencies;
- Representatives from the police or other security forces ;
- Representatives of transportation agencies who will be moving the weapons for destruction;

- Representatives from logistics and operational control divisions of government agencies concerned;
- Representatives from the media.

The plan should provide for detailed verification and accounting procedures and security arrangements. However, while taking security and safeguarding of the weapons into consideration, the actual destruction process as well as those planning elements that would not compromise security, should be as transparent as possible to build public support for the government's proposed action and to keep awareness of the programme in the public view.

In the case of South Africa, periodic press statements were made which gave updates on the planning of Operation Mouflon and then allowed the media and invited guests to view the actual destruction. However detailed information on the location of the weapons, the site of destruction and the timing were not released until close to the time of the event.

The objective of the destruction programme should be identified and agreed upon by the stakeholders.

In South Africa, the objective for the destruction programme was to ensure that the weapons were put beyond use, destroyed in such a way that they could never be used again. In addition, the safety of all personnel in charge of the destruction programme, as well as the security of the weapons, was paramount.

In order to ensure effective planning, technical details for the weapons are required, including:

- The types of small arms and light weapons to be destroyed;
- The quantities of each type of small arm or light weapon to be destroyed;
- The current location of the weapons (e.g. will they need to be gathered to a central location for inventorying and preparation for destruction);
- The condition of the weapons (e.g. serviceable or unserviceable).

In addition, all relevant national and international arms control legislation, treaties, regulations and policies will need to be gathered and analysed to ensure compliance.

For example, in the joint operation to destroy weapons from Lesotho in South Africa (Operation Qeto), it was necessary for Lesotho to apply for an export permit to remove the weapons from its territory and for South Africa to apply for a permit to import the weapons into the country for destruction.

This is also the stage to plan the communication strategy so that information about the destruction programme can be conveyed in a professional and transparent manner. The communication plan should include:

• Media statements;
• Media conferences.

These can occur both before the actual destruction and at the time of destruction. Prior to the destruction event, it may be useful to use media statements to provide general information on the objectives of the destruction programme and to educate the public on why the weapons are being destroyed and what the expected benefit to the country from the destruction will be. Providing updates of the destruction effort (especially if it is to be conducted over a period of time) may also help generate support for the programme.

For the destruction itself, attention needs to be given to:

• Speeches;
• Invitation of dignitaries (e.g. diplomatic community);
• Guest lists (including representatives from the media and civil society);
• Formal appreciation to those involved in the destruction process.

## PHASE 2: DESTRUCTION OPTIONS

A process of investigating ways and means to destroy small arms will be required, especially if this is the first time such an operation is undertaken.

Once the scope of the operation is known (e.g. number of weapons for destruction, location and transport requirements), various options for destruction can be investigated. Each option should be costed to take into account the total cost of the destruction.

Different techniques have been identified to destroy weapons, for example in the various United Nations resources on weapons destruction. The selection of the most suitable technology depends primarily on:

- Available finances;
- Condition of the stock to be destroyed;
- In-country capacity; and
- National environmental policies, legislation and other relevant regulations.

In selecting a destruction option, it is assumed that the intention is to render the weapons completely unusable. Therefore only techniques that meet that criteria are listed below.

A final decision on the preferred destruction method may entail a pilot study to satisfy the requirements for audibility, accountability, transparency, safety, security and cost-effectiveness.

The primary destruction options used internationally are:

- Open-pit burning;
- Melting in foundries;
- Open-pit detonation;
- Cutting (oxyacetylene, oxygasoline, plasma or hyraulic shears);
- Bending/crushing;
- Shredding;
- Dumping at sea;
- Burial on land.[14]

In the case of South Africa, various techniques were investigated. Each option was assessed for transparency, cost, safety, security of weapons, total destruction of the weapon, cost-recovery, timing and environmental impact, among others.

The following processes, available within South Africa, were considered:

*KROB cutting – A device that cuts the weapons into lengths. Considered as too labour-intensive for the amount of weaponry due for destruction.*

*Baling—Considered effective for light metals but unsuitable for the destruction of weapons due, in part, to the fact that this process would not render the weapons completely unusable on its own.*

*Press machine—Weapons are stamped at strategic places to render them useless. The method was dismissed since, while the weapon as a whole is no longer usable, certain parts can be stripped for further use, which did not meet the objective of the total destruction of the weapon, including its parts.*

*Smelting—Smelting at the local Iscor steel plant could destroy 600 kilograms of weapons at a time. However the process required that all non-metallic parts be removed prior to smelting, thereby increasing labour cost. Also the destruction had to be scheduled into the company's production schedule, resulting in considerable delays.*

*Fragmentiser—Weapons are destroyed by cutting and pressing the metal into small parts. A single machine can handle 20 tons of metal per hour and automatically separates metal and non-metal parts. The scrap metal is sold to the contractor for a fixed price per kilogram.*

*Explosion—Explosives were deemed incompatible with the principles of verification, transparency and security. Also, once the weapons had been destroyed by an explosive charge, the scrap metal would still need to be collected and disposed of.[15]*

*Deep sea dumping—not considered an option for a variety of reasons, including security and environmental considerations.*

The South Africa National Defence Force made the choice to fragmentise the weapons, which met the criteria for destruction as stipulated in planning documents.

The option of fragmentising (shredding) was considered by the United Nations Report (S/2000/1092), which noted that:

Of all the methods mentioned, shredding is one of the fastest and most effective for destroying weapons. A large, mobile shredder can literally destroy thousands of weapons per day and there is absolutely no possibility that any parts could be re-used. Additionally, shredded scrap metal can be recycled to recapture some of the costs of this method.

The primary disadvantages to this method are the expense and availability of the requisite equipment. Even in countries that have established recycling facilities, there are only a few of these machines… This method would only be cost-effective… if the country had an already well-established shredding and recycling capability.[16]

In South Africa's situation, the disadvantages of shredding were minimised due to the availability of equipment and the large amount of weapons awaiting destruction. The machines that undertake this work are able to shred an automobile in 25 seconds and process 50 tons of scrap per hour. The SANDF received tenders from companies in South Africa able to undertake the work of destroying the surplus weapons. An advantage from the safety and security perspective to using this approach was that the resulting scrap was almost unidentifiable as any part of a weapon. The SANDF received R140 (USD 14) per 1,000 kilograms of scrap metal.



Photo 3: Separation of ferrous and non-ferrous metal during destruction. Photo credit: Institute for Security Studies.

## PHASE 3: ACCESS TO RESOURCES

Once an appropriate solution is decided on and costed, it is likely that resources to undertake the destruction will need to be accessed. These include human, financial and material.

Financial resources may be available through the relevant department's budget or from the national government or may have to be sourced from the donor community. A number of donor agencies and governments are willing to provide financial assistance for developing countries or post-conflict states to destroy weapons.

Costs should be carefully estimated and all equipment needed itemised, including, for example: protective clothing, protection (security) services, rations, travel, allowances for personnel involved in the destruction operation (where necessary), vehicle transport costs, rail transport costs and the repair and maintenance of equipment. A contingency cost should also be budgeted for unforeseen expenses.

It should be noted that the destruction of the weapons is in itself not necessarily a costly exercise and a small return may be gained via the destruction process from the scrap value of the resulting metal.

It is often other factors associated with the destruction that are the cost drivers.

The South African National Defence Force's experience in this regard was:

1. Transportation. Transportation by either rail or road is often the only transport options available due to the weight and size of the weapons. The cost per running kilometre should be calculated. This is possibly the single biggest cost driver.

2. Verification and Audit. For the purposes of transparency and to ensure that each weapon, spare part and accessory can be certified, a rigorous system of verification and audit was used. Verification includes the weapons being checked, accounted for and stored. This involves a large amount of skilled person-power and thus also entails costs for travel allowances, accommodation and meals.

3.  Security. Given the nature of the task, security during the loading, transport and destruction of the weapons was considered to be of utmost importance could not be compromised. In South Africa, this involved the deployment of security protection officers, convoy drills and information gathering.

If in-country commercial companies have the necessary equipment to destroy the weapons, a tender process should be initiated. However, rigid specifications and criteria need to be stipulated, especially regarding safety for workers, security at the site, timing of the destruction and, if applicable, payment for the scrap metal. Once completed, any necessary permits should be applied for and contracts concluded (e.g. with transportation or scrap metal companies or security firms).

Before entering into contractual negotiations with commercial concerns it may be necessary to ascertain beforehand whether the relevant government authority can be a party to contractual negotiations (in the case of the SANDF weapons destruction, the contract was signed between the scrap metal company and ARMSCOR, the national defence procurement and marketing agency).

## PHASE 4: EXECUTION OF THE DESTRUCTION

Once all the above are in place, the actual destruction of the weapons can be undertaken.

### Measures to Ensure the Security of the Weapons during Transit

During transit strict security measures should be instituted, including:

1.  There should be a certified and verified list of all weapons in transit;
2.  All weapons should be locked and sealed in secure containers;
3.  The weapons should be safeguarded and protected during transit.

Certain methods of transport may be more secure, and require fewer resources than others. For example, while transport by train was used by the SANDF to move large amounts of weapons, this required extra security personnel and special scheduling of trains to ensure complete physical

security of the weapons at all times. It may be preferable, where possible, to move weapons by road.

## Verification Plan

Once the weapons for destruction have been identified, it is important to develop a plan to verify the weapons and their location so that complete control is retained over them before they are destroyed. This verification plan should be based on a number of principles:

1. The process should make provision for the separation of responsibilities of members involved in the verification process (and should include external people, such as representatives from the auditor or inspector-general's office);
2. Weapons for destruction should be cross-verified during the inventory process. Thus two people are responsible for each stage of verification and each weapon is double-checked at each stage;
3. The process should be transparent with auditable documentation for future reference;
4. Who is, and remains, accountable for the weapons throughout the process should be clearly specified;
5. The relevant policing authority should be involved in the entire planning process, but specifically in the verification of weapons for destruction.

In the case of the SANDF, weapons were being removed from inventoried armouries in different parts of the country for destruction. The above principles were applied to ensure that:

- No corruption, including theft of firearms, could occur;
- Each weapon identified for destruction was, in fact, destroyed;
- Serial numbers of weapons for destruction could be checked and verified during random checks during the destruction process;
- Complete records of the process of verification and destruction were maintained so that these could be audited by the South African Auditor-General.

Below is the process followed by the SANDF for the verification of weapons during Operation Mouflon. The process relied upon by the SANDF at that time benefited from the large number of personnel available

for verification and control purposes. While it is recognized that the capacity of government departments in other countries may not extend to this volume of personnel, the principles of verification utilized by the SANDF would remain valid, even if fewer people were used. For example, a computerized verification system could negate the need for multiple people verifying each stage of the process.

## Verification Process Outline

1.   Firearms are identified by type and serial number;[17]
2.   The serial number is read out by an appointed member (First Weapon Reader);
3.   The serial number is verified by the First Database Controller on the database list kept by him/her and certified correct;
4.   The firearm is marked with a coloured (red) spray paint;
5.   The firearm is then passed on to another appointed member (Second Weapon Reader) who again verifies the type and serial number of the firearm;
6.   The serial number is read out to the Second Database Controller who verifies the serial number on the Database List kept by him/her and certifies it correct;
7.   The firearm is marked with another colour (yellow) of spray paint;
8.   A bundle number is allocated to each of 10 firearms;
9.   The firearms are then bundled in a bundle of ten and tagged;
10.  After each ten bundles the Database Controllers compare their lists and check the bundled firearms against control lists. Any discrepancies are pulled and addressed by a senior officer;
11.  The appointed stores officer signs for the bundles on the bundle schedule;
12.  The ten bundles are then transferred to a container and the container is sealed;
13.  The convoy commander signs for each consignment when the firearms are moved to the destruction site;
14.  On arrival of the containers at the destruction site, the appointed Disposal Officer certifies and signs the Disposal Certificate that all the firearms in the container were destroyed;
15.  The Disposal Certificates and Bundle Schedules are returned to the Accounting section to finalise the accounting and filing of the documentation.

Photo 4: Verified weapons in containers after transport to destruction site. Photo credit: Institute for Security Studies.

**Personnel Appointments and Responsibilities**

*1.   Chief Verification Officer*

The Chief Verification Officer should be responsible for the following tasks and supporting activities:

- Responsible for the management of the verification process and oversees the verification chain;
- To provide the list of weapons to be destroyed.

*2.   Senior Floor Manager/Chief Armourer*

The Senior Floor Manager/Chief Armourer would be responsible for:

- The execution of the verification plan;
- For reporting all deviations to the Chief Verification Officer;

- All deviations during verification are to be removed from the production line and stored in a separate container. Keys of the containers are to be kept by the Senior Floor Manager only;
- The bodily search of all members (access control);
- Spot-checks of the marking (with paint) of weapons during the various destruction phases;
- Compare weapons lists with physical weapons before being put into the container. Ensuring that all containers are fully loaded and sealed at the end of each day;
- Ensuring that the verification procedures are adhered to.

3.   *First Database Controller*

The First Database Controller's main responsibilities are to:

- Verify the serial number on the database list for correctness;
- Confirm the correct serial number on the database list by ticking it off on the database list;
- Allocate new serial number to the firearms without serial numbers;
- Add serial numbers to the database list for those firearms that are not listed.

4.   *Second Database Controller*

The Second Database Controller is mainly responsible for:

- Verifying the serial number on the database list for correctness;
- Confirming the correct serial number on the database list by ticking it off on the database list;
- Adding serial numbers to the database list of those firearms that are not listed;
- Allocating bundle numbers.

5.   *Chief Stores Officer*

The Chief Stores Officer is responsible for the availability of human resources and labour saving devices, as well as the following:

- Responsible and accountable for all firearms and weapon spares that are earmarked for destruction;

- The availability of the specific warehouse;
- Ensure that all weapons are available at the weapon warehouse;
- Ensure that all labour saving devices and human resources are available at the weapon warehouse for the two production lines;
- The safe keeping of breach blocks removed from weapons earmarked for destruction;
- Oversee the reliability of the verification process.

6.  *First Weapon Reader*

The First Weapon Reader is responsible for the following:

- Receive the weapon from the armourer;
- Ensure that the breach block is removed from the weapon;
- Read the serial number of the weapon loud and clear to the First Database Controller;
- Pass weapons on to the First Weapon Marker.

7.  *Second Weapon Reader*

The Second Weapon Reader is responsible for the following:

- Receive weapons from First Marker;
- Read the weapon serial number loud and clear to the Second Database Controller;
- Hand weapon to Second Weapon Marker.

8.  *First Weapon Marker*

The First Weapon Marker is responsible for the following:

- Receive the weapon from First Weapon Reader;
- Mark weapons on the frame with red paint after confirmation from the First Database Controller that weapon serial number has been confirmed on the database list;
- Pass weapon to the Second Weapon Reader.

9.  *Second Weapon Marker*

The Second Weapon Marker is responsible for the following:

- Receive the weapon from the Second Weapon Reader;
- Mark weapons on the frame with yellow paint after confirmation from the Second Database Controller that weapon serial number has been confirmed on the database list;
- Pass weapons on to weapon strapper.

### 10. Weapon Strapper

The Weapon Strapper is responsible for the following:

- Receive the weapon from second weapon marker;
- Ensure that every bundle consists of ten weapons and is strapped and tagged;
- Weapons must be handed to the loading team.

### 11. Loading Team

The Loading Team is responsible for the following:

- Receive the weapons from weapon strappers;
- Loading weapons in containers and sealing containers.

### 12. Disposal Officer

The Disposal Officer is responsible for the following:

- Handling documentation for each loaded container;
- Being physically present during the off-loading of the weapons and the destruction of the weapons at the destruction site;
- Certifying the disposal certificate;
- Ensuring that the relevant accounting documents are handed to the Chief Verification Officer.

## PHASE 5: POST-DESTRUCTION

### Auditing and Accounting

After the destruction programme is complete (or a single phase is complete, if the programme is scheduled to run over a longer period of

time), the costs of the operation should be consolidated and reconciled. Inventory records may need to be adjusted regarding the number and serial numbers of weapons destroyed, and those weapons destroyed need to be reflected as such on inventory records for future reference. These records then should be submitted to the relevant authorities (e.g. government agencies responsible for registry of state-owned firearm) and/or donors along with reports of the destruction programme.

In some cases, the auditor-general of the country may verify the use of funds, especially if government funds were used to pay for the destruction programme. This audit will include a review of the programme budget and expenditure, checking of weapons destroyed versus the lists of weapons scheduled for destruction, interviews with personnel involved in the programme and investigation of any irregularities. Irregularities could include, for example, a weapon with a serial number that was certified as destroyed but is found at a crime scene.

## Post-Project Review (PPR)

A review of the project should be conducted at the end, incorporating the stakeholders who have been engaged throughout the process. The project review should include the following:

- Assessment of personnel hours;
- Funds available and expended;
- Shortcomings in destruction process, e.g. from planning through verification to final disposal;
- Assessment of process followed and its strengths and weaknesses;
- Evaluation of destruction process from start to finish;
- Identification of lessons learned and process for incorporating these into future practice.

As the final stage in the destruction process, those involved should be encouraged to present the results of the destruction programme to various government stakeholders (e.g. the intelligence community); senior management and other interested parties (e.g. parliament or civil society).

## Notes

1   United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on General and Complete Disarmament: Small Arms, 27 August 1997, New York: United Nations, A/52/298 paragraph 79 (g).

2   Media Statement by the Acting Chief of the SA National Defence Force, Lieutenant General Gilbert Ramano, Destruction of Small Arms, 6 July 2000.

3   For an assessment of these programmes, see Sarah Meek and Noel Stott, *Destroying Surplus Weapons: An Assessment of Experience in South Africa and Lesotho*, UNIDIR and SAS, 2003.

4   United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, *Methods of Destruction of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives*, S/2000/1092, New York: United Nations, 15 November 2000.

5   United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General, *Methods of Destruction of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives, S/2000/1092,* New York: United Nations, 2000, p. 4.

6   Op. cit., p. 5.

7   Op. cit., p. 25.

8   United Nations Department of Disarmament Affairs, *A Destruction Handbook: Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives*, New York: United Nations, 2001, p. iii.

9   Op. cit., p. 1.

10  John Hughes-Wilson and Adrian Wilkinson, *Safe and Efficient Small Arms Collection and Destruction Programmes: A Proposal for Practical Techniques,* New York: United Nations Development Programme, 2001, p. 21.

11  UN DDA, *Handbook*, p. 70.

12  United Nations Secretary-General, *Methods of Destruction of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives,* S/2000/1092, New York: United Nations, 2000, p.24.

13  Report of the Secretary-General, Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms, A/52/298, August 1997, annex, para. 26.

14  S/2000/1092, pp. 7-15.

15  N.C. Sendall and M.P. Zondagh, South African Experiences in the Destruction of Small Arms and Light Weapons, unpublished paper, pp. 6-7.

16  S/2000/1092, pp. 14-15.

[17]   In South Africa, this process was complicated by the fact that some weapons had no existing serial number and had to be given serial numbers so that they could be entered into the database. In addition, duplicate serial numbers were sometimes found. These had to be tagged as "duplicate" "duplicate 2", etc. so that each firearm was unique in the database and its destruction could be verified.

# Further Reading

The following are recommended for additional perspectives:

David DeClerq, *Destroying Small Arms and Light Weapons: Survey of Methods and Practical Guide*, Report 13, Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion, 1999.

Department for Disarmament Affairs (n.d), *A Destruction Handbook: Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives,* New York: United Nations.

Owen Greene, *Stockpile Security and Reducing Surplus Weapons*, Biting the Bullet Brief 3, London: British American Security Information Council, International Alert and Saferworld, 2001.

John Hughes-Wilson & Adrian Wilkinson, *Safe and Efficient Small Arms Collection and Destruction Programmes: A Proposal for Practical Techniques,* New York: United Nations Development Programme, 2001.

Keith Krause, *Small Arms and Light Weapons—Proliferation Processes and Policy Options*, Canada DFAIT, 2000.

Edward Laurance and William Godnick, *Tackling Small Arms and Light Weapons: A Practical Guide for Collection and Destruction*, Bonn and Monterey, California: Bonn International Centre for Conversion and the Programme on Security and Development at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, 2000.

*Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Handbook of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons*, Vienna, 2003.

United Nations, *Report of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms,* UN Document A/52/298, New York: United Nations, 1997.

United Nations, *Report of the Secretary-General on Methods of Destruction of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Ammunition and Explosives,* UN Document S/2000/1092, New York: United Nations, 2000.

# Templates

## 1. List of Weapons for Destruction

(based on South African National Defence Force destruction)

| Type of Weapon | Quantity |
|---|---|
| **ASSORTED RIFLES & SHOTGUNS** | |
| 0.22 | |
| .303 rifles | |
| AK-47 | |
| Pump action shotguns | |
| 7.65 rifles | |
| G3 rifles | |
| **Sub-total** | |
| | |
| **MORTARS** | |
| 60mm mortars | |
| 81mm mortars | |
| **Sub-total** | |
| | |
| **REVOLVERS & PISTOLS** | |
| .38 Special revolvers | |
| 9mm pistols | |
| **Sub-total** | |
| | |
| **ASSORTED SPARES** | |
| Barrels | |
| Shotgun Triggers | |
| **Sub-total** | |
| | |
| **TOTAL ITEMS** | |

## 2. Estimated Expenditure List for Budget

| Serial No | Description | Period | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Danger allowance for __ members deployed for __ days doing escort and security tasks. | | |
| | Foreign subsistence and transport allowance (S&T) (including accommodation and daily allowances) for __ members assisting with verification and security tasks. | | |
| | Rations packs for __ members providing escort and security for __ days. | | |
| | Transportation costs: (calculated per vehicle, based on type of vehicle, i.e. armoured vehicle, passenger car, etc.) | | |
| | Rations packs for __ members doing escort and providing security for __ days. | | |
| | Transportation cost for escort and security elements. | | |
| | Logistic consumables (including seals, safety locks, paint, gloves etc). | | |
| | Rental of 2 x 6m containers and related transportation. | | |
| | Media communication and function. | | |
| **TOTAL AMOUNT** | | | |

### 3. Seal Register for Packaged/Containerized Weapons

Container Number: _____          Date: _____

Vehicle Number:_____

| Serial Number | Seal Number | Remarks |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |

We, the undersigned, certify that the above mentioned container was properly locked and sealed.

_____          _____

Signature/Designation          Signature/Designation

## 4. Requirements for Verification Material

The relevant officer must ensure that the following material is available before the commencement of the execution phase.

| Material | Estimated Cost |
|---|---|
| Aerosol spray paint x 50 (two colours) | |
| Gloves plastic—30 pairs | |
| Coveralls/dust coats assorted sizes x 130 | |
| Binding Wire—400 m | |
| Tags x 400 | |
| Cotton twine x 100 m | |
| Lever arch files x 10 | |
| Hand cleaner x 20 li/kg. | |
| Cleaning cloths x 10 rolls | |
| Scissors x 2 | |
| Padlocks x 6 | |
| Clipboards x 5 | |
| Railway Containers x 2 | |
| Tables x 6 | |
| Chairs x 12 | |
| Masking tape x 2 rolls | |
| Markers (black permanent) x 10 | |
| Container for firearm working parts x 5 | |
| Blankets x 6 | |
| School board chalk—5 packets | |
| Occurrence book x 1 | |
| Highlighters x 10 (Red and Yellow) | |
| Ball Point pens x 10 (black) | |
| **TOTAL** | |

## 5. Destruction Certificate

Container Number: _____    Date: _____

| Serial Number | Incident | Remarks |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |

We, the undersigned certify that the above-mentioned weapons were properly destroyed.


_____                    _____

Signature/Designation                  Signature/Designation

## 6. Security Key Register

Container Number: _____    Date: _____

| Serial Number | Security Bag Seal Number | Signature for key | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open | | | |
| Close | | | |
| Open | | | |
| Close | | | |
| Open | | | |
| Close | | | |
| Open | | | |
| Close | | | |

We, the undersigned certify that the above-mentioned keys were properly controlled.


_____                    _____
Signature/Designation                Signature/Designation

## 7. Sample Occurence Register

| Serial Number | Incident | Remarks |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

We, the undersigned certify that the above-mentioned incidents were properly noted.

_____                    _____
Signature/Designation                   Signature/Designation

## 8. Budget for Destruction Programme

---

### The Experience of South Africa

*The budgeted cost for Operation Mouflon was R1.9 million (US $190,000). Of this, the majority was spent on transportation costs to the destruction site and allowances for SANDF personnel travelling with the operation. The Department of Defence Chief of Finance approved a total budget of R1.98 million (US$ 198,000) in May 2000.*

---

| Budget item | Estimated costs for SANDF (in USD) |
|---|---:|
| Media and communication expenses | 2,500 |
| Rail freight | 52,000 |
| S&T | 95,000 |
| Communication equipment | 1,000 |
| Primary and rechargeable batteries | 1,000 |
| Rations | 7,000 |
| Petrol allowance | 22,000 |
| Cranes and trenching equipment | 4,000 |
| Computer service—development | 2,500 |
| Computer service—operation | 2,000 |
| Computer service—hardware maintenance | 1,000 |
| **Total** | **190,000** |

## 9. Sample Arrangement between donor and recipient

**SAMPLE ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN**

**THE
(DONOR COUNTRY X)**

**AND**

**(THE REQUESTING COUNTRY Y)**

**(REPRESENTED BY THE RELEVANT AUTHORITY Z)**

ON

**FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE WITH REGARD TO THE DESTRUCTION OF SURPLUS AND REDUNDANT SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS**

**ARTICLE 1: OBJECT**

The **(Donor Country X)** shall contribute, on a grant basis, an amount of **(Currency X)** to cover the costs to be incurred by the **(Relevant Authority Z)** in rendering assistance to the destruction of surplus and redundant small arms and light weapons.

**ARTICLE 2:  COMPLIANCE**

The **(Relevant Authority Z)** undertakes to comply with the conditions for the grant stated below.

**ARTICLE 3:  PURPOSE OF THE GRANT**

The grant must be spent exclusively to cover the costs incurred respectively by the **(Relevant Authority Z)** during the destruction of excess and redundant small arms and light weapons.

## ARTICLE 4: COMMITMENT OF FUNDS

Upon signature of this Arrangement, an amount of **(Currency X)** shall be identified and committed for this purpose by the **(Donor Country X)**.

## ARTICLE 5: SUBMISSION OF CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT

On completion of the destruction of the excess and redundant small arms and light weapons, the Finance Division of the **(Relevant Authority Z)** will submit, to the **(Donor Country X)**, a consolidated statement of all costs exclusively incurred by the **(Relevant Authority Z)** during the destruction.

## ARTICLE 6: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

On receipt of a consolidated statement of all costs exclusively incurred for the destruction, the **(Donor Country X)** will transfer **(Currency X)** corresponding to the total grant, to the bank account. **[Specify Bank Details]**.

## ARTICLE 7: AUDIT

The **(Relevant Authority Z)** will, as soon as possible after the termination of the financial year **(State financial year)** and not later than **(State month)** submit its respective account as audited by the Auditor General to the **(Donor Country X)**. The total grant transferred to the **(Relevant Authority Z)** must be clearly identifiable in the account submitted to the **(Donor Country X)**.

## ARTICLE 8: AUDITORS' RECORD

The audit of the accounts must appear as an endorsement of the audit on the accounts, accompanied by the comments in the auditor's record, if any.

## ARTICLE 9:  ACCOUNT OF ACTIVITIES

At the time of submitting the audited accounts, the **(Relevant Authority Z)** must provide the **(Donor Country X)** with a brief written account listing the activities carried out during the destruction of excess and redundant small arms and light weapons, as well as specifications of equipment and the number of people involved.

## ARTICLE 10: INDEPENDENT AUDIT

Representatives of the Auditor General will have the right to carry out any audit or inspection considered necessary with regards to the use of **(Donor Country X)** funds in question, on the basis of all relevant information.

## ARTICLE 11: PERIOD OF OPERATION

This Arrangement enters into force upon signature by both parties and the terms thereof will remain in force until the final audited accounts have been accepted by the **(Donor Country X)** relevant authority.

DONE at _____ on this _____ day of _____

in this year _____ .

_____          _____
FOR THE DONOR COUNTRY          FOR THE RECEIVING COUNTRY

**CONTRACT FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF SURPLUS AND REDUNDANT SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS AND THE PURCHASE OF THE FRAGMENTED PRODUCTS DERIVED THEREBY**

**Entered into and between**

**(Relevant Authority, e.g. the particular security agency)**
**(Hereafter referred to as X)**

**and**

**(The commercial fragmentation company)**
**(Hereafter referred to as the CONTRACTOR)**

1. **Scope of Contract**

1.1   Contract for the destruction of surplus and redundant small arms and light weapons and the purchase of the fragmented products derived thereby.

1.2   Weapons and weapon spare parts as per Annexure A.

1.3   Contractor's offered price per kg of weighed goods is **(Currency and Amount)** _____ (price to be indicated by CONTRACTOR).

2. **Definitions**

In these conditions the expressions defined below shall have the meaning assigned to them unless the context indicates otherwise.

2.1   "Destruction", means the destruction of weapons by mechanical fragmentation in accordance with the technical specifications (as stipulated in para 5.2.1.).

2.2   "Contractor", means **(Name of Company)**.

2.3 "Contract date", means the date on which the contract agreement comes into effect upon signing of the contract by the **X**.

2.4 "Contract validity" means the period of validity which **(Name of Company)** is required to keep the contract valid.

2.5 "Price validity", means the period of validity which **(Name of Company)** is required to keep the price valid.

2.7 "The Goods" means the weapons and spare parts in their original state before destruction.

2.8 "Fragmented Products" means the state of the weapons once they have been destroyed.

## 3. Applicable Laws and Interpretation

3.1 These conditions or any terms or conditions incorporated in this contract shall be subject to and interpreted in accordance with the law of the **(NAME OF COUNTRY).**

## 4. Contract Validity

This contract shall be valid until all weapons and weapon spare parts as per Annexure A, have been destroyed to the satisfaction of the X's appointed inspector.

## 5. Obligations of the Contractor

5.1 The destruction process of the Contract must be carried out within **(SPECIFY NUMBER OF DAYS)**.

5.2 The goods are to be destroyed as follows:

5.2.1 All the goods are to be fragmented and changed from their original form. Any pieces thereof may not exit 100 mm in size.

5.3 The **CONTRACTOR** must dedicate the day(s) mutually agreed upon by both parties, for the destruction of the **X**'s goods. The area demarcated for the destruction of the **X**'s goods will be cleared of all other debris timeously. The **CONTRACTOR** will be allowed to

occupy and use the fragmentation machinery and immediate surroundings, once the delivered goods are destroyed from their original form.

5.4     The delivery of the **X** goods at the premises of the **CONTRACTOR** is to be mutually agreed upon, but within the parameters of paragraph 4 of this Contract.

5.5     The **CONTRACTOR** shall supply, maintain, insure, licence and operate at its own risk and in its own name all transport and equipment or obtained transport and equipment considered necessary to carry out its obligations under this Contract.

5.6     The **CONTRACTOR** must accept the presence of an appointed inspector and security team from the **X** on the premises during the destruction process. The inspector and the Chief Security Officer will have unrestricted access to the premises and supervision of the destruction process, and will have the right to call an immediate halt to the process should the fragmented product not comply to the requirements set out in this Contract.

5.7     The **CONTRACTOR** shall be liable to pay any additional costs that may be incurred by **X** in respect of the CONTRACTOR's failure to carry out his obligation in terms of this Contract.

5.8     The **CONTRACTOR** shall submit a valid weigh bridge calibration certificate to the **X** with this contract. and undertake to ensure that it remains valid for the duration of this Contract.

## 6.     Obligations of the X

6.1     To deliver the goods to the premises of CONTRACTOR, where the destruction is to take place.

6.2     The **X** remains accountable for the goods until such time that they have been completely reduced from their original form by means of the destruction process, to the satisfaction of the **X**'s appointed inspector, who shall have unrestricted access to, and supervision of the whole process.

### 7. Indemnity

The **CONTRACTOR** shall be solely responsible for and indemnify **X** and hold them harmless against any losses, expenses, costs, damages, demand or claims arising from or in connection with illness or injury to or the death of any person or employee (including his own employees, employees of sub-contractors or employees, agents and the representatives of **X**) and/or damage to the property of any or all such persons, suffered or allegedly suffered in connection with or by reason of the execution of the Contract, unless such loss, expense, cost, damage, demand or claim was caused by negligence on the part of **X**, its employees, agents or representatives.

### 8. Non Disclosure/Confidentiality

8.1    Neither the existence nor the contents nor any information pertaining to this Contract shall be disclosed by the **CONTRACTOR** to any third party not involved, unless the prior written consent to such disclosure has been obtained from **X**.

8.2    All media related inquiries will be referred to the appointed Media Liaison Officers of the **X**.

### 9. Cession

The **CONTRACTOR** shall not cede, delegate or transfer any of its rights or obligations.

### 10. Non-Waiver

The failure of either party at any time to enforce a provision or right in terms of this Contract, shall not be construed to be a waiver of such a provision or right.

### 11. Payment Conditions

11.1    The weigh bridge printout/s of the goods delivered shall be certified as correct and signed by the **X**'s inspector and the CONTRACTOR.

11.2 The **X**'s invoice shall be generated upon receipt of the certified weigh bridge printout.

11.3 Payment shall take place within seven (7) days after receipt of **X**'s invoice, which will occur after the destruction of the goods. **X** will be paid by means of a bank transfer which shall be in **(SPECIFY CURRENCY).**

11.4 All bank costs or any other charges regarding the payment as indicated in paragraph 11.1 will be for the account of the CONTRACTOR.

11.5 The offered price is fixed for the duration of this contract.

## 12. Amendments

No agreement to alter, amend or vary the conditions of this Contract shall be valid or of any force and effect unless such agreement is reduced to writing and signed by the duly authorised representatives of both parties.

## 13. Language

All the data to be furnished, as well as correspondence or other communications between the parties in connection with this Contract or the execution thereof, shall be in (**SPECIFY LANGUAGE)** only.

## 14. General

14.1 All military containers remain the property of the **X**.

14.2 Any annexure's to this Contract shall form an integral part of this Contract.

## 15. Domicilium

I/We choose the following Domicilium citandi et executandi:

Full street address: .......................................................................
......................................................................................................

## 16. Signatures

Signed on this ....................... day of ............................... YEAR

For the **CONTRACTOR** and duly authorised thereto.

Name: .................................... Title .........................................

Witness Signature .....................Witness Signature ......................

Witness Name ......................... Witness Name ...........................

Signed on this.................... day of .......................... YEAR

For the **X** and duly authorised thereto.

Name: ......................... Title ..............................................

Witness Signature ................. Witness Signature .....................

Witness Name ....................... Witness Name ...........................

# Glossary of Terms

There is an effort at the international and regional levels to standardize the terminology used in weapons collection and destruction efforts (sometimes termed micro-disarmament or practical disarmament). The small arms community has benefited from the work of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), both of whom have developed internationally recognized standard terminology that is relevant to mine action (and, by extension to small arms and light weapons destruction efforts). Most recently, the South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC), a joint initiative of the UNDP and the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe, has elaborated a set of Regional Micro-disarmament and SALW Control Measures. These build on the efforts of the ISO and UNMAS but are suited to the small arms operating environment.

The glossary presented below draws on the work of these three bodies and due gratitude and recognition is given to their work.

## Terms and Definitions[1]

**accident**
An undesired event which results in harm

**ammunition**
See **munition**

**arms control**
The imposition of restrictions of the production, exchange and spread of weapons by an authority vested with legitimate powers to enforce the restriction.

**arms exports**
The trade in weapons, guns and ammunition, usually internationally and often closely monitored and controlled by governments.

**benchmark**
Reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed.

**burning ground**
> An area authorized for the destruction of **ammunition, mines** and **explosives** by burning.

**capacity**
> The strength and ability, which could be in terms of knowledge, skill, personnel and resources, to achieve desired outcomes.

**commercial off-the-shelf**
> In the context of mine action equipment procurement, the term refers to an equipment that is available direct from the manufacturer and requires no further development prior to introduction into service apart from minor modifications.[2]

**cooperation**
> The process of combining separate actors (states/members/armies) to work as a cohesive unit in attaining pre-defined goals.

**cost-effectiveness**
> An assessment of the balance between a system's performance and its whole life costs.[3]

**DDR** (Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration)
> A three-pronged programme of reducing or abolishing weapons of government or opposition forces, shedding their excess personnel and integrating their former fighters back to civil life, after a period of conflict.

**demilitarization**
> The complete range of processes that render weapons, ammunition, mines and explosives unfit for their originally intended purpose.

**destroy (destruction)** *in situ*
> The destruction of any item of ordnance by **explosives** without moving the item from where it was found, normally by placing an **explosive** charge alongside.

**destruction**
> The process of final conversion of weapons, ammunition, mines and explosives into an inert state that can no longer function as designed.

**disarmament**

The collection, control and disposal of small arms, ammunition, explosives. Light and heavy weapons of combatants and often also of the civilian population. It includes the development of responsible arms management programmes.[4]

**donor funding**

Financial assistance provided by multilateral, bilateral or individual actors involved in aiding missions and security-related projects, especially in developing countries.

**disposal (logistic)**

The removal of ammunition and explosives from a stockpile by the utilization of a variety of methods (that may not necessarily involve destruction).

Note: There are five traditional methods of disposal used by armed forces around the world, some of which are obviously not suitable for micro-disarmament programmes. These are: 1) sale; 2) gift; 3) increased use at training; 4) deep sea dumping; and 5) destruction or demilitarization.

**disposal site**

An area authorized for the destruction of **ammunition** and **explosives** by **detonation** and burning.

**evaluation**

A process that attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the merit or value of an intervention.

**harm**

Physical injury or damage to the health of people, or damage to property or the environment.

**harmful event**

Occurrence in which a **hazardous situation** results in harm.

**intended use**

The use of a product, process or service in accordance with information provided by the supplier.

**International Organization for Standardization (ISO)**

Note: A worldwide federation of national bodies from over 130 countries. Its work results in international agreements which are published as ISO **standards** and **guides**. ISO is an NGO and the standards it develops are voluntary, although some (mainly those concerned with health, **safety** and environmental aspects) have been adopted by many countries as part of their regulatory framework. ISO deals with the full spectrum of human activities and many of the tasks and processes which contribute to mine action have a relevant standard. A list of ISO standards and guides is given in the ISO catalogue (www.iso.ch).

Note: The revised mine action standards have been developed to be compatible with ISO standards and guides.

**munition**

A complete device charged with explosives, propellants, pyrotechnics, initiating composition, or nuclear, biological or chemical material for use in military operations, including demolitions.[5]

**policy**

Defines the purpose and goals of an organization, and it articulates the rules, standards and principles of action which govern the way in which the organization aims to achieve these goals.

**protective measures**

Means used to reduce **risk**.

**public information**

Information which is released or published for the primary purpose of keeping the public fully informed, thereby gaining their understanding and support.

**risk**

Combination of the probability of occurrence of **harm** and the severity of that **harm**.

**risk analysis**

Systematic use of available information to identify **hazards** and to estimate the **risk**.

**risk assessment**

Overall process comprising a **risk analysis** and a **risk evaluation**.

**risk evaluation**

Process based on **risk analysis** to determine whether the **tolerable risk** has been achieved.

**safe**

Absence of **risk.** Normally the term **tolerable risk** is more appropriate and accurate.

**safety**

The reduction of **risk** to a tolerable level.
Degree of freedom from unacceptable **risk**.

**stakeholder**

Everyone with an interest (or stake) in what the entity does.

**standard**

A standard is a documented agreement containing technical specifications or other precise criteria to be used consistently as rules, guidelines or definitions of characteristics to ensure that materials, products. Processes and services are fit for their purpose.

**standard operating procedures**

Instructions which define the preferred or currently established method of conducting an operational task or activity.
Note: Their purpose is to promote recognizable and measurable degrees of discipline, uniformity, consistency and commonality within an organization, with the aim of improving operational effectiveness and safety. SOPs should reflect *local* requirements and circumstances.

**stockpile**

In the context of mine action, the term refers to a large accumulated stock of explosive ordnance (EO).[6]
In the context of SALW, the term refers to a large accumulated stock of weapons and EO.[7]

**stockpile management**

> Those procedures and activities regarding SALW safety and security in accounting, storage, transportation and handling.

**stockpile destruction**

> The physical destructive procedure towards a continual reduction of the national **stockpile.**

**tolerable risk**

> **Risk** which is accepted in a given context based on the current values of society.

**transparency**

> Free and open access to information which enables civil society to perform its regulatory function.

**unexploded ordnance (UXO)**

> Explosive ordnance which has been primed, fuzed, armed or otherwise prepared for action, and which has been dropped, fired, launched, projected or placed in such a manner as to constitute a hazard to operations, installations, personnel or material and remains unexploded either by malfunction or design or for any other cause.[10]

**verification**

> Confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence that specified requirements have been fulfilled.

## Notes

[1]  All terms and definitions are adopted from the SEESAC Glossary of SALW terms and abbreviations (RMDS 02.10) unless otherwise noted.

[2]  United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, A Destruction Handbook, Annex A.

[3]  Ibid.

[4]  Ibid.

[5]  Ibid.

[6]  UN DDA.

[7]  SEESAC RMDS 02.10.

[8]  NATO definition.

## RECENT UNIDIR PUBLICATIONS[1]

<div style="border:1px solid; text-align:center;">Research Reports / Rapports de recherche</div>

*Costs of Disarmament—Mortgaging the Future: The South Asian Arms Dynamic*, by Susan Willett, 2004, 124p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.04.0.1.

*After Non-Detection, What?—What Iraq's Unfound WMD Mean for the Future of Non-Proliferation*, by Michael Friend, 2003, 32p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2003/38.

*Outer Space and Global Security*, 2003, 104p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.26.

*Costs of Disarmament—Disarming the Costs: Nuclear Arms Control and Nuclear Rearmament*, by Susan Willett, 2003, 174p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.25.

*Desarme nuclear: Regímenes internacional, latinoaméricano y argentino de no proliferación*, por Marcelo F. Valle Fonrouge, 2003, 146p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.S.03.0.24.

*Coming to Terms with Security: A Lexicon for Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence-Building*, by Steve Tulliu and Thomas Schmalberger, 2003, 252p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E/A.03.0.21.
    * Also available in Arabic, 278p., Sales No. GV.E/A.03.0.21.
    * Also available in Spanish, 548p., Sales No. GV.E/S.03.0.29.
    * Also available in Korean, 626p., UNIDIR/2003/30.

*Destroying Surplus Weapons: An Assessment of Experience in South Africa and Lesotho*, by Sarah Meek and Noel Stott, 2003, 102p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.18.

*Lutte contre la prolifération des armes légPres en Afrique de l'Ouest: Manuel de formation des forces armées et de sécurité*, sous la direction de Anatole Ayissi et Ibrahima Sall, 2003, 150p., publication des Nations Unies, numéro de vente: GV.F.03.0.17.

---

[1] For a complete list, please see our Web site at http://www.unidir.org, or contact Anita Blétry: Tel.: +41(0)22 917 42 63, Fax: +41 (0)22 917 01 76, abletry@unog.ch.

*Coming to Terms with Security: A Handbook on Verification and Compliance*, 2003, 158p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E/A.03.0.12.

    * Also available in Arabic, 172p., Sales No. GV.E/A.03.0.12.

*Internal Conflict and Regional Security in South Asia: Approaches, Perspectives and Policies*, by Shiva Hari Dahal, Haris Gazdar, S.I. Keethaponcalan and Padmaja Murthy, 2003, 62p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.10.

*The Scope and Implications of a Tracing Mechanism for Small Arms and Light Weapons*, 2003, 238p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.7.

    * Existe également en français: *Portée et implications d'un mécanisme de traçage des armes légères et de petit calibre*, 2003, 264p., publication des Nations Unies, numéro de vente: GV.F.03.0.07.

*Participatory Monitoring of Humanitarian Mine Action: Giving Voice to Citizens of Nicaragua, Mozambique and Cambodia*, by Susan Willett (ed.), 2003, 122p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.6.

*The Treaty of Pelindaba on the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone*, by Oluyemi Adeniji, 2002, 332p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.03.0.5.

*Project Coast: Apartheid's Chemical and Biological Warfare Programme*, by Chandré Gould and Peter Folb, 2002, 300p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.02.0.10.

*Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Time for Control*, by Taina Susiluoto, 2002, 162p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.02.0.7.

*Le Conseil de sécurité à l'aube du XXIème siècle : quelle volonté et quelle capacité a-t-il de maintenir la paix et la sécurité internationales ?*, par Pascal Teixeira, 2002, 106p., publication des Nations Unies, numéro de vente: GV.F.02.0.6.

    * Also available in English: The Security Council at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: To What Extent Is It Willing and Able to Maintain International Peace and Security?, by Pascal Teixeira, 2003, 135p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.02.0.6.

*Costs of Disarmament—Rethinking the Price Tag: A Methodological Inquiry into the Cost and Benefits of Arms Control*, by Susan Willett, 2002, 70p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.02.0.3.

*Missile Defence, Deterrence and Arms Control: Contradictory Aims or Compatible Goals?*, in cooperation with Wilton Park, 2002, 39p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2002/4.

*Disarmament as Humanitarian Action—A discussion on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)*, in cooperation with the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA), 2001, 24p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2001/23.
* Existe également en français: *Le désarmement comme action humanitaire*, en coopération avec le Département des affaires de désarmement de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, 2003, 30p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2003/7.

*Cooperating for Peace in West Africa: An Agenda for the 21st Century*, by Anatole Ayissi (ed.), 2001, 159p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E/F.01.0.19 / *Coopération pour la paix en Afrique de l'Ouest : Agenda pour le XXIème siècle*, sous la direction d'Anatole Ayissi, 2001, 169p., publication des Nations Unies, numéro de vente : GV.E/F.01.0.19.

*Illicit Trafficking in Firearms: Prevention and Combat in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil—A National, Regional and Global Issue*, by Péricles Gasparini Alves, 2000, 66p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.01.0.2.

*Tactical Nuclear Weapons: A Perspective from Ukraine*, by A. Shevtsov, A. Yizhak, A. Gavrish and A. Chumakov, 2001, 95p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.01.0.1.

*Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Options for Control*, by William C. Potter, Nikolai Sokov, Harald Müller and Annette Schaper, 2000, 87p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.00.0.21.

*Bound to Cooperate: Conflict, Peace and People in Sierra Leone*, by Anatole Ayissi and Robin-Edward Poulton (eds), 2000, 213p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.00.0.20.

*Coming to Terms with Security: A Lexicon for Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence-Building*, by Steve Tulliu and Thomas Schmalberger, 2000, 246p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.00.0.12.

*The Small Arms Problem in Central Asia: Features and Implications*, by Bobi Pirseyedi, 2000, 120p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.00.0.6.

*Peacekeeping in Africa: Capabilities and Culpabilities*, by Eric G. Berman and Katie E. Sams, 2000, 540p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.00.0.4.

*West Africa Small Arms Moratorium: High-Level Consultations on the Modalities for the Implementation of PCASED*, by Jacqueline Seck, 2000, 81p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2000/2 / *Moratoire*

*ouest-africain sur les armes légères : Consultations de haut niveau sur les modalités de la mise en œuvre du PCASED*, par Jacqueline Seck, 2000, 83p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/2000/2.

*The Potential Uses of Commercial Satellite Imagery in the Middle East*, 1999, 58p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/99/13.

*Small Arms Control: Old Weapons, New Issues*, by Lora Lumpe (ed.), 1999, 302p., ISBN 0 7546 2076 X, published for UNIDIR by Ashgate Publishing Limited (Aldershot).

*Fissile Material Stocks: Characteristics, Measures and Policy Options*, by William Walker and Frans Berkhout, 1999, 66p., United Nations publication, Sales No. GV.E.99.0.15.

*Collaboration internationale et construction de la paix en Afrique de l'Ouest : l'exemple du Mali*, 1999, 64p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/99/4.

*The Implications of South Asia's Nuclear Tests for the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Regimes*, 1999, 28p., United Nations publication, UNIDIR/99/2.

.

---

**Disarmament Forum** / *Forum du désarmement*
(quarterly / trimestriel)

---

four • 2003     Women, Men, Peace and Security
quatre • 2003   Les femmes, les hommes, la paix et la sécurité

three • 2003    Disarmament, Development and Mine Action
trois • 2003    Désarmement, développement et action antimines

two • 2003      Nuclear Terrorism
deux • 2003     Le terrorisme nucléaire

one • 2003      Making Space for Security?
un • 2003       Un espace de sécurité ?

four • 2002     The CWC Review Conference
quatre • 2002   La Conférence d'examen de la convention sur les armes chimiques

three • 2002    Children and Security
trois • 2002    Les enfants et la sécurité