


UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH
UNIDIR

International Assistance

**for implementing the Programme of Action
to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in
Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects**

Findings of a Global Survey

Kerry Maze and Sarah Parker



UNITED NATIONS

**International Assistance
for Implementing the Programme of Action
to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in
Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects**

Findings of a Global Survey

Kerry Maze and Sarah Parker

UNIDIR
United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
Geneva, Switzerland



UNITED NATIONS
New York and Geneva, 2006

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 publication are the sole responsibility of the individual authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the United Nations, UNIDIR, its staff members or sponsors.

UNIDIR/2006/22

Copyright © United Nations, 2006
All rights reserved

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION

The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)—an intergovernmental organization within the United Nations—conducts research on disarmament and security. UNIDIR is based in Geneva, Switzerland, the centre for bilateral and multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation negotiations, and home of the Conference on Disarmament. The Institute explores current issues pertaining to the variety of existing and future armaments, as well as global diplomacy and local tensions and conflicts. Working with researchers, diplomats, government officials, NGOs and other institutions since 1980, UNIDIR acts as a bridge between the research community and policy makers. UNIDIR's activities are funded by contributions from governments and donor foundations. The Institute's web site can be found at:

www.unidir.org

CONTENTS

Foreword ix

Acknowledgements xi

About the authors xiii

SECTION I 1

 Introduction 1

 International assistance and cooperation in the PoA 2

 International assistance project: methodology 3

 Definition 3

 Questionnaire 4

 Calculating the amount of assistance 5

 Processing data by thematic issue 5

 Processing data by destination 6

 Processing data according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence ... 6

SECTION II 7

 Overview of assistance currently allocated to implement the PoA 7

 Key findings 7

 Summary of assistance at the global level 7

 Funding relationships 11

 Assistance via civil society 12

 Assistance via international organizations 12

 Assistance via regional organizations 14

 Uncovering the challenges of assistance: requests for assistance and perceived sufficiency 15

 Key findings 15

 Communicating and responding to requests for assistance 16

 Facilitating donor and recipient communication 19

 Perceived sufficiency of assistance received 20

 Assistance desired 22

 Key findings 22

SECTION III 29

 Conclusion and recommendations 29

Annex A. Geographic profiles 35

 Africa 35

 Profile of responses 35

 Key findings 36

 Assistance desired 38

 Americas 41

 Profile of responses 41

 Key findings 41

 Assistance desired 43

Asia	45
Profile of responses	45
Key findings	45
Assistance desired	47
Europe	49
Profile of responses	49
Key findings	50
Assistance desired	52
Middle East	53
Profile of responses	53
Key findings	53
Assistance desired	54
Pacific	55
Profile of responses	55
Key findings	55
Assistance desired	56
Least Developed Countries	59
Profile of responses	59
Key findings	59
Assistance desired	61
Annex B. Questionnaire recipients	63
Acronyms	69
List of charts	
Chart 1. Activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	8
Chart 2. Activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)	9
Chart 3. Channels used to allocate assistance (number of activities)	12
Chart 4. Channels used to allocate assistance (monetary value in US\$ million)	12
Chart 5. Breakdown of requests made by affected states	16
Chart 6. Outcome of requests	16
Chart 7. Requests for assistance made according to region, 2001–2005	18
Chart 8. Requests for assistance made according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence	19
Chart 9. Response to question “Does your country consider the assistance it receives to implement the PoA sufficient to address its SALW situation?” ..	21
Chart 10. Response to question “Does your country perceive that the assistance received to date addresses the most important SALW priorities in your country?”	21
Chart 11. Assistance received versus future priorities	25
Chart A.1. Africa: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	37
Chart A.2. Africa: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR) ...	37
Chart A.3. Americas: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	42
Chart A.4. Americas: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR) .	43
Chart A.5. Asia: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	46

Chart A.6. Asia: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)	47
Chart A.7. Europe: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	51
Chart A.8. Europe: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding destruction)	51
Chart A.9. Middle East: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	54
Chart A.10. Pacific: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	56
Chart A.11. Least Developed Countries: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005	60
Chart A.12. Least Developed Countries: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)	61

List of tables

Table 1. Types of assistance provided by international organizations	13
Table 2. Priorities by region	22
Table 3. Current priorities according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence	24
Table 4. Priorities for regional organizations	26
Table 5. Priorities for certain international organization field offices and regional centres	27
Table A.1. Africa: assistance desired	39
Table A.2. Americas: assistance desired	44
Table A.3. Asia: assistance desired	48
Table A.4. Europe: assistance desired	52
Table A.5. Middle East: assistance desired	54
Table A.6. Pacific: assistance desired	57
Table A.7. Least Developed Countries: assistance desired	62

FOREWORD

In the five years since the adoption of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects, scores of activities, projects and programmes have been put in place to address the needs of the Member States most affected by the proliferation and misuse of these weapons. This global assistance effort recognized the fact that those states and communities that are most affected by the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects are those states and communities with the fewest resources to address these issues.

The central importance of mobilizing resources and providing assistance to address the illicit trade in small arms is clearly identified in the Programme of Action. Progress has been made in developing concrete measures to implement the Programme of Action. Yet, the international community has not had an overall picture of where and how much assistance has been provided to date nor whether the assistance has matched the most pressing needs.

In my capacity as Chair of the 2005 Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action, I heard many calls from governments and multilateral organizations for a mapping and analysis of the current status of small arms assistance, both given and received.

I was thus delighted that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) had taken this task forward with the financial support of the Governments of Austria, Finland and the United States of America. I warmly welcome the analysis and recommendations of this report. While informing the reader of the global trends of assistance provided and received, this report also highlights areas that need improvement such as how requests for assistance are communicated/received, how states keep track of the assistance they have provided or received and how various government departments coordinate internally.

I encourage states and regional and international organizations alike to consider and act upon the recommendations outlined in this report. While some recommendations require further discussion and coordination, there are a number of recommendations that could have an immediate and positive impact.

Considering that the *illicit* trade in small arms represents approximately US\$ 1 billion annually, can anyone really say that the estimated US\$ 660 million in Programme of Action assistance provided over five years has been sufficient? The response rate to UNIDIR's questionnaire on assistance and the interest displayed by donors and affected states to UNIDIR's study at the 2006 Review Conference is heartening and speaks of the keen interest to ensure that international assistance to implement the Programme of Action is targeted, focused and, most importantly, effective.

Understanding the global dynamics of small arms assistance will contribute toward and build upon our efforts to fulfil the commitments we all, as the international community, undertook in 2001.

Pasi Patokallio
Ambassador of Finland to Canada
Chair of the 2005 Biennial Meeting of States to Consider
the Implementation of the Programme of Action

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UNIDIR would like to thank the Governments of Austria, Finland and United States of America for financially supporting this project. We would also like to express our heartfelt appreciation to all of the states and organizations that completed the questionnaire. We recognize the time consuming nature of the questionnaires and hope that this report is useful to your endeavours.

Many individuals and organizations facilitated the contacts and communications around the globe. In this regard, UNIDIR would like to acknowledge the support of Guy Lamb and Ana Leao (ISS), Cyriaque Agnekethom (ECOWAS), Daniel Andoh (UNDP Ghana), Keo Chheo (ASEAN) and Eucher Eklu-Koevanu (UNREC). The United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA) and members of the Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) also helped promote responses from international organizations.

UNIDIR would additionally like to thank Ambassador Pasi Patokallio (Finland) and Ambassador Sylvester Rowe (Sierra Leone) as their endorsement of the questionnaire and encouragement for states to fill in the questionnaire helped us achieve a very strong rate of return.

Colleagues at the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HDC), the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons (RECSA) and SaferAfrica commented on drafts of the questionnaire and the HDC offered advice for implementing the questionnaire-based research. Stuart Maze's technical expertise was a considerable help and Marc-Antoine Morel (UNDP) provided useful comments for the final report.

We are most grateful for the essential assistance provided by John Berrie, Hayane Dahmen, Caroline McQueen and Meredith Wotten. We would also like to thank our colleagues Anita Blétry, Valérie Compagnion and Nicolas Gérard who saved the day on more than one occasion. Many thanks as well to AvisAnne Julien for editing the report and to the many consultants who helped us translate the questionnaire and their responses.

The views expressed in this report are solely the work of UNIDIR and do not reflect those of the United Nations or governments of Member States. Omissions, errors and any potential misrepresentations of data are the sole responsibility of the authors.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kerry Maze manages the project “International Assistance for Implementing the Programme of Action on the Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons” at the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Geneva. Kerry worked previously in the fields of education, gender policy and human security but has been concentrating on small arms issues since joining UNIDIR. She completed an MA in International Relations at McGill University in 2003, focusing on private security.

Sarah Parker works as a research assistant at the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, Geneva. She is completing a Masters of International Law through the University of Sydney, focusing on international security and human rights. She graduated from the Law Faculty of the University of Edinburgh in 1999 and spent five years working as a corporate lawyer in Sydney, Australia.

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

*Finally, we, the States participating in the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects: b) Also encourage all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote the implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action.*¹

The negative impacts of small arms and light weapons (SALW) are usually felt most strongly in states that have the least capacity to address the issue. International assistance, both financial and technical, is thus critical for alleviating the humanitarian impacts of SALW and for preventing, combating and eradicating the cycle of violence perpetuated by the illicit trade of these weapons. Recognizing this, when Member States of the United Nations agreed in 2001 to the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA), they included a number of provisions to encourage states and multilateral organizations to mobilize resources and to provide assistance when in a position to do so.

Since the PoA's inception, much activity has taken place. Considerable resources have been mobilized and financial and technical assistance have been provided. However, it has not been clear what level of assistance is being provided, where resources are being mobilized from and where technical and financial assistance to implement the PoA is flowing to. It is not clear if there are specific issues that are receiving more assistance than others, or if some important issues are being neglected. There is no overall awareness of the degree of coordination and coherence in technical and financial assistance. Thus, we do not know whether needs are being met by the resources that exist.

If states that require assistance (affected states) were aware of all the possible sources of funding and if donor states were aware of all the requirements that exist, then governments could make wise and strategic use of limited resources and identify how the assistance relates to SALW priorities. Increased awareness of needs and resources would help affected states communicate their assistance needs to donors and international organizations more clearly and would enhance the coordination of PoA activities by implementing agencies.

The following report presents the results of the project "International Assistance for Implementing the Programme of Action on the Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons". The chair of the 2005 Biennial Meeting of States on the Programme of Action, Finnish Ambassador Pasi Patokallio, first articulated the idea for the project. Funded by the Governments of Austria, Finland and the United States, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) launched the project in January 2006 with the following goals:

- to ascertain the amount of financial assistance currently allocated to PoA activities;
- to uncover the challenges associated with requesting assistance;
- to survey the types of assistance that developing countries and affected states themselves are seeking; and
- to translate the findings from the project into recommendations for improving how assistance is being requested and communicated.

The project does not assess the quality of the assistance that has been provided since 2001, nor does it pass judgement on the policies and practices of states and international organizations. Rather, it represents the first attempt to capture and analyse data on assistance, and is intended to be a starting point for future analysis, discussion and understanding of this issue.

This report begins by briefly summarizing how the PoA addresses international assistance, followed by a description of the methodology for compiling and interpreting the data of a global survey on international PoA assistance. The report concludes with a summary of the project findings and puts forward recommendations to help states, organizations and implementing agencies improve the ways in which assistance is sought and provided. The body of the report focuses on the global perspective of international assistance. Regional overviews and a summary of assistance to the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) are provided in Annex A.

It is hoped that states, regional and international organizations, implementing agencies and civil society will use this information to engage in concrete and progressive discussions on matching resources to needs.

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION IN THE POA

The Preamble of the PoA stresses the urgent necessity for assistance to support local, national, regional and global efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in SALW. In Section III of the PoA—“Implementation, international cooperation and assistance”—states are encouraged to share information, to establish and strengthen partnerships and to support global initiatives such as tracking databases and tracing and detection technologies. This section also establishes that states should:

- upon request, seriously consider rendering financial and technical assistance to support implementation of the measures contained in the PoA (Section III.3);
- upon request, consider assisting and promoting conflict prevention and the pursuit of negotiated solutions to conflicts, including by addressing their root causes (Section III.4);
- seriously consider assisting states, upon request, in building capacities in such areas as legislation and regulation, law enforcement, marking and tracing, stockpile management and weapons collection and destruction (Section III.6);
- upon request, provide assistance for destruction (Section III.14) and to combat the linked issues of drug trafficking, transnational organized crime and terrorism (Section III.15);
- support programmes for specialist training on small arms stockpile management and security (Section III, paragraph 8);
- support, where appropriate, national disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) (Section III.16);
- make efforts to address problems related to human and sustainable development (Section III.17); and
- develop and support action-oriented research for greater awareness and understanding of the nature and scope of associated problems (Section III.18).

Section III has been worded in such a way that states are encouraged to give assistance “upon request”, “when appropriate” and/or when they are “in a position to do so”. Nevertheless, Section IV contains an overarching paragraph in which states encourage “all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote the implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to states in their implementation of the Programme of Action” (Section IV.2.b). It is clear that when negotiating the PoA, states were well aware of the importance of providing assistance and mobilizing resources for its implementation.

INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT: METHODOLOGY

DEFINITION

As stated in its title, the PoA covers measures to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. The absence of a precise definition of "small arms and light weapons" in the PoA, along with the broad reference to the illicit trade in SALW "in all its aspects", makes it very difficult to have a common interpretation of what constitutes a PoA activity and, in turn, what constitutes assistance to support the implementation of the PoA (PoA assistance).

One repercussion of this ambiguity is the broad range of activities that potentially qualify as PoA assistance. While some states may narrowly interpret PoA assistance to be direct measures such as weapons collection and destruction, other states include assistance provided more generally to mine action, the destruction of rocket propellant and broader-based peacekeeping, security and reintegration measures as assistance to implement the PoA.

Without consensus on the parameters of PoA activities, information on PoA assistance varies according to the different methods and procedures that individual states use to define and record PoA activities. Overly conservative approaches can lead to underreporting of activities, while a broad interpretation of relevant activities can easily inflate perceptions of the amount of PoA assistance taking place. In addition, since reporting on the implementation of the PoA is incomplete, an absence of reporting does not necessarily mean an absence of assistance.² In short, a comprehensive, complete view of PoA assistance activities is problematic and difficult to attain.

For the purposes of this project, PoA assistance refers to one or more of the themes drawn from the PoA as listed in the box below that specifically help another state's implementation of the PoA.³ Global and multilateral initiatives such as the UN Group of Governmental Experts on Tracing⁴ are not included in this study though assistance to help representatives participate in such a process is.

The thematic issues are:

- National Commissions, coordinating agencies, National Points of Contact (NPCs) (National Commissions)
- destruction of SALW and ammunition (Destruction)
- assistance to address brokering (Brokering)
- disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)
- legislation, regulations and administrative procedures (includes import, export, transfers, licensing, end-user certificates) (Legislation)
- building and strengthening partnerships between and among states, organizations or civil society (Partnerships)
- record keeping, registration and information sharing (Record keeping)
- capacity-building and training on SALW issues (Capacity-building)
- customs and borders (Customs)
- action-oriented research (Research)
- law enforcement (Law enforcement)
- children in armed conflict (Children)
- assistance to address marking and tracing (Marking and Tracing)
- promoting dialogue, awareness raising, education (Awareness raising)
- stockpile management and security (Stockpiles)
- linked issues of organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism (Linked issues)
- weapons collection (Collection)
- money into trust funds (Trusts)

The short form of each category (presented in parentheses) is used throughout the report. It does not suggest a priority of the issues within the category.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Preparation for the project included assessing existing information on the provision of international assistance. The starting point for this assessment was to survey the reports on national implementation of the PoA (UN national reports) and annual reports on the implementation of the European Union (EU) Joint Action of 12 July 2002 and associated literature.⁵ While many UN national reports make some reference to international assistance and cooperation, the data on assistance is not comprehensive. Only five states have submitted UN national reports on an annual basis and states might list only selected examples of their activities in the reports. Few national reports consistently include monetary values for the assistance provided and fewer still for assistance received. Furthermore, activities listed in both the EU annual reports and UN national reports are frequently clustered together making it difficult to assess the level of attention a particular issue received.

As a result, the best way to achieve an accurate global mapping of PoA assistance was to gather the information directly from those that provide and receive assistance through the distribution and processing of questionnaires issued to all UN Member States, and a selection of relevant international and regional organizations. Four separate questionnaires were developed and distributed according to:⁶

- states that are in a position to *provide* assistance;
- states that *receive* or *desire* assistance;
- international organizations that *provide* assistance; and
- regional organizations that *require* assistance and/or are in a position to *provide* assistance.

The four groups were targeted to reduce the likelihood of a low response rate often associated with questionnaire-based research. While donor A may not have returned the questionnaire, the areas that received support from donor A may be represented in the returned questionnaires from the implementing agencies or affected states. Responses to the questionnaire were cross-referenced to avoid double counting, which was, however, a difficult task since the details provided by donors and recipients in relation to the same activity were generally inconsistent (elaborated on page 15).

The questionnaires were made available by the following means:

- copies were sent by post and e-mail to the National Points of Contact (NPCs) on small arms of every UN Member State;
- copies were sent to relevant ministerial or law enforcement authorities when relevant contact details were not available or an NPC has not been established;
- follow-up information was sent to every Permanent Mission to the UN in either Geneva or New York;
- copies were sent to designated focal points in international and regional organizations; and
- the questionnaires were available online.

The questionnaire sent to states that may receive, request or desire assistance was available in five languages: Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

Each questionnaire asked for details of assistance provided/received, details of requests for assistance made/received and the mechanisms through which assistance was funded and implemented. States and regional organizations that receive or require assistance were also asked to identify the kinds of assistance they would like to receive. States and organizations were asked to only list the activities that took place between 2001 until the end of 2005, which covers the first five years of the Programme of Action.⁷

The questionnaire consisted of questions requiring a “yes/no” answer and questions that required commentary. The use of checkboxes ensured that the questionnaire was easy to answer and facilitated processing and comparing data.

UNIDIR received responses from:⁸

- 68 states that identify themselves as receiving or desiring assistance (affected states);
- 23 donor governments;
- 10 regional organizations that provide and/or receive assistance;
- 18 international organizations, primarily the members of the UN-based Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA), that provide assistance;⁹ and
- 19 states and seven organizations that claim they neither provide nor receive assistance.

A total of 83 UN Member States, four regional organizations and four international organizations did not return the questionnaire in time to be included in the report.

In 15 of the instances in which no questionnaire was returned, UNIDIR found information in UN national reports and the annual reports compiled for the EU Joint Action (EU annual reports).¹⁰ These sources were also used to supplement and reinforce the information provided in the questionnaire in instances where the questionnaires were returned incomplete or the details of assistance were unclear.

CALCULATING THE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE

Assistance measured on monetary value alone gives a general overview of how much money has been allocated to a particular theme, but is not a basis for comparison without considering such factors as: the needs of a particular area; the cost, duration and scale of one activity over another; the cost of implementing the same activity in different states and the capacity of an affected state’s infrastructure at the time of implementation.

Basing a comparison solely on the number of activities also has limitations. State A may have received more incidents of assistance, but state B may have received one project of larger scope and longer duration.

A combination of the two elements provides the best overview possible of the assistance provided to implement the PoA. For the purposes of this project, the quantitative assessment was determined by:

- the amount of financial assistance donors allocated toward activities that involve PoA implementation; and
- the number of instances that donors and organizations implemented a specific project (also referred to as activity).

PROCESSING DATA BY THEMATIC ISSUE

The first part of Section II of this report provides a breakdown of assistance according to the amount of assistance devoted to each theme of the PoA during the period of 2001–2005 inclusive. There is a particular challenge in addressing assistance by theme as assistance is often allocated in one lump sum to cover a variety of SALW issues; or, SALW activities may be a small portion of broader development or reconstruction objectives.

This study applied a two-step approach to preparing its thematic analysis. First, the questionnaire listed PoA themes (see Box 1) and asked states to indicate the assistance that they have received or provided since the PoA was agreed in 2001 by checking the appropriate box/boxes. States were then asked to provide details of the assistance they received or provided. The first step provided the researchers with an overall sense of which issues were covered, and an analysis of the description of activities listed in the second step provided information on the number, cost and destination of each of the activities. In the future, once the dynamics of PoA assistance are better understood, it may be useful to weight the activities according to primary and secondary objectives for a more accurate picture of the degree of attention each theme receives.

PROCESSING DATA BY DESTINATION

Annex B provides a list of states that returned the questionnaire. Affected states were grouped based on their geographical region and/or membership in a regional or subregional organization. The study also examined PoA assistance in terms of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Regional summaries of international assistance in addition to a summary of assistance received by LDCs are provided in Annex A.

PROCESSING DATA ACCORDING TO PERCEIVED LEVELS OF SALW AVAILABILITY AND VIOLENCE

The questionnaire asked respondents in affected states to give their perception of the SALW situation in their respective countries according to the following characterizations:

- areas in conflict or general instability (Conflict);
- high levels of SALW availability and violence, but are not in conflict (High/High);
- high level of SALW availability, but no immediate threat of violence (High/Low);
- low level of SALW availability and low level of violence (Low/Low); and
- no perceived SALW problem.

These characterizations were used to understand assistance needs in environments that share similar SALW concerns, but that may not be geographically linked. As these characterizations are based only on the perception of the questionnaire respondents, it would be beneficial for future assessments to establish objective indicators for characterizing SALW availability and violence, which was, however, beyond the budget and timeframe of this project.

SECTION II

OVERVIEW OF ASSISTANCE CURRENTLY ALLOCATED TO IMPLEMENT THE POA¹¹

KEY FINDINGS

- Over the five years 2001–2005, approximately 600 different PoA activities with an estimated total of US\$ 660 million have taken place in at least 94 states.
- There was a significant increase in the amount of financial assistance provided in 2001 and 2002; however, the increase in the number and financial amount of assistance provided up to and including 2005 has been inconsistent.
- In terms of the number of activities implemented, the amount allocated and the number of activities implemented with partnerships, PoA assistance was most actively implemented in 2003, the year in which the first Biennial Meeting of States to implement the PoA was held.
- In financial terms, the majority of the assistance has been allocated to DDR programmes, followed by the destruction of SALW and ammunition, collection and stockpile management.
- In terms of number of activities, the most frequently addressed activities have been capacity-building, DDR, destruction and global research.
- The vast majority of the activities that donors have supported are of a duration (or funding cycle) of one year or less.
- The majority of donor funding was allocated to DDR and destruction activities implemented by international organizations and regional organizations. Civil society implemented a large number of activities, which focused primarily on research.

SUMMARY OF ASSISTANCE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL

As stated in the project methodology, a number of fundamental and conceptual details of PoA activities must be resolved at the political level before a study can accurately reflect the money spent and the number of activities that have assisted states to implement the PoA. Overall, however, this study has pinpointed at least 600 different PoA activities, with an estimated value of just under US\$ 660 million¹² that have taken place in 94 states and/or in a broader regional context throughout 2001–2005. Given that current estimates of the number of arms in circulation is 640 million,¹³ it means that just over one US dollar is provided as assistance per arm in circulation. Reportedly, 32 states and 22 international and regional organizations have provided PoA assistance, though 15 states and six organizations can be considered to be the main providers of the assistance, contributing at least US\$ 2 million each to activities in affected states since 2001. Among these donors, however, five states and four organizations are responsible for over 95% of the funding, each of them providing almost US\$ 20 million or more.


In 2001, there were about 115 activities underway: 94 of the activities (US\$ 40 million) were actually initiated in 2001, while at least 17 activities (US\$ 48 million) had begun before 2001 but had mandates that continued throughout the 2001–2005 period under study. Although the 111 new activities initiated in 2002 did not represent a dramatic increase from the number of activities initiated in 2001, the value of the assistance more than tripled (US\$ 145 million). During 2002–2005, the number and value of assistance fluctuated and a five-year period is not a sufficient amount of time to conclude any reliable trends.¹⁴ In 2005, there were approximately 112 activities

valued at approximately US\$ 120 million, but it is possible that a number of activities in 2005 had not yet been accounted for in the UN national reports and EU annual reports by the time of the research.¹⁵

The majority of the activities that took place between 2001 and 2005 were listed as having a duration of one year or less. In 2004, a larger percentage of activities began to have a duration of four or five years, which was mirrored in 2005. Initial speculation of activities in 2006 suggests that international organizations may be preparing projects that are from four to six years in duration.

Chart 1 reflects the information gathered from merging the data from the four sets of questionnaires as well as UN national reports and the EU annual reports. Chart 2 reflects the same information excluding DDR, to allow for a more detailed view of the other issues. The charts reflect the number of activities implemented during 2001–2005 and the values associated with the different activities. The charts also indicate the number of instances in which a theme was reportedly addressed as part of a larger activity. Since a number of projects address multiple issues, the monetary value was attributed to what appeared to have been the central objective of a given SALW project. This has likely led to a degree of bias for the amount of money one theme received


Chart 1. Activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005



over another, which, unfortunately, cannot be helped. While comprehensive and inclusive projects are to be encouraged, it would be useful if states and organizations could, when preparing for or conducting their final evaluations of projects, account for the level of attention given to each theme of the PoA.

The charts are intended to approximate assistance based on the data available. The information should not be viewed as comprehensive or conclusive due to the methodological reasons stated above and as a handful of key donor and affected states neither returned the questionnaire nor listed exhaustively the activities in other submitted reports.

Chart 2. Activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)



In financial terms, well over half of total financial assistance was allocated to DDR activities (US\$ 458 million), which often included the operational and staff costs of the DDR missions administered by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).¹⁶ Approximately 45% of the total assistance allocated to DDR focused solely on reintegration.

Africa received 71% of the DDR assistance with US\$ 323 million (approximately 63 different activities) allocated to 17 countries and to the World Bank's regional Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Program in the Great Lakes region. Asia was allocated 24% of the DDR assistance. Afghanistan has received approximately US\$ 87 million largely through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan's "New Beginnings Programme", which began in 2003 and is currently under way. Another significant DDR project is the EU programme to monitor demobilization and decommission armaments in Asia for

which almost US\$ 11 million was allocated. All but three recipients of DDR assistance are classified as LDCs.¹⁷

Destruction received the second largest amount of financial assistance (US\$ 55 million) of which at least 80% of the total was allocated to projects that specifically included ammunition. The Stability Pact countries received the largest percentage (69%) of destruction assistance, mainly administered through the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). Collection and stockpile management comprised US\$ 37 million and US\$ 12 million, respectively; however, stockpile management is also frequently included as a part of collection and capacity-building (training) activities.

Referring to Chart 1, “research” includes two categories. For the purposes of this project, action-oriented research refers to research that was either conducted within an affected state or was associated with a case or feasibility study of a particular affected state. Global research refers to studies that addressed SALW thematically and did not concentrate specifically on an affected state. Accordingly, the project identified 65 instances of action-oriented research (US\$ 6.7 million) and 83 instances of global research (US\$ 17 million).

Chart 1 shows that the number of activities addressing capacity-building far exceeds the amount of financial assistance provided. This is partly due to the fact that some activities such as sponsoring meetings, workshops and seminars can be less costly than other activities, or it could be that states did not assign monetary values to the technical assistance they provided in this area. It could also suggest that donors do not provide substantive funding for larger capacity-building projects.

Overall, there have been about 139 capacity-building activities with an approximate value of US\$ 23 million. Of these activities, about 40 consisted of meetings in/for affected states (US\$ 1.5 million), including seminars on legislation and regional-level conferences. An additional 45 activities (US\$ 2 million) targeted training and capacity-building workshops on such issues as enforcement and intelligence, transfer controls, best practices and implementation of the PoA. There were 19 instances of support (almost US\$ 6 million) that specifically strengthened the capacity of regions and regional organizations.

During the five-year period from 2001 through 2005, while approximately 20 activities (US\$ 2.8 million) addressed National Commissions, coordinating bodies or NPCs, almost one-third of this funding was spread across other activities, including destruction. As a number of issues overlap, it is possible that National Commissions, coordinating bodies or NPCs may have benefited from an additional US\$ 2 million for some capacity-building activities and may be the direct beneficiaries of various trainings and workshops.

In many cases, small arms projects are designed to be comprehensive, covering a range of different but related issues. This is particularly the case in Cambodia where both Japan and the European Commission implemented projects that covered weapons for development programmes and small arms management programmes (destruction, safe storage, registration and public awareness by the former and legal frameworks, collection, destruction, cache searching, stockpiles and public awareness by the latter). Large inclusive projects were also implemented, for instance, in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2003–2005 where UNDP allocated approximately US\$ 1.3 million to National Commissions, capacity-building, destruction, building and strengthening partnerships, awareness raising, collection, civil society, national strategy and destruction of rocket propellant.

Indeed, based on the way that states and organizations listed their activities in the questionnaire and other reports, just under a third of the activities (168) at an estimated value of US\$ 99 million specifically referred to two or more thematic issues. Collection is frequently associated with

destruction, while law enforcement is often an element of capacity-building and/or customs and borders. Record keeping, registration and information sharing activities are referenced in larger arms control, and stockpile management initiatives are rarely funded as a stand-alone issue. Likewise, legislation, regulations and administrative procedures feature in a number of nationally focused activities as well as among capacity-building, stockpile management and activities that promote dialogue and public awareness. And, of course, many projects invariably contribute toward training or building a state's capacity.

The activities listed that specifically referenced gender did so primarily in terms of workshops, research and DDR (US\$ 4.5 million, 11 activities). For example, the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) implemented a project that focused on women's participation in weapons in exchange for development projects, and among the donors, Sweden in particular has supported a number of projects that address women and children in reintegration programmes. Approximately 18 different activities (US\$ 40 million) specifically targeted children, generally with respect to DDR. One of the projects funded by the United States targeted youth and crime prevention in Guatemala, while another project addressed community support for war-affected youths. The issues of gender and children are cross-cutting themes within the PoA and are often mainstreamed in larger programmes. These figures are likely to represent a sample of the true amount of assistance being allocated to gender and child-related issues.

The most common types of technical assistance include the provision of experts; fact-finding missions; preparing reports and project proposals; donation of computers, software and information technology (IT) support; and support for conducting conferences, seminars and workshops—from printing services and the provision of text materials to supplying venues and hospitality—as well as providing specialized personnel. Fiji, for instance, provided support and curriculum training for police officers in the Solomon Islands. The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-LiREC) in Lima provides IT support throughout Latin America and helps states in preparing their national reports on implementation of the PoA. The provision of technical assistance, particularly with respect to conferences and workshops, is the most common form of support that regional organizations offer to their member states, especially those organizations that are not in a position to provide financial support.

Without a complementary assessment of the types of assistance that is needed by states and organizations, it is difficult to highlight the areas of assistance that have not received adequate attention. The last part of Section II (Assistance desired) and Annex A address what respondents to the questionnaire would like to receive as assistance. However, it is evident in the global overview that states have received comparably little to assist them in addressing such issues as brokering, marking and tracing, customs and borders and linked issues such as terrorism and transnational crime.

FUNDING RELATIONSHIPS

Charts 3 and 4 illustrate the various channels that governments have used to allocate assistance ranging from direct assistance to governments, via non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international organizations, or through regional and subregional organizations. Given that around a quarter of the activities implemented involve partnerships, some of these figures may overlap. Trust funds, for instance, were always channelled through a regional or international organization

Chart 3. Channels used to allocate assistance
(number of activities)





Chart 4. Channels used to allocate assistance
(monetary value in US\$ million)



Aside from contributions to core funding and activities of a global nature (not directly involving affected states), donors allocated PoA assistance directly through international organizations in 128 instances (US\$ 305 million), regional organizations in 97 instances (US\$ 31 million) and engaged 45 civil society organizations in 162 instances (US\$ 80 million). The evidence collected from the range of sources suggests that donors provided support bilaterally to affected states in 65 instances (US\$ 32 million) and to regional organizations that have affected states as members in 14 instances (US\$ 7 million). However, some bilateral activities are likely to be among the 110 instances of assistance (US\$ 63 million) in which there were no details on how the funding was allocated.

Assistance via civil society

The engagement with civil society doubled between 2001 and 2002 and has since remained steady, with funding channelled through 25 civil society organizations on average per year. Civil society organizations include NGOs, academic institutes and private companies. An estimated 82% of the funds allocated to civil society went to internationally based NGOs for research-related activities. The South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC) has engaged local NGOs and donors have allocated some funds to internationally based NGOs that then engaged local NGOs. Private companies were most commonly employed to destroy weapons and ordnance.

Assistance via international organizations

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from the headquarters of 14 international organizations and from four field offices.¹⁸ Of these, 14 provided assistance to states affected by SALW¹⁹ and four responded that their organization has no role in implementing or coordinating specific PoA

activities.²⁰ With respect to the 11 organizations active in PoA assistance, five responded that they generally implement assistance through resources that were earmarked specifically for SALW from the donor.²¹ Another organization generally provides assistance from its own internal mechanisms and resources.²² Seven organizations use a combination of internal and earmarked resources from donors.²³ Table 1 reflects the financial and technical assistance provided by some of the organizations active in PoA assistance.

Table 1. Types of assistance provided by international organizations

Activity	International organization
National Commissions, coordinating agencies, NPCs	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, UNDP, DPKO, UNICEF BiH, ^a UNICEF Haiti, ^b UNIFEM, UNREC
Capacity-building and training on SALW issues	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, UNDP, UNICEF BiH, UNREC
Legislation, regulations and administrative procedures	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, UNDP, DPKO, UNODC, UNREC, WCO
Customs and borders	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, UNDP, DPKO, UNODC, SEESAC, WCO
Law enforcement	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, UNDP, DPKO, UNICEF Haiti, UNODC, UNREC
Addressing brokering	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, DDA, UNODC
Building and strengthening partnerships	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, DDA, UNDP, UNICEF Haiti, UNIFEM
Promoting dialogue, awareness raising, education activities	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, UNDP, UNEP, UNICEF BiH, UNICEF Haiti
Addressing marking and tracing	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, UNODC, UNREC
Stockpile management	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, UNDP, UNREC
Record keeping, registration and information sharing	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, UNDP, UNDP Ghana, UNODC, UNREC
Weapons collection	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, DPKO, UNDP, UNREC
Destruction	Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, UNDP, DPKO
DDR	UNDP, DPKO, UNICEF Haiti, UNIFEM
Children in armed conflict	DPKO, UNICEF BiH, UNICEF Haiti, UNREC
Action-oriented research	SEESAC, UNDP, UNIDIR, UNIFEM, WHO, UNREC
Linked issues of organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism	DDA, Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, UNODC, WCO

Source: returned questionnaires.

^a We did not receive an official response from UNICEF; however, the UNICEF field office in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) responded to the questionnaire based on its own field projects.

^b We did not receive an official response from UNICEF; however, the UNICEF field office in Haiti responded to the questionnaire based on its own field projects.

As stated above, states funded international organizations with US\$ 305 million on 128 occasions. International organizations have implemented an additional 141 activities with US\$ 154 million from their own resources, which are often supported by donor funding.

International organizations that concentrated in a specific geographical area have had a strong impact on the amount of assistance provided to a region financially and in terms of the number of activities implemented. By the end of 2005, SEESAC had implemented at least 54 different direct assistance activities (US\$ 1 million) in its region, and in its questionnaire response it listed at least another US\$ 1 million to be allocated toward activities that would commence by early 2006.

Assistance via regional organizations

Given that the causes of SALW issues usually extend beyond the immediate territory of the affected state, a regionally integrated approach is often necessary. A number of regions have existing instruments to address SALW such as the Nairobi Protocol, the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol,²⁴ the Organization of American States (OAS) Convention,²⁵ the Andean Declaration²⁶ and the EU Small Arms Strategy.²⁷ These instruments reflect and address SALW concerns of a more localized nature and, when legally binding, pose an obligation on states to implement the established measures. Such instruments put regional organizations in a unique position between global and local initiatives to address SALW and can act as a motivating force to address the transnational nature of a number of SALW issues at the local, regional and global levels.

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 10 regional organizations: four of which identify themselves as having member states that either are in conflict situations or have areas of general instability;²⁸ three of the 10 act as donors and/or implementing agencies;²⁹ and three responded that their organization has no role in either implementing or coordinating SALW issues.³⁰

Most regional organizations reported in the questionnaires that they receive funds from donors that are specifically earmarked for PoA assistance. Overall, donors channelled at least US\$ 31 million through regional organizations in at least 97 different instances. Regional organizations have used the contributions as well as their own internal resources to implement 31 activities (US\$ 63 million); however, a number of the figures provided were based on projections and the projects have not been fully implemented.

- Regional organizations have most actively engaged in capacity-building and training activities, which include conducting and hosting workshops, seminars and conferences.
- While not having the resources to provide financial support to their member states to implement the PoA, regional and subregional organizations in Africa and the Americas have been actively engaged on PoA issues particularly with respect to hosting, conducting and providing expertise at conferences and meetings.
- Regional organizations in affected regions consider themselves to be in a strong position for implementing training activities; and
- The OSCE and NATO have implemented about a quarter of the estimated total number of destruction activities, which account for 67% of the financial assistance provided for destruction—just under half of the activities supported by the EU, including approximately 83% of its financial assistance, was allocated toward DDR programmes.

According to one organization that both receives and provides assistance, a number of the problems that regional organizations face come down to capacity constraints within the organization itself, which limits the types of activities they can pursue and challenges implementation on the activities they are conducting.³¹ One such organization noted that it was difficult to meet capacity needs to fully service meetings with respect to the translation of documents and presentations, etc. A major donor organization noted that “greater financial generosity of donors would be welcome”.³²

UNCOVERING THE CHALLENGES OF ASSISTANCE: REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE AND PERCEIVED SUFFICIENCY

KEY FINDINGS

- Information on PoA assistance is inconsistent among donors, implementing agencies and affected states.
- States affected by SALW may not be provided details on the activities implemented by international organizations and NGOs.
- Despite the presence of National Commissions and/or NPCs, the level of inter-departmental coordination on PoA issues is often low.
- Although the number of requests for assistance appears to be on the rise, affected states lack the capacity to formulate proposals and lack knowledge of the procedures to request PoA assistance (for example, how to make requests for assistance and where the requests should be sent).
- States with a high level of SALW availability and a high level of violence have put forward the least number of requests for assistance.
- The majority of affected states claim that assistance received to date is insufficient though a few states believe the assistance received is on track with their priorities.
- Most donors and implementing agencies that responded to the questionnaire expressed that some form of coordination mechanism is necessary.

The details of the assistance listed by donors and affected states in their respective questionnaires vary considerably. In a few cases, donors reported funding assistance to an activity that the recipient did not report. Conversely, states claimed to have received assistance that donors and implementing organizations did not list either in their questionnaire responses or in other alternative reports. In some cases, information provided in the questionnaire differed from the information reported in the same country's UN national reports and/or EU annual reports. More often, the details of the activity such as the monetary value, the year it took place and even the scope of the project varied even though, to the best of the information available, it was indeed the same activity.

One explanation for the discrepancy could be the lack of capacity or infrastructure of some affected states to maintain records on the assistance received, particularly for those without a capacitated National Commission. In certain instances, responses could only account for the PoA assistance that took place since a National Commission was established or the point of contact was assigned.

Another possible reason for the discrepancy may be by the lack of consensus for classifying activities under the PoA. Donor governments were much more likely to classify broader peace and reconstruction activities as PoA assistance than were affected states. Responses from affected states concentrated primarily on the direct or technical aspects of PoA activities.³³

While the discrepancy of an activity's scope can be explained partly by the different interpretations of PoA assistance, the mismatch in monetary value and/or the dates of project implementation suggest that there is a lack of communication and/or recording of PoA assistance both between states and inter-departmentally. A large number of the donors that did not respond fully or at all to the questionnaire highlighted the difficulty of inter-departmental coordination (in terms of time and ease) as the main reason. An affected state noted that a lack of support and coordination within its government departments undermines the capacity and efficiency of its National Commission.³⁴

Similarly, although many affected states provided details on the assistance they received, when it came to noting the monetary value some responses stipulated the amount as “unknown” or “no figure is available to us”, particularly for activities provided by civil society on behalf of donors. Citing specifically a lack of transparency, one country in Africa stated:

The request [for assistance] was addressed to [Donor State removed], funds were channeled to [NGO name removed]. We never knew how much was [received] and neither benefited from such amount.³⁵

Transparency is necessary for improving the efficiency of donors, recipients and implementing agencies to coordinate and cooperate in implementing the activities and to maintain records for assessing progress.

COMMUNICATING AND RESPONDING TO REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE

A key aspect of PoA assistance is how well affected states communicate their needs and how well donor states respond to these requests. The PoA calls on states to provide assistance *upon request* from affected states. It is, therefore, essential for affected states to initiate the process through which assistance will be requested and provided. An analysis of requests made and received for assistance has particular relevance for understanding how donors and affected states communicate on these issues.

Aside from one donor citing that the details of the requests it received was a confidential issue, most donors indicated that they did not know the exact number of requests they had received. Consequently, it was not possible to build a comparison of requests received from the donor perspective. While in certain instances assistance was received without a formal request being made, this section summarizes the requests as reported by affected states.

Charts 5 and 6 illustrate the breakdown of requests for assistance made by affected states and the outcome of those requests.

Chart 5. Breakdown of requests made by affected states





Chart 6. Outcome of requests



While 15% of states that responded to the questionnaire did not know whether or not their country had ever submitted a request for assistance, almost half (49%) had made at least one request for PoA assistance since the UN Conference in 2001. However, of the requests made, in approximately 15% of the cases the requesting states did not know if the project had been accepted. Furthermore, approximately one-third (31%) of the states that consider themselves to be negatively affected by SALW have never submitted a request for assistance.

States provided a variety of reasons to explain the lack of requests made. Several states commented that they did not know why no requests were made, while others reported that they simply did not know *how* to make a request or *where* to send the request.³⁶ This is particularly relevant as donors may address different aspects of small arms within their different government ministries or departments. One state commented that it is not worth making the effort to formulate requests, despite the need, since priority is given to its neighbouring states, which are or have been at war. Similarly, two other states asserted that the SALW problems they face do not attract donors, particularly as they are small states and their concerns may be “smaller” relative to other countries. In this regard and with respect to the growing recognition of the relationship between SALW and development, it would be useful to enhance awareness of PoA activities in other forms of assistance.

The most frequently cited explanation for the low number of requests for assistance was that states lacked the capacity to request international assistance. At least 12 states that returned the questionnaire reported that they have only recently established or are in the process of establishing the relevant institutional processes such as NPCs and National Action Plans, which they say will facilitate requests for assistance.³⁷

The following quotation reflects a number of comments made by states in their returned questionnaires:

Suffice to indicate that, the Government of the Republic of Namibia has not yet submitted any requests for assistance or project proposals. However, the country highly requires such assistance hence having now a National Action Plan on Small Arms and Light Weapons in place, the government intends to present the National Action Plan (NAP) on SALW to the International Donors officially, to request for both financial and technical assistance in order to prevent, combat and eradicate the Illicit Trade, Circulation, Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons.³⁸


Similarly, the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) Sub-Regional Bureau Harare states that “most countries [in southern Africa] have Action Plans ready for implementation but the draw back has been the lack of money to finance the implementation of these plans”.³⁹

Having a National Action Plan and a clear sense of the types of activities desired in a state would significantly help donor governments that are interested in supporting projects. Similarly, as one donor expressed, a project was conceptualized and ready to begin but was delayed for two years because the recipient state was not submitting necessary information for the project to begin.⁴⁰ One possible interpretation of this dilemma is that the expectations of donors on the type and level of information that affected states can provide may be too high. An option may be for donors to include a capacity-building component into the preliminary stage of the project itself to help the affected states gather and record the necessary information. That being said, states that receive or desire assistance have the primary responsibility to communicate their needs and to help with the preparations and records of the assistance they receive.

With regard to the information drawn from the returned questionnaires, as Chart 7 illustrates, there has been a sustained increase in the number of requests being made each year since 2001, with

the majority of requests coming from states in Africa. Most of the requests made were accepted (23% were not). Donor governments and international organizations usually rejected projects for being unclear and lacking a specific objective. One UNDP field office, for instance, received 10 requests for assistance but accepted only four since “the rest were not good, lacking capacity, etc”.⁴¹ Other requests may not have been justifiable such as a request for a US\$ 3 billion DDR project for an African country that has since publicly stated its objective to purchase weapons.

Chart 7. Requests for assistance according to region, 2001–2005



Requests for assistance are handled in several ways. With respect to international organizations, three organizations reported having personnel responsible for receiving and processing requests.⁴² Three organizations reported that they initiate dialogue with affected states for the activities they want to support.⁴³ One organization actively solicits requests for assistance from affected states⁴⁴ and two neither receive nor actively seek requests for assistance.⁴⁵ The Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, as part of the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organisation’s Secretariat, spearheads the issue of SALW in the SADC Region “and the entire regional countries look up to the Bureau to mobilise the necessary resources for the implementation of the SADC Protocol”.


With respect to regional organizations, the European Commission does not solicit requests for assistance, but generally receives them through its field offices or directly through its headquarters. NATO actively solicits requests for assistance, has personnel responsible for requests and initiates dialogue with affected states for the activities it would like to support.

Overall, the OSCE, the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA), UNDP and UN-LiREC all communicated that they only fund projects that have been requested by states. The requesting states, however, often require organizations to help them design and articulate the requests. Both DDA and UNIFEM reported using the CASA mechanism for receiving requests. UNDP in Liberia receives requests from NGOs.

Chart 8 reflects the proportion of requests made according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence. As stated previously, states and regional organizations were asked to indicate whether they perceive themselves (or their member states) as having: (i) conflict or areas of general insecurity (Conflict); (ii) high levels of SALW availability and violence (High/High); (iii) high level of

availability but low level of violence (High/Low); (iv) low levels of SALW availability and violence (Low/Low); or (v) no SALW problem.

Chart 8. Requests for assistance made according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence



Almost half of all requests originated from either states that classified themselves as having a conflict situation or general instability (28%) or regional organizations that have member states that are in a conflict situation or have general instability (18%). Low/Low and High/Low states accounted for a further 47% of the requests made. Only 5% of requests came from High/High states.

Since 2002, 44 states⁴⁶ have referenced in their national reports, some in detail and others more generally, the types of assistance they would like to receive to implement the PoA. The national report from the Central African Republic, for instance, provides a table with two columns whereby the first column lists the activities required and the second column lists the necessary means to implement each activity.⁴⁷ The national reports are an ideal forum for states to highlight their main SALW concerns and the types of assistance they require. As 94 states have received at least some form of assistance and 73 states have listed in their questionnaire responses the types of assistance they would like to receive (elaborated on page 22), but only 44 states have used national reports to communicate the assistance they would like to receive, states are encouraged to make more use of the national reports to list the assistance they require.

FACILITATING DONOR AND RECIPIENT COMMUNICATION

Donors, affected states and international and regional organizations frequently expressed in their responses to the questionnaire the desire for improved coordination of activities.⁴⁸ At least 12 donors and organizations expressed in the returned questionnaires their desire for a coordinating mechanism that focuses specifically on matching resources to needs. For some states, this includes a database. Finland stated that an international clearinghouse mechanism could help achieve better coordination. Canada and the Netherlands both called for a centralized database that could permit requesting and assisting parties to input their priorities. Japan stated that it is supporting the development of the CASA database project, and Australia mentioned that “the Nadi Framework endorsed by the Pacific Island Forum includes the creation by the Forum Secretariat of a matrix of Member State needs”.⁴⁹

The European Commission stated that it would benefit “from a system (internal or external) to track down, administrate and assess the requests for better prioritization of the assistance” and that it would be useful for its member states to include SALW in their national plans for development assistance.

Many donor states that did not explicitly call for a database, nevertheless, called for an assessment tool to improve coordination. The United States put forward that “a solid, global assessment of the needs of states will facilitate donor nations such as the US in resource allocation planning”; South Africa likewise mentioned that it would appreciate having clear plans of priorities from affected states and enhanced donor coordination.

Switzerland and the United Kingdom added that an expert support unit or mechanism could aid the assistance process. Switzerland called for “a cost-effective small arms support mechanism or implementation unit to provide independent and professional assistance, information and analysis”. The United Kingdom expressed the need for “an international corps of experts who could be called on to respond to requests of assistance in developing small arms programs”.⁵⁰

According to the World Customs Organization (WCO), a database that could help identify high-risk consignments could help border control. It also suggests that its customs services might be useful for implementing SALW measures. The WCO has not yet provided technical assistance directly in this area, however, it states that:

the assistance community should take into account such role of Customs and invite Customs officials to the SALW control technical assistance programs organized by them If we were provided funds for such program, we would be able to share our expertise in this important enforcement technique, which may also result in promoting closer collaboration between Customs and other national enforcement agencies such as Police.⁵¹

Other suggestions on how to improve the assistance process include adopting a more regional approach,⁵² integrating gender issues,⁵³ and the creation of an information exchange forum.⁵⁴ The Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons (RECSA) stated that “a regional pool [for] funding and coordination by donors of their contribution should be emphasised” to improve the duplication and overlapping of efforts and information exchange. One regional organization from an affected region stated that the capacity of regional organizations needs to be improved in order for them to keep their member states abreast of regional SALW issues and to be able to provide training for their member states. The organization also states that guides to help with fundraising would also be helpful.

Other lessons can also be learned from the Resource Mobilization Group on Mine Action, an initiative of the Government of Norway and from the activities of the Group of Interested States. Nevertheless, it is clear by the questionnaire responses and discussions at the 2006 United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action the willingness of donors, affected states and implementing organizations alike to take the issue of international assistance forward, recognizing that action is necessary to improve not only how needs for PoA assistance are communicated and received, but also to help states make the optimal use of the assistance they are providing and receiving.

PERCEIVED SUFFICIENCY OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED

As noted above, it is beyond the scope of this report to assess the quality or efficacy of assistance received, which would have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis or at the very minimum on a country-by-country or organizational basis. However, measuring the level of satisfaction that states

have with regard to the assistance they have received is a helpful tool for evaluating the level and effectiveness of communication between donors and affected states. The questionnaire distributed to affected states asked whether or not the level of assistance received is sufficient to implement the PoA and whether the assistance has addressed the top five most important SALW priorities in their countries.

Charts 9 and 10 reflect the perceptions of affected states regarding the adequacy and relevance of the assistance they receive.

Chart 9. Response to question "Does your country consider the assistance it receives to implement the PoA sufficient to address its SALW situation?"





Chart 10. Response to question "Does your country perceive that the assistance received to date addresses the most important SALW priorities in your country?"



The states that described the level of assistance as insufficient are not necessarily the same states that claimed their SALW priorities have not been met. In some cases, the level of assistance was recognized as high even though it may not be sufficient to overcome the SALW situation in a state or may not have addressed the most important concerns of states.

For instance, in the High/Low category, Indonesia responded that the level of assistance it receives to implement the PoA is "very good but problems remain", however, the assistance received to date was listed as not addressing the most important priorities in the country. Conversely, both Mali and Namibia⁵⁵ responded that the level of assistance that they are receiving has been insufficient to address the SALW situation, and yet they both confirmed that assistance received to date addresses the most important SALW priorities in their respective countries.

Among states that characterized themselves as High/High, one state considered that the assistance is targeting its most important SALW priorities and that the level of assistance received is good, "but many problems remain".⁵⁶ Six states that perceive themselves to be in conflict indicated that the assistance received did *not* meet their most important SALW priorities, and that the assistance to

implement the PoA has been “insufficient”. Of the three states that perceive themselves to be in conflict but consider that the assistance received *does* address their most important SALW priorities, two rated the assistance as “good but many problems remain”, while the other claimed the assistance received to implement the PoA has been “sufficient”.

ASSISTANCE DESIRED

KEY FINDINGS

- The most frequently cited form of assistance desired is capacity-building followed closely by assistance to support the activities of National Commissions.
- With respect to an affected state’s own perception of assistance received and their future priorities, the thematic issues that have received the least amount of attention include capacity-building, customs and borders, linked issues and record keeping.

The final goal of the project was to provide states with the opportunity to list the assistance they desire. The questionnaires asked affected states to nominate the top five priorities of assistance they would like to receive. Table 2 presents the themes that appeared most frequently among the top five priorities by region. However, as many of the themes in the PoA overlap, donors are encouraged not to view the themes in isolation, but rather to strategically address compatible themes and areas.

Table 2. Priorities by region

Region	Number of responses	Themes most commonly rated as a top five priority				
		1	2	3	4	5
Global	68	Capacity-building	National Commissions	Record keeping	Legislation	Customs and borders Linked issues
Africa	30	Capacity-building	National Commissions	Legislation	Customs and borders Awareness raising	
Americas	14	Capacity-building	Record keeping	Collection Legislation Linked issues Record keeping Marking and tracing		
Asia	6	Capacity-building	National Commissions	Linked issues	Partnerships Law enforcement Collection	
Europe: Stability Pact and CIS	11	Destruction	Legislation	Marking and tracing	Record keeping Capacity-building	

Region	Number of responses	Themes most commonly rated as a top five priority				
		1	2	3	4	5
Pacific	3	Linked issues	Customs and borders Legislation		Capacity-building Law enforcement National Commissions Partnerships Record keeping Stockpiles	
Middle East	4	National Commissions Linked issues Collection			Customs and borders	Law enforcement Brokering Stockpiles Destruction Awareness raising Research Partnerships

Note: Multiple entries in a cell mean they received the same number of responses.

As indicated by the number of responses, African states account for almost half of the global figure. Nevertheless, there is a measure of consistency among different regional priorities. Globally, capacity-building and National Commissions/NPCs emerged as the top two priorities.

As mentioned above, a large number of states cited a lack of knowledge and capacity to submit requests for assistance. States that already have coordinated national SALW programmes were able to give more specific assessments of their current priorities, while states that do not have such national programmes consistently listed capacity-building as one of their priorities. This was also the case for states that stated a lack of resources within (or for establishing or sustaining) their National Commissions or coordinating bodies. Despite the growth in the annual number of requests made between 2001 and 2005 (elaborated on page 15), a significant number of affected states have never submitted a request. This lack of capacity in national coordination is a key gap that has been clearly identified by the states in their assessment of their future priorities.

The Stability Pact and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) have not prioritized capacity-building, which may possibly reflect pre-existing capacity and the involvement of regional organizations and an international organization with a specific geographic focus. The priorities for these regions are instead destruction, legislation, and marking and tracing.

Legislation is a priority of Africa, Asia and the Pacific. More visible measures such as stockpile management, weapons collection and destruction, and marking and tracing do not feature in the priorities of Africa and Asia and the Pacific. This may be due to a number of reasons such as collection and destruction being included in a number of DDR programmes, which take place largely in Africa (although almost half of the DDR assistance focuses only on reintegration activities).⁵⁷ Another possible explanation may be that without national capacity to address SALW, states cannot enforce legislation and the benefits of collection and destruction would be only short term.

The Americas, Asia, the Middle East and the Pacific region all frequently listed assistance to address the linked issues of drug trafficking, organized crime and terrorism among their top five priorities.

As noted in the overview of assistance currently allocated to implement the PoA, (elaborated on page 7) both legislation and record keeping received little attention in monetary value and frequency of activities taking place. While donors and implementing agencies may include these categories when addressing other thematic areas, affected states clearly indicated a desire to receive more assistance on these issues. Comprehensive programming could ensure that assistance is adequately distributed; however, this would require that donors and implementing agencies be able to disaggregate the level of attention each of the various themes they are addressing receives.

Table 3 presents the themes most frequently rated among the top five priorities of states according to states that share similar SALW situations.

Table 3. Current priorities according to perceived levels of SALW availability and violence


Region	Number of responses	Themes most commonly rated as a top five priority				
		1	2	3	4	5
Conflict	10	Capacity-building	Collection	National Commissions	Legislation Linked issues	
High/High	15	Capacity-building	Legislation Record keeping		National Commissions	Awareness raising
High/Low	17	Capacity-building	Record Keeping	Legislation National Commissions		Customs and borders Awareness raising Stockpiles
Low/Low	18	Capacity-building	Customs and borders	Customs and borders National Commissions Linked issues		
No SALW problem or did not characterize	8 (7 stated they did not have a SALW problem; 1 did not characterize)	Linked issues	Money into trusts	Customs and borders Capacity-building		Collection Stockpiles

Note: Multiple entries in a cell mean they received the same number of responses.

Consistent with the regional analysis, when analysing the results based on the perceived levels of SALW availability and violence, capacity-building again emerges as the most frequently mentioned priority. Each of the categories that classified themselves as having some degree of SALW availability or violence placed assistance for National Commissions among their top five priorities. Record keeping, customs and borders and National Commissions also featured prominently within the different categories. Linked issues featured much more predominantly for states with no or low levels of availability and violence and states in conflict.

With respect to affected states' own perception of the thematic issues covered by the assistance they have received, Chart 11 compares the types of assistance that states received with the types of assistance they have identified as their top priorities for the future. The black line indicates the number of affected states that prioritized an area for which they have never received assistance.

Chart 11. Assistance received versus future priorities



When comparing the number of states that have received assistance on a particular thematic issue and the number of states that listed the issue among their top five priorities, there is a notable gap in the number of thematic issues that have not yet received (or have received less) attention. The gap is most evident in the issues of capacity-building, customs and borders, linked issues and record keeping, respectively.

Regional organizations in areas affected by SALW were asked to list the top five priorities that the organization would like to be able to provide for the states in their region, and were asked to list their organization's own priorities to improve their capacity to implement objectives of the PoA. The responses are reflected in Table 4 in the order listed by organizations (where no number is indicated, the order of the priorities was not provided):

Table 4. Priorities for regional organizations

Regional organization	Regional priorities	Organizational priorities
AU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DDR 2. Building and strengthening partnerships between and among states, organizations or civil society 3. Law enforcement 4. Security Sector Reform (SSR) 5. Legislation, regulations and administrative procedures (includes import, export, transfers, licensing, end-user certificates) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training in project formulation 2. Resource mobilization
Andean Community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Commissions, coordinating agencies, NPCs 2. Building and strengthening partnerships between and among states, organizations or civil society 3. Legislation, regulations and administrative procedures (includes import, export, transfers, licensing, end-user certificates) 4. Law enforcement 5. Linked issues: organized crime, drug trafficking and terrorism 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity-building and training on SALW issues 2. Promoting dialogue, awareness raising, education 3. Legislation, regulations and administrative procedures (includes import, export, transfers, licensing, end-user certificates)
LAS	<i>None listed</i>	Capacity-building and training
RECSA	<p><i>Not prioritized numerically</i></p> <p>Law enforcement Stockpile management and security Action-oriented research Promoting dialogue, awareness raising, education Weapons collection and destruction</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legislation, regulations and administrative procedures 2. Regional pool funds on small arms projects 3. Capacity-building and training on small arms issues 4. Building and strengthening partnerships between and among other states, organizations or civil society

A number of international organization field offices also responded on the types of assistance that they would like to provide in their region of work, but that need external assistance in order to do so. The responses are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Priorities for certain international organization field offices and regional centres

	Activity to implement if external resources were available
UNDP Ghana	Expand the local area network of the national firearms registry with a wide area network that covers all regional capitals Support skills training for the National Commission members and Secretariat Improve armouries of the armed forces and police Support alternative livelihoods and weapons for development for local manufacturers and post-conflict communities Improve border control and management Support civil society organizations in awareness raising education
UNDP Liberia	Support border control work of the Liberia National Police Vehicles, scanners, communication equipment, rain gear Training
UNREC	DDR SSR Improving relations between civilians and military forces Creating a code of ethics for the military and security institutions
UNICEF BiH	Research on SALW impact on children Research on SALW children risk perception Advocacy Implement school-based SALW projects in support to Ministry of Education SALW curricula Establish and maintain coordination of SALW awareness strategy for BiH Support the development of SALW awareness and advocacy capacities Support the establishment of country information management system on SALW

SECTION III

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are some positive findings with respect to international assistance to implement the PoA. At least US\$ 660 million has been allocated to assist over 94 countries implement the PoA since 2001.

Nevertheless, the estimate of US\$ 660 million spread globally over five years is indeed modest considering the breadth and scope of SALW problems. Mine action, for instance, received about US\$ 400 million in 2004 alone. Furthermore, the information gathered and the additional written and oral communications that formed the research for this study suggest that there is a lack of coordination and coherence for giving and receiving assistance.

Donors lack knowledge of the different technical and financial needs of individual states and regions to implement the PoA and affected states often lack the capacity to assess their own needs. It is also very difficult to ascertain the full extent of international assistance allocated to date in light of the numerous challenges to gathering data. Further methodological thinking is needed as is cooperation from states. Low levels of inter-departmental coordination and inadequate records of assistance make it harder to account for assistance provided and received. This makes strategic planning of activities more difficult. It is also difficult to establish activities that have long-term objectives and partnerships when the allocation of assistance is limited to one- or two-year funding cycles.

Affected states often lack the capacity and resources to make requests for assistance to donors due partly to a lack of knowledge of how to formulate and submit the requests and partly to inadequate resources of National Commissions, where they exist. The evidence also suggests that when assistance has not been channelled directly to the government (for example, when it has been given to NGOs), affected states may not know the details of the assistance that has been provided, particularly the monetary value. This makes it difficult for a country to assess and evaluate its level of progress in implementing the PoA.

The following recommendations are derived from the suggestions that states made as well as the findings from this project. States are encouraged to consider the recommendations for immediate action and to engage in dialogue on other possibilities for improving international PoA assistance.

CAPACITY-BUILDING

A competent National Commission, coordinating body and point of contact and the development of a National Action Plan help confirm a state's political will to implement the PoA and guide future action on SALW. National Action Plans that detail immediate and long-term objectives would help donors and implementing communities target the needs of a state and would make it easier to coordinate with other agencies. States that have not yet established a National Commission, coordinating body or National Action Plan are encouraged to do so, and donors are encouraged to help build the capacity of National Commissions and coordinating bodies and help affected states develop such national plans of action.

A well-funded, well-resourced National Commission is an important and cost-effective investment in building capacity in a country or region.

The work of National Commissions, coordinating bodies and focal points *in both donor and affected states* requires an increased level of inter-departmental communication and coordination.

To ensure the sustainability and coherence of action, donors are encouraged to engage local resources as much as possible for consulting on project designs and assisting in the implementation of the project.

RECORDING POA ASSISTANCE

It is important for National Commissions and relevant bodies to keep an accurate account of the PoA activities that have been provided or received and for handling requests for assistance. Records of PoA activities are necessary for proper and effective monitoring of international assistance, sharing of information and assessing the progress of PoA implementation. Such records would facilitate inter-departmental coordination, maintain institutional memory and help governments and organizations make wise strategic choices in programming.

Detailed records would assist states to prepare their national reports. It would be useful for states to follow a template on international assistance when preparing the national reports that would list a state's priorities for assistance and practical means for implementing the desired activities.⁵⁸

It is important for civil society and implementing agencies to notify relevant government officials of the specific details of the PoA activities that they are implementing including location, beneficiaries, cost and the related PoA thematic issues being addressed.

THE REQUESTS PROCESS

Donors and organizations are encouraged to support and assist affected states to design and formulate requests for assistance and project proposals. Such support could be factored into the project proposal as a capacity-building measure.

It would be useful for donors to develop short and clear guidance on the types and format of project proposals that comply with donor requirements. This information would include where to send the proposals and the types of activities the various departments support. As access to the Internet is often limited in affected states, hard copies could be disseminated to governments and made readily available in field offices and missions. *Pro forma* request forms would simplify the making and processing of requests. It is also important for states requesting assistance to be aware of restrictions of fundable activities, and donors could include details of such restrictions in their guidance information.

CENTRALIZATION OF INFORMATION

States and organizations are encouraged to consider the establishment of an international clearinghouse or equivalent mechanism to centralize information and facilitate the matching needs and resources. Affected states that require assistance in a particular area could find out which donor states are offering funding or technical assistance for PoA activities, rather than having to approach donor governments individually. Likewise, it could help donors and implementing agencies to identify activities that they could support.

BROAD APPROACHES

As many SALW concerns are transnational in nature, it is essential for donors and implementing agencies to consider activities that have a regional approach. It would be useful for donors to take advantage of the flexibility and coordinated approaches that trust funds can offer.

The one- to two-year funding cycles of some activities limit their effectiveness and scope, whereas activities that are adequately funded with long-term planned objectives enhance the lasting success of an activity, and help implementers coordinate and establish sustainable partnerships. States are, therefore, encouraged to allocate funding to support long-term objectives.

SALW problems tend to be multifaceted and, therefore, a comprehensive approach is usually required; however, such an approach should not preclude the ability to disaggregate individual thematic issues.

It is important for donors, implementing agencies and affected states to be able to recognize the level of attention that the individual themes are receiving. This is relevant for evaluating progress on the thematic areas the activity is designed to address and to ensure that some activities, equal in merit but smaller in cost and scope, are not forgotten.

CLASSIFICATION

As a broad range of interpretations is currently given to what constitutes PoA activities and assistance to implement the PoA, it is important that the scope of PoA activities be clarified since many donors provide financial assistance from funds earmarked for SALW activities.

Similarly, it would be useful if capacity-building were not treated as a stand alone issue as has often been reported in the questionnaires and in alternative reports. Rather, project designers and implementers should clarify the issue area that capacity-building aims to address, for instance, capacity-building for a National Commission, capacity-building to address brokering, capacity-building to address transfers and so on. The significance of capacity-building assistance would then be clearer.

Notes

- ¹ *Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects*, Document A/CONF.192/15, 2001, Section IV, 2 (b).
- ² For a full analysis, see E. Kytömäki and V. Yankey-Wayne, 2004, *Implementing the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons: Analysis of the Reports Submitted by States in 2003*, Geneva, UNIDIR. See also E. Kytömäki and V. Yankey-Wayne, 2006, *Five Years of Implementing the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons: Regional Analysis of National Reports*, Geneva, UNIDIR.
- ³ Activities listed by states and organizations in their questionnaire responses are only included in this study if the activity addresses one or more of the thematic issues contained in the PoA, as listed in Box 1.
- ⁴ Group of Governmental Experts established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 56/24 V of 24 December 2001, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".
- ⁵ International Alert, International Action Network on Small Arms, Saferworld and the University of Bradford, 2003, *Implementing the Programme of Action 2003: Action by States and Civil*

Society, London, Biting the Bullet project: International Alert, International Action Network on Small Arms, Saferworld and the University of Bradford, 2006, *Reviewing Action on Small Arms 2006: Assessing the First Five Years of Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms*, London, Biting the Bullet project; E. Kytömäki and V. Yankey-Wayne, 2004, op. cit. See also E. Kytömäki and V. Yankey-Wayne, 2006, op. cit.

- 6 Ascertaining civil society's role in providing assistance to affected states for implementing the PoA was beyond the scope of this study; however, civil society is included inasmuch as states and organizations were asked to clarify the activities implemented by civil society organizations. Also, the PoA is a political agreement between states and this study focuses on the commitments of states. An assessment of civil society would be a worthy contribution in the future.
- 7 The questionnaires were distributed in February 2006 with a return deadline of April 2006. As it would not have been possible to accurately represent the full year of 2006, this study does not cover assistance activities beginning in 2006.
- 8 See Annex B.
- 9 Includes individual responses from field offices: UNICEF BiH and Haiti, and UNDP Kosovo, Ghana and Liberia.
- 10 Official Journal of the European Union, 2002, *Second Annual Report on the Implementation of the EU Joint Action of 12 July 2002 on the European Union's Contribution to Combating the Destabilizing Accumulation and Spread of Small Arms and Light Weapons*, Document 2002/C 330/01, 31 December, Brussels, European Union; *Ibid.*, *Third Annual Report*, 2003, Document 2003/C 312/01, 22 December; *Ibid.*, *Fourth Annual Report*, 2005, Document 2005/C 109/01, 4 May.
- 11 Regional summaries on international assistance, in addition to a summary of assistance allocated to LDCs, are provided in Annex A.
- 12 An activity is counted each time an activity was listed by a donor, recipient country, international organization or regional organization. If a small arms project was listed as beginning in 2001–2002 and then renewed for 2002–2003, it counts as two activities. As a number of projects (approximately 168) addressed multiple thematic issues, it was decided that the best way to illustrate the level of attention the different thematic issues received was to also count the number of occasions in which the thematic issue was addressed. Therefore, while the estimate of different *projects or activities* implemented was 600, there were approximately 768 instances in which thematic issue received some form of assistance.
- 13 See *Small Arms Survey 2002: Counting the Human Cost*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 63.
- 14 Though 2003 saw the largest amount of assistance provided in terms of the number of activities initiated (151) and in monetary value (US\$ 171 million), the upward trend did not continue for 2004 and 2005, with 127 activities/US\$ 135 million and 119/US\$ 111 million, respectively.
- 15 The starting dates for 22 activities at an approximate value of US\$ 5 million could not be accounted for in the available resources.
- 16 Note that the total US\$ 458 million reflects figures that extend beyond 2005 as in a number of cases the DDR activities are ongoing.
- 17 For the list of LDCs and other LDC details, see the United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island States web site at <www.un.org/special-rep/ohrls/ldc/list.htm>.
- 18 Questionnaire response: ICRC, Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, SEESAC, DDA, UNDP (UNDP field offices in Ghana and Liberia also responded to the questionnaire, which are reflected in the overall UNDP response unless there is a variance from the UNDP response in which case the appropriate field office is specifically referenced), DPA, DPI, DPKO, UNEP, UNICEF (although UNICEF headquarters did not return the questionnaire, two field offices did: UNICEF BiH, and UNICEF Haiti), UNIFEM, UNODC, UNREC, WCO, World Bank.

-
- 19 Questionnaire response: Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, DDA, UNDP, UNDP Ghana, DPKO, UNEP, UNICEF BiH, UNICEF Haiti, UNIFEM, UNODC, UNREC and WCO.
- 20 Questionnaire response: ICRC, DPA, DPI, World Bank.
- 21 Questionnaire response: Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, UNDP, UNICEF BiH, UNICEF Haiti, UNIFEM.
- 22 Questionnaire response: UNEP.
- 23 Questionnaire response: DDA, UNDP, DPKO, UNICEF Haiti, UNODC, UNREC, WCO.
- 24 The Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and Other Related Materials in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Region, at <www.sadc.int/english/documents/legal/protocols/firearms.php>.
- 25 The Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials, at <www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/a-63.html>.
- 26 The Andean Declaration on Security in the Americas, at <www.comunidadandina.org/INGLES/documentos/documentos/OASsecurity.htm>.
- 27 The EU Strategy to Combat Illicit Accumulation and Trafficking of SALW and their Ammunition, at <register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/06/st05/st05319.en06.pdf>.
- 28 Questionnaire response: the African Union (AU), Andean Community, League of Arab States (LAS), and Regional Centre for Small Arms (RECSA).
- 29 Questionnaire response: the European Commission, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), Organization for Security Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).
- 30 Questionnaire response: Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The OECD does not deal directly with small arms at this time; however, it included small arms in its approach to development in 2005.
- 31 Questionnaire response to a confidential question.
- 32 Questionnaire response: NATO, iterated as well by international organizations: Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare, DPKO, and indirectly by UNIFEM and the WCO.
- 33 Although the reintegration of ex-combatants is critical to prevent spoilers from destabilizing fragile peace, a respondent in Africa noted that “the protocol of the World Bank excludes disarmament activities from its credit, as a result no financing was available for the collection of arms and even less so for the destruction”.
- 34 Questionnaire response to a confidential question.
- 35 Questionnaire response to a confidential question.
- 36 For instance, Cameroon, Ecuador, Gambia, Jordan, Panama, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe stated that they did not know what the procedural requirements are for making requests and/or where the requests should be sent. Jamaica stated that it needs to formalize proposals in a more structured way. It is likely that a number of other affected states that did not respond to this question or that claimed they lack capacity as an explanation for not making requests are also unaware of how to make requests for assistance.
- 37 Questionnaire response: Bolivia, Cambodia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Iraq, Liberia, Malawi, Namibia, Panama, Senegal and Trinidad and Tobago.
- 38 Direct quotation, questionnaire: Namibia.
- 39 Direct quotation, questionnaire: Interpol Sub-Regional Bureau Harare.
- 40 Telephone conversation March 2006, country name withheld.
- 41 E-mail correspondence with a questionnaire respondent on 24 April 2006.
- 42 Questionnaire response: DDA, UNDP Ghana, WCO.
- 43 Questionnaire response: UNDP Ghana, UNICEF BiH, UNODC.
- 44 Questionnaire response: UNODC.
- 45 Questionnaire response: DPKO, UNEP.
- 46 For regional summaries of assistance desired as reflected in the national reports, see E. Kytömäki and V. Yankey-Wayne, 2006, *op. cit.*

- 47 UN national report on the implementation of the PoA of the Central African Republic (2003), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2002/centralafricanrepublic.pdf>.
- 48 For instance, the following commented that better coordination would assist them to match resources to needs: Canada, Finland, the Netherlands, RECSA, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Switzerland, UNDP, UNEP, United Kingdom, United States, UNODC.
- 49 Questionnaire response: Australia. However, the Pacific Island Forum has not confirmed that such a matrix exists.
- 50 Answer to question 9 for both questionnaires.
- 51 Questionnaire response: WCO.
- 52 Questionnaire response: UNDP Liberia.
- 53 Questionnaire response: UNDP Liberia, UNIFEM.
- 54 Questionnaire response: UNICEF BiH.
- 55 Namibia indicated that the assistance it received “relatively” addressed its biggest priorities.
- 56 Questionnaire response: Costa Rica.
- 57 See Section II: Overview of assistance currently allocated to implement the PoA.
- 58 For a good example of such a list, see the Central African Republic national report on implementation of the PoA (2003), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2002/centralafricanrepublic.pdf>.

ANNEX A

GEOGRAPHIC PROFILES

AFRICA

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 33 African countries and two regional organizations, which represents over a quarter of the total number of questionnaire responses and 46% of the responses from affected states. Among the responses, only Mauritius stated that the questionnaire does not apply to them as they do not receive, provide or desire PoA assistance. States in the two subregions of West Africa and East Africa, which have subregional organizations active in small arms issues, returned the largest number of questionnaires.

Africa: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
African Union	Gambia	PCASED/ECOSAP*
Angola*	Ghana	RECSA
Burkina Faso	Guinea*	Republic of the Congo*
Burundi	Guinea-Bissau*	SADC*
Cameroon	Kenya	Sao Tome and Principe
Central African Republic*	Liberia	Senegal
Chad	Lesotho	Sierra Leone
Côte d'Ivoire	Malawi	Somalia*
Djibouti	Mali	South Africa Sudan
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Mauritania	Tanzania (United Republic of)*
ECOWAS*	Mozambique	Togo
Eritrea*	Namibia	Uganda
Ethiopia	Niger	Zimbabwe
Gabon	Nigeria	
Provided assistance		
African Union	PCASED/ECOSAP*	SADC*
ECOWAS*	RECSA	South Africa
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
Mauritius		

* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

In terms of how respondents in African countries characterize the levels of SALW availability and SALW-related violence in their respective countries: eight consider themselves to have areas that are in conflict and/or have areas of general instability; seven have high levels of both availability

and SALW-related violence; eight have a high level of availability and a low level of violence; eight have low levels of both availability and related violence; one has no small arms problem and one did not respond to the question (see Annex B).

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, African countries have received approximately US\$ 409 million in PoA assistance, administered to implement 252 PoA activities.
- The most common type of PoA-related assistance for Africa has been for DDR, which has received an estimated US\$ 323 million for about 64 DDR activities. This figure accounts for 79% of the total amount of assistance provided to Africa and 49% of the global total of PoA assistance.
- Of the total allocated for DDR in Africa, 43% solely targeted reintegration activities.
- At least 17 countries (as well as a regional-level programme covering the Great Lakes) benefited from DDR assistance, of which at least 47% was allocated to the countries of Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Sudan.
- Other areas of assistance include children in armed conflict, which primarily related to reintegration (US\$ 31 million, 10 activities, eight countries); capacity-building (US\$ 17 million, 54 activities, which were primarily building regional capacity but also in 14 countries); weapons collection (US\$ 14 million, 21 activities in 11 countries); destruction (US\$ 2.9 million, 17 activities in 16 countries). Donors provided 14 instances of support (US\$ 820, 000) toward supporting National Commissions.
- Excluding DDR, assistance to African countries account for about 13% of the global total.
- There are 26 countries that have received less than US\$ 2 million of assistance each, half of which are LDCs.¹

Charts A.1 and A.2 summarize the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to African countries. Chart A.1 includes all activities and Chart A.2 excludes DDR in order to give a better indication of the other PoA activities.

Chart A.1. Africa: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005





Chart A.2. Africa: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)



ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.1 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Donors and implementing agencies are encouraged to examine the national reports for possible elaboration on the types of assistance that states require. Zimbabwe, for instance, stated in its 2005 national report on the implementation of the PoA:

We would greatly appreciate assistance in the form of computerization of the Central Firearm Registry presently it is done manually. Training of personnel in records management is also a necessity. All our ports of entry need to be computerized and have proper x-ray machines and scanners to detect hidden weapons.²

Although the Republic of the Congo did not return a questionnaire, it stated in its 2003 national report on implementation of the PoA that it would like assistance to collect approximately 15,000–20,000 arms.³ Similarly, in its 2005 national report, Zambia stated that it requires technical and financial assistance for capacity-building, including the establishment of a National Commission in addition to assistance to collect surplus “illegal” arms and improve their border control system.⁴ In its 2003 national report, the Central African Republic included a table of the types of assistance it would like to receive ranging from training and identifying weapons caches to technical equipment, border controls and a regional strategy to address proliferation.⁵

Table A.1. Africa: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
AFRICA																		
EAST AFRICA																		
Burundi	2	1	3								4						5	
Kenya		Y		Y						Y		Y	Y	Y			Y	
Uganda							3	1	4		5	2						
HORN OF AFRICA																		
Djibouti	Y				Y							Y					Y	Y
Ethiopia		3	1						2					4			5	
SOUTH AFRICA																		
Botswana		Y			Y		Y						Y					Y
Lesotho		Y					Y	Y				Y						Y
Malawi	Y	Y					Y			Y			Y					
Mozambique	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y											
Namibia		Y	Y		Y		Y						Y					
South Africa		Y		Y	Y				Y									Y
Zimbabwe	Y		Y			Y	Y	Y										
WEST AFRICA																		
Burkina Faso	5	1			3		4											2
Côte d'Ivoire		Y	Y										Y					Y
Gambia	Y	Y			Y		Y					Y						
Ghana	Y	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y			Y					
Liberia	Y	Y			Y		Y					Y						
Mali		3					1		2	5		4						
Niger		1											Y					Y
Nigeria	Y		Y		Y								Y			Y		
Senegal		Y	Y			Y					Y							Y
Sierra Leone	Y	Y										Y	Y					Y
Togo	Y	Y					Y	Y	Y									
CENTRAL AFRICA																		
Cameroon	2	1	5		3													4
Chad							Y				Y							
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Y	Y	Y							Y								Y
Gabon	1	3					2						5				4	
Sao Tomé and Príncipe	Y	Y	Y		Y					Y								Y
NORTH AFRICA																		
Mauritania			Y				Y											Y
Sudan	1			5			4				2	3						

AMERICAS

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 19 countries in the Americas and two subregional organizations, of which two states have been donors and three respondents (two states and one subregional organization) returned the questionnaire stating that it does not apply to them. A total of 15 states have either received assistance in the past or have expressed an interest in receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Three states did not respond to the questionnaire but, according to donors, have received assistance.

Americas: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Andean Community	Guatemala	Paraguay
Argentina	Guyana*	Peru
Brazil*	Haiti*	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Bolivia	Honduras*	Suriname*
Colombia*	Jamaica	Trinidad and Tobago
Ecuador	Nicaragua	Uruguay
El Salvador	OAS*	
Grenada	Panama	
Provided assistance at least once since 2001		
Andean Community	Mercosur*	United States
Canada	OAS*	
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
Mexico	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	

* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

In terms of how respondents in Latin America and the Caribbean that receive or desire assistance characterized the level of SALW availability and related violence in their respective countries: seven have high levels of availability and related violence; four have a high level of availability but a low level of related violence; and seven have low levels of both availability and related violence (see Annex B).

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, about 18 countries in the Americas have received approximately US\$ 41 million in PoA assistance to implement about 113 different activities.
- Almost half of this financial total, however, was channelled in 2004–2006 toward the US\$ 19.8 million DDR programme in Haiti. There has, otherwise, not been a large focus on DDR activities in the Americas, other than that received by Colombia.
- The notable features of PoA assistance in the Americas include: having a strong regional approach in the activities implemented; the large emphasis put on promoting dialogue and awareness-raising activities, which—aside from the DDR mission in Haiti—have received

the largest sum of assistance (US\$ 6 million); and being the only reported recipient of a programme that specifically targets tracing SALW and ammunition through a 2002–2004 initiative of Switzerland for Brazil (US\$ 350,000).

- UN-LiREC has played a large role in Latin America and the Caribbean for providing technical assistance and in the areas of destruction, capacity-building and training.
- A concern expressed by some of the smaller states is the difficulty in attracting SALW assistance funding when their small arms problems are viewed in comparison to larger and/or conflict-affected countries.

Charts A.3 and A.4 summarize the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to the Americas. Chart A.3 includes all activities and Chart A.4 excludes DDR in order to give a better comparison of the other PoA activities.

Chart A.3. Americas: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005





Chart A.4. Americas: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)

ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.2 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Although Honduras did not return a questionnaire, it stated in its 2004 national report for implementation of the PoA that it would like to receive assistance for brokering, legislation, record keeping, customs and borders and capacity-building.⁶

Table A.2. Americas: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
AMERICAS																		
CARIBBEAN																		
Jamaica		Y	Y	Y			Y											Y
Saint Kitts and Nevis				Y	Y													Y
Trinidad and Tobago		2			4							5	3	1				
CENTRAL AMERICA																		
Costa Rica		1				4	2		3				5					
El Salvador	Y	Y					Y	Y		Y								
Guatemala		Y	Y							Y			Y	Y				
Nicaragua	4	2					1			3								5
Panama			Y	Y		Y	Y	Y										
SOUTH AMERICA																		
Argentina		2		5				4	1	3								
Bolivia		Y	Y		Y		Y										Y	Y
Ecuador		3					2	1			4							5
Paraguay		Y	Y				Y							Y			Y	
Peru		Y							Y	Y								
Uruguay					Y			Y				Y	Y					Y

ASIA

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 13 Asian countries, of which two have acted as donors and five returned the questionnaire stating that it does not apply to them. Six states have either received assistance in the past or have expressed an interest in receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Three states did not respond to the questionnaire but, according to donors, have received assistance. ASEAN also returned the questionnaire, however, it has no mandate to implement the PoA and thus the questionnaire did not apply.

Asia: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Afghanistan*	Indonesia	Philippines*
Bhutan	Maldives	Sri Lanka
Cambodia	Nepal	Timor-Leste*
Provided assistance at least once since 2001		
China	Japan	
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
ASEAN	Korea (Republic of)	Singapore
Bangladesh	Malaysia	Thailand
India		

* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

In terms of how respondents of Asian countries that receive or desire assistance characterized the levels of SALW availability and related violence in their respective countries: two consider themselves to have areas that are in conflict and/or have areas of general instability; one has a high level of availability and a low level of violence; two have low levels of both availability and related violence; and one has no small arms problem (see Annex B).

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, approximately US\$ 135 million has been allocated to 74 different PoA activities in Asia of which 85% was specifically directed toward Afghanistan and Cambodia.
- Afghanistan received approximately US\$ 94 million in PoA assistance. Ex-combatants were the main beneficiaries of this assistance with approximately US\$ 87 million allocated for DDR, in particular reintegration. Approximately US\$ 5 million has been used for the destruction of arms and ammunition in Afghanistan.
- Cambodia received approximately US\$ 22 million in PoA assistance. The EU and Japan both sponsored and implemented comprehensive small arms programmes that covered a range of issues from, inter alia, legislation, collection and destruction to registration and reintegration.
- While both Afghanistan and Cambodia are considered LDCs, the other Asian LDCs—Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal and Timor-Leste—have received about US\$ 4 million in assistance that, in particular, addressed DDR in Nepal and reintegration in Timor-Leste.⁷

In its response to the questionnaire, however, Bangladesh stated that it does not require assistance to implement the PoA and, although the Maldives would like some assistance for related issues, it stated that it does not have a small arms problem.

- The two countries—Nepal and Sri Lanka—that characterized their SALW situation as having areas either in conflict or with general instability have received about US\$ 4 million since 2001. This does not account, however, for the financial assistance for the UNDP’s DDR programme in Nepal, for which details have not been provided by either UNDP or Nepal. Sri Lanka has received some support for its National Commission, however, most of the assistance was aimed at reintegration, notably the Swedish-funded “Rights of Women and Children in Sri Lanka”, which included several components with a special focus on children affected by armed conflict (US\$ 3.5 million).
- Indonesia characterized itself as having a high level of SALW availability but a low level of related violence and has received about US\$ 12 million. The main activities in Indonesia include a monitoring demobilization and decommissioning armaments (about US\$ 11 million) funded by the EU and a UNDP programme focusing on DDR and awareness raising (just over US\$ 1 million).
- As a region, Asian states have also benefited from 12 joint Asia–Pacific seminars and training (US\$ 460,000) sponsored by Japan on such issues as enforcement, intelligence management and anti-smuggling.

Charts A.5 and A.6 summarize the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to Asia. Chart A.5 includes all activities and Chart A.6 excludes DDR in order to give a better comparison of the other PoA activities.

Chart A.5. Asia: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005





Chart A.6. Asia: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)

ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.3 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

In its response, Bhutan specified that the type of assistance it needs is technical. Indonesia specified that it needs technical and financial assistance for its National Commission, capacity-building and training and law enforcement and that it requires technical assistance to address customs and borders and legislation, regulation and administrative procedures. Cambodia commented,

The Royal Government of Cambodia is grateful for the assistance received so far from the international community. ... Our problems now are largely of another nature, that is developing the capacity to meet the international requirements of the United Nations SALW control measures. Cambodia also requires technical assistance to stimulate regional SALW co-operation on SALW issues. However, ammunition security still remains a major problem.

Table A.3. Asia: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
ASIA																		
Bhutan	Y	Y																
Cambodia	1	3					5					4					2	
Indonesia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y													
Maldives												Y					Y	
Nepal	Y	Y				Y				Y	Y							
Sri Lanka		2		4						5				3			1	

EUROPE

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 35 states in Europe, which includes CIS and members of the Stability Pact. A total of 20 questionnaires were returned from countries that have provided assistance at least once since 2001. Although seven states returned the questionnaire stating that the questionnaire does not apply to them, it is possible that these countries have provided assistance, particularly as part of OSCE and NATO SALW initiatives.

Four countries from CIS and six countries from the Stability Pact responded to the questionnaire as countries that receive or require assistance. However, according to other sources Albania, Moldova, Romania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan have also received some form of assistance since 2001.

Europe: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Albania*	Kosovo-UNMIK	Serbia and Montenegro
Belarus	Kazakhstan	Romania*
Bulgaria	Macedonia (The Former	Tajikistan
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yugoslav Republic of)	Turkmenistan*
Croatia	Malta	Uzbekistan*
Georgia	Moldova*	
Provided assistance at least once since 2001		
Austria	Germany*	Norway*
Belgium	Greece*	OSCE
Czech Republic	Hungary	Poland
Denmark	Ireland	Slovak Republic
Estonia	Italy	Switzerland
European Commission	Lithuania	Sweden
European Council*	Luxembourg	Turkey
Finland	NATO	United Kingdom
France*	Netherlands	
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
Liechtenstein	OECD	Slovenia
Monaco	Russian Federation	

* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

In terms of how respondents from the states in this region that receive or require assistance characterized the small arms situation in their respective countries, Kosovo stated that it has high levels of availability and related violence; Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine stated that they have a high level of SALW availability but a low level of related violence; and Croatia, Kazakhstan and Serbia and Montenegro reported having low levels of both availability and related violence in their country. Bulgaria and Malta both

reported not having a small arms situation but that assistance on specific issues would still be desirable (see Annex B).

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and of the Stability Pact have received approximately US\$ 64 million in assistance to implement about 200 activities of the PoA of which approximately US\$ 9 million has been allocated to 12 members of CIS (46 activities) and about US\$ 55 million to approximately 10 Stability Pact countries.
- The main recipients of assistance in the Stability Pact were Moldova (US\$ 24 million, though not yet fully implemented),⁸ Albania (US\$ 9 million), Serbia and Montenegro (US\$ 6 million), Bosnia and Herzegovina (US\$ 3 million), Bulgaria (US\$ 2.5 million) and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (US\$ 2 million).
- The main recipients of assistance in members of CIS are Ukraine (US\$ 5 million), Tajikistan (almost US\$ 2 million) and Georgia (US\$ 1 million).
- Destruction has been the main area of concentration in both CIS and Stability Pact countries, receiving US\$ 7 million (10 activities) and US\$ 38 million (31 activities) respectively, which accounts for about 65% of the regional total of financial assistance.
- Ammunition featured in 49% of the activities (US\$ 44 million).
- Stockpile management (US\$ 4 million, 28 activities) and capacity-building (US\$ 3 million, 49 activities) were the next most commonly implemented activities in this region.
- The majority of capacity-building assistance took place in the form of OSCE workshops that addressed trafficking. The nature of the assistance received by the Kyrgyz Republic, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan was only in the form of these workshops.
- With the support of NATO, OSCE and SEESAC, the region has benefited from a number of regionally focused initiatives (41 activities) and almost a quarter of all activities inclusively cover more than one theme.

Charts A.7 and A.8 summarize the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to Europe (CIS and Stability Pact). Chart A.7 includes all activities and Chart A.8 excludes destruction in order to give a better comparison of the other PoA activities.

Chart A.7. Europe: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005





Chart A.8. Europe: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding destruction)



ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.4 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Table A.4. Europe: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening Partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts	
EUROPE																			
<i>CIS</i>																			
Belarus			2	5	4			3	1										
Georgia	1						3	4				5							
Kazakhstan			Y	Y				Y		Y	Y								
Ukraine						Y	Y		Y										
<i>STABILITY PACT</i>																			
Bosnia and Herzegovina		Y				Y		Y	Y	Y									
Bulgaria									1										
Croatia			Y		Y	Y		Y	Y										
Kosovo	Y	Y	Y						Y	Y			Y						
Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic of)	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y												
Malta		4			2			3											1
Serbia and Montenegro		Y	Y						Y						Y	Y			

MIDDLE EAST

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from five states in the Middle East and one regional organization. While Egypt and Syria both characterized their states as having no small arms problem, Jordan characterized itself as having low levels of SALW availability and related violence and Iraq characterized itself as being in a conflict situation. Qatar stated that the questionnaire does not apply to them as they do not provide, receive or desire PoA assistance.


Middle East: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Egypt Iraq	Jordan Syria	LAS
Provided assistance at least once since 2001		
LAS		
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
Qatar		

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, states in the Middle East have received assistance for capacity-building. In 2004, Germany provided assistance for establishing a regional focal point on SALW issues for LAS, and Germany and Switzerland organized orientations for building the capacity of LAS to address SALW.
- The Netherlands supported a workshop in Jordan in 2001 to discuss the PoA and the first meeting of Arab National Focal Points on SALW issues was held in 2005 in Egypt.
- Although Iraq, Jordan and Syria had not received international assistance for implementing the PoA by 2005, they stated in their responses to the questionnaire that they would like to receive assistance.
- Iraq anticipates a number of PoA-related activities to commence in 2006 such as the creation of a point of contact for SALW; care and rehabilitation for children affected by SALW; cooperation with civil society and mass media institutions; establishment of Internet connection infrastructure; training courses for executive officers; and collection and destruction of SALW.

Chart A.9 summarizes the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to the Middle East.

Chart A.9. Middle East: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005



ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.5 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Table A.5. Middle East: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
MIDDLE EAST																		
Iraq	Y					Y			Y	Y		Y						
Jordan			5	1				4		3							2	
Syria	1	2											4	3		5		

In its returned questionnaire, Syria specified that it would like assistance to obtain a system to store their related data stating: “Do think that this system will help us greatly to control SALW and solve and reduce crimes”.⁹

PACIFIC

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from five Pacific countries, two of which—Australia and New Zealand—act as donors. While Fiji characterized itself as having no small arms problem, the Federated States of Micronesia characterized itself as having low levels of SALW availability and related violence and Papua New Guinea characterized itself as having high levels of SALW availability and related violence. Although the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu did not return the questionnaire, donors have stated they have provided PoA-related assistance to them. An upcoming mutual assistance programme to improve armoury security and storage, maintenance and management of weapons is aimed at the Cook Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.

Pacific: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Cook Islands*	Papua New Guinea	Tonga*
Fiji	Solomon Islands*	Vanuatu*
Micronesia (Federated States of)		
Provided assistance at least once since 2001		
Australia	New Zealand	


* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

KEY FINDINGS

- Since 2001, approximately US\$ 8 million and 19 different PoA activities have been allocated to the Pacific. This does not, however, include the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands and the Bougainville Peace Process as it was not possible to distinguish which elements of the large mandates and how much of the respective US\$ 630 million and US\$ 150 million budgets would have been spent on PoA-related activities.
- Assistance to the Pacific concentrated primarily on stockpile management, particularly with respect to the building and maintaining of secure armouries by Australia in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Vanuatu. Furthermore, an initiative of the New Zealand Defence force, the mutual assistance programme focuses on helping regional defence and police forces improve security, storage and maintenance of weapons in such countries as the Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands.
- The Solomon Islands received assistance for DDR in 2002–2003 (US\$ 1.4 million) from the European Commission, Japan and UNDP.
- In 2005, Australia and UNDP provided funding for a Gun Control Summit held in Papua New Guinea.
- As a region, Pacific states have also benefited from 12 Asia-Pacific seminars and training (US\$ 460,000) sponsored by Japan on such issues as enforcement, intelligence management and anti-smuggling.

Chart A.10 summarizes the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to the Pacific countries

Chart A.10. Pacific: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005



ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.6 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Table A.6. Pacific: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening Partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
PACIFIC																		
Fiji			Y		Y			Y									Y	
Micronesia (Federated States of)		Y		Y	Y							Y					Y	
Papua New Guinea	Y		Y				Y				Y						Y	

LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

PROFILE OF RESPONSES

UNIDIR received questionnaire responses from 25 of the 50 LDCs of which 20 of the responses came from African states and five from Asia.

LDCs: assistance received and/or provided		
Assistance received and/or desired		
Afghanistan*	Gambia	Samoa*
Angola*	Guinea*	Sao Tome and Principe
Bhutan	Guinea-Bissau*	Senegal
Burkina Faso	Haiti*	Sierra Leone
Burundi	Lesotho	Solomon Islands*
Cambodia	Liberia	Somalia*
Cape Verde*	Malawi	Sudan
Central African Republic*	Maldives	Tanzania (United Republic of)*
Chad	Mali	Timor-leste*
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Mauritania	Togo
Djibouti	Mozambique	Uganda
Eritrea*	Nepal	Vanuatu*
Ethiopia	Niger	
	Rwanda*	
Assistance was not provided, received or desired (questionnaire does not apply)		
Bangladesh		

* did not return questionnaire but provided or received assistance according to other sources

The questionnaire asked respondents to characterize what they *perceive* to be the levels of SALW availability and violence in their countries. Among the LDC respondents, five consider themselves to have areas that are in conflict and/or have areas of general instability; four to have high levels of SALW availability and SALW-related violence; and six to have a high level of SALW availability but a low level of related violence. While seven countries claimed to have low levels of both availability and violence, two stated that they have no SALW problem at all (see Annex B).

KEY FINDINGS

- Since the PoA was agreed in 2001, LDCs have received approximately US\$ 463 million in PoA assistance to implement 194 different PoA activities.
- An additional US\$ 34 million was allocated to regions or regional organizations that represent a large number of LDCs.
- The most common type of PoA-related assistance for LDCs has been for DDR, accounting for about 90% of the total financial assistance provided.
- During 2001–2005, approximately 85 different DDR activities have been implemented at an estimated value of US\$ 417 million. This total also includes some of the operational and staff costs of the DDR activities administered by the DPKO. Just under half (45%) of the DDR activities focused primarily on reintegration.

- With respect to the total number of states that have received DDR assistance, all but three are LDCs. LDCs that have received DDR assistance include: Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Timor-Leste.
- The second most common theme to receive assistance was weapons collection (22 activities with an approximate value of US\$ 25 million, although US\$ 21 of the US\$ 25 million were projects that additionally covered destruction, stockpile management, and legislation) followed by destruction (16 activities with an approximate value of US\$ 8 million) and capacity-building (11 activities with an approximate value of US\$ 1.7 million).
- According to 18 of the 26 countries that returned the questionnaire, the level of assistance received to date is insufficient. Seven of the 26 countries revealed that the assistance received addressed their most important priorities.
- The following countries received less than US\$ 1 million during 2001–2005 as assistance to implement the PoA: Burkina Faso, Central Africa Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, Lesotho, Mali, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Vanuatu.

Charts A.11 and A.12 summarize the value and number of PoA assistance activities allocated to LDCs. Chart A.11 includes all activities and Chart A.12 excludes DDR in order to give a better comparison of the other PoA activities.

Chart A.11. Least Developed Countries: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005





Chart A.12. Least Developed Countries: activities by frequency and value, 2001–2005 (excluding DDR)

ASSISTANCE DESIRED

The questionnaire asked states to rate their top five priorities of the assistance that they would like to receive and to list the other themes that were not among the top five but were recognized as important issues for receiving assistance to implement the PoA. Table A.7 reflects these responses by numbering the top five priorities as provided by states. Boxes with the letter “Y” represent the top five priorities of states that did not provide a numerical ordering of the priorities. Lightly shaded boxes are additional priorities beyond the top five.

Table A.7. Least Developed Countries: assistance desired

	National Commissions	Capacity-building	Legislation	Law enforcement	Customs and borders	Brokering	Record keeping	Marking and tracing	Stockpile management	Destruction	Collection	DDR	Strengthening partnerships	Awareness raising	Research	Children	Linked issues	Money into trusts
AFRICA																		
EAST AFRICA																		
Burundi	2	1	3								4						5	
Uganda						3	1	4		5	2							
HORN OF AFRICA																		
Djibouti	Y				Y							Y					Y	Y
Ethiopia		3	1					2					4				5	
SOUTH AFRICA																		
Botswana		Y			Y		Y						Y					Y
Lesotho		Y					Y		Y	Y			Y					Y
Malawi	Y	Y					Y			Y			Y					
Mozambique	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y											
WEST AFRICA																		
Burkina Faso	5	1			3		4											2
Gambia	Y	Y			Y		Y					Y						
Liberia	Y	Y			Y		Y					Y						
Mali		3					1		2	5			4					
Niger		1											Y					Y
Senegal		Y	Y			Y					Y							Y
Sierra Leone	Y	Y										Y	Y					Y
Togo	Y	Y					Y		Y	Y								
CENTRAL AFRICA																		
Chad							Y				Y							
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Y	Y	Y							Y								Y
Sao Tomé and Príncipe	Y	Y	Y		Y					Y								Y
NORTH AFRICA																		
Mauritania			Y				Y											Y
Sudan	1			5			4				2	3						
ASIA																		
Bangladesh	(none)																	
Bhutan	Y	Y																
Cambodia	1	3						5					4					2
Nepal	Y	Y					Y				Y	Y						

ANNEX B

QUESTIONNAIRE RECIPIENTS

States that returned the questionnaire and identify themselves as receiving and/or desiring assistance (affected states)	
AFRICA	
Central Africa	Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe
East and Horn of Africa	Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda
North Africa	Mauritania, Sudan
South Africa	Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe
West Africa	Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo
AMERICAS	
Caribbean	Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago
Central America	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Panama, Nicaragua
South America	Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay
ASIA	Bhutan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka
EUROPE	Malta
CIS	Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine
Stability Pact	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo [*] , Macedonia (The Former Yugoslav Republic of), Serbia and Montenegro
MIDDLE EAST	Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Syria
PACIFIC	Fiji, Micronesia (Federated States of), Papua New Guinea

* Kosovo–United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo. Questionnaire completed by UNDP.

Donor states that returned the questionnaire

Australia	Ireland	South Africa
Austria	Japan	Sweden
Belgium	Lithuania	Switzerland
Canada	Luxembourg	Turkey
Denmark	the Netherlands	United Kingdom
China	New Zealand	United States
Finland	Poland	
Hungary	Russian Federation	

States that responded that the questionnaire does not apply to them—they neither provide nor receive PoA assistance¹⁰

Bangladesh	Liechtenstein	Republic of Korea
Czech Republic	Malaysia	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Estonia	Mauritius	Singapore
Greece	Mexico	Slovenia
Holy See	Monaco	Thailand
India	Qatar	
Italy		

States that did not return the questionnaire, but did provide assistance-related information in UN national reports and/or EU annual reports

Albania	Germany	Spain
Algeria	Honduras	Tajikistan
Brazil	Norway	Yemen
Central African Republic	Republic of the Congo	Zambia
Colombia	Solomon Islands	

States that did not return the questionnaire

Albania	Guinea	Republic of the Marshall Islands
Algeria	Guinea-Bissau	Romania
Andorra	Guyana	Rwanda
Angola	Haiti	Saint Lucia
Antigua and Barbuda	Honduras	Samoa
Armenia	Iceland	San Marino
Azerbaijan	Islamic Republic of Iran	Saudi Arabia
Bahrain	Israel	Seychelles
Barbados	Kiribati	Solomon Islands
Belize	Kuwait	Somalia
Benin	Kyrgyz Republic	Spain
Brazil	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Suriname
Brunei Darussalam	Latvia	Swaziland
Cape Verde	Lebanon	Tajikistan
Central African Republic	Libya	Tanzania (United Republic of)
Chile	Madagascar	Timor-Leste
Colombia	Mongolia	Tonga
Comoros	Morocco	Tunisia
Cook Islands	Myanmar	Turkmenistan
Cuba	Nauru	Tuvalu
Cyprus	Norway	United Arab Emirates
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Oman	Uzbekistan
Dominica	Pakistan	Vanuatu
Dominican Republic	Palau	Venezuela *
Equatorial Guinea	Palestine	Viet Nam
Eritrea	Philippines	Yemen
Fiji	Portugal	Zambia
France	Republic of Moldova	
Germany	Republic of the Congo	

* Venezuela returned its national report in lieu of the questionnaire.

Organizations that returned the questionnaire and to which the questionnaire applies

Regional organizations

African Union (AU)
 Andean Community
 European Commission
 League of Arab States (LAS)
 North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)
 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
 Organization for Security Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)
 Regional Centre on SALW (RECSA)

International organizations

International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) sub-regional bureau Harare
 UN Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA)
 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
 UNDP field office Ghana (UNDP Ghana)
 UNDP field office Liberia (UNDP Liberia)
 UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)
 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
 United Nations Children's Fund field office in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNICEF BiH)
 UNICEF field office Haiti
 United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)
 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
 South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC)
 United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa (UNREC)
 World Customs Organization (WCO)

International and regional organizations that responded that the questionnaire does not apply to them—they neither provide nor receive PoA assistance

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)
 Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat
 European Police Office (EUROPOL)
 International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
 UN Department of Political Affairs (DPA)
 UN Department of Public Information (DPI)
 World Bank

International and regional organizations that did not return the questionnaire

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
 Mercosur
 Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
 Organization of American States (OAS)
 Pacific Islands Forum
 Southern African Development Community (SADC)
 United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (except for field offices BiH and Haiti)
 Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
 Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
 World Health Organization (WHO)

Perceived levels of SALW availability and violence—characterization of affected states that responded to the questionnaire

States in conflict/general instability (Conflict)	Ethiopia, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Uganda
High availability/high violence (High/High)	Cameroon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kosovo, Lesotho, Liberia, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Senegal
High availability/low violence (High/Low)	Argentina, Belarus, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ghana, Indonesia, Macedonia (The Former Yugoslav Republic of), Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia
Low availability/low violence (Low/Low)	Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Croatia, Djibouti, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Mauritania

Notes

- ¹ For the list of LDCs and other LDC details see the United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island States web site at <www.un.org/special-rep/ohrrls/ldc/list.htm>.
- ² See the Zimbabwe national report on implementation of the PoA (2005), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2005/Zimbabwe.pdf>.
- ³ See the Republic of the Congo national report on implementation of the PoA, at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2002/congo.pdf>.
- ⁴ See the Zambia national report on implementation of the PoA (2005), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2005/Zambia.pdf>.
- ⁵ See the Central African Republic national report on implementation of the PoA (2003), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2002/centralafricanrepublic.pdf>.
- ⁶ See the Honduras national report on implementation of the PoA (2004), at <disarmament.un.org/cab/nationalreports/2003/Honduras-e.pdf>.

- ⁷ The total of US\$ 4 million, however, represents Japan's contribution to the reintegration programme in Timor-Leste. The amount was not available for the 2003–2004 UNDP DDR programme in Nepal.
- ⁸ Moldova has been a member of the Stability Pact since 2001 and is also a member of CIS. For the purposes of this analysis, it was grouped with the Stability Pact countries because it was more closely affiliated with the Stability Pact countries in certain regional activities.
- ⁹ Questionnaire: Syria, translation from Arabic to English.
- ¹⁰ Other sources have revealed that assistance was provided or received by some of these countries.

ACRONYMS

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AU	African Union
CARICOM	Caribbean Community Secretariat
CASA	Coordinating Action on Small Arms
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
DDA	Department for Disarmament Affairs (United Nations)
DDR	disarmament, demobilization and reintegration
DPA	Department of Political Affairs (United Nations)
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations (United Nations)
DPI	Department of Public Information (United Nations)
ECOSAP	ECOWAS Small Arms Control Programme
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
EUROPOL	European Police Office
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
Interpol	International Criminal Police Organization
IT	information technology
LAS	League of Arab States
LDC	least developed country
Mercosur	Southern Common Market (Mercado Común del Sur)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NGO	non-governmental organization
NPC	National Point of Contact (on small arms)
OAS	Organization of American States
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PCASED	Program for Coordination and Assistance for Security and Development in Africa
PoA	Programme of Action for Combating the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects
RECSA	Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SALW	small arms and light weapons
SEESAC	South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons
SSR	Security Sector Reform
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNICEF BiH	UNICEF office in Bosnia and Herzegovina
UNIDIR	United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UN-LiREC	United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean
UNMIK	United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNREC	United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa

WCO World Customs Organization
WHO World Health Organization