



SMALL ARMS MONITOR

*Civil society perspectives on the Third Review Conference of the
UN Programme of Action on small arms
18-29 June 2018*



Reaching Critical Will

27 June 2018
Vol. 10, No. 4

IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial: The world deserves better than the lowest common denominator
- 3 | Ammunition control practices in Latin America and the Caribbean
- 6 | Side event report: Gender lenses on
- 7 | News in Brief

The Small Arms Monitor is produced by the Reaching Critical Will programme of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) during meetings related to the UN Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons.

Editor: Allison Pytlak

The views expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom or the Reaching Critical Will programme.

See reachingcriticalwill.org for information, statements, papers, reports, archived Small Arms Monitors, and more.

EDITORIAL: THE WORLD DESERVES BETTER THAN THE LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR

Allison Pytlak and Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

It's not often that applause breaks out at the United Nations, particularly during weapons conferences. But on Monday afternoon, an impassioned plea from a state with a tragic history of bloody civil conflict and violence provoked a visceral response from conference participants. The sincere and unscripted remarks of this country's representative centred on the necessity of controlling ammunition and reflected the genuine importance that his country attaches to this issue.

It's well known that the topic of ammunition has been a source of significant disagreement at meetings of the UN Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons (UNPoA) for years. This has usually centred on whether or not the word will be included in the negotiated outcome documents, rather than any proposed amendments to the scope of the instrument itself.

Not surprisingly, this is again the situation as the Third Review Conference (RevCon) approaches its final days. The first draft outcome document contained ten explicit references to ammunition; in the most recent version there are only four. Many of the original references pertained to practical activities meant to reduce the easy availability of bullets, lead to safer communities, and reduce violence. Who can argue with that?

Apparently there are some who can. Throughout the RevCon a small group of countries have been vocal about eliminating any reference to the word itself—even those that relate to a new, and separate, UN General Assembly

process that will lead to a governmental experts group on surplus ammunition. Efforts to accommodate their concerns have led the proposal of vague euphemisms that, as of Tuesday afternoon, may be palatable to some delegations—but the reverse could also be true. Those that are tired of repeating the same arguments year after year and want to recognise the problem for what it is may find such watered down language unacceptable. Bullets are killing people across the globe. What is a gun without a bullet, asked one frustrated delegation, other than a useless ornament?

Ammunition isn't the only contentious issue in the draft outcome document. Some states are also questioning the nature of the UNPoA's relationship to other disarmament and arms control instruments. In this context, a few delegations raised concerns about the inclusion of the call in paragraph 11 of the draft declaration to "consolidate and strengthen effective implementation synergies between the Programme of Action, the International Tracing Instrument and other relevant instruments" to which a state is party. They objected to the phrase "synergies," arguing that "coordination" would be a more appropriate term. Others disagreed, and asked the President to retain the concept of synergies.

It seems like a strange and perhaps benign request to change synergies to coordination. However, the ask seems to indicate that certain states do not see these instruments as being interlinked, but instead, as separate agreements that stand on their own.

continued on next page

Editorial, continued

Synergy stems from the interaction of elements that, when combined, produce an effect that is greater than the sum of the individual elements. The UNPoA, the International Tracing Instrument (ITI), as well as the Firearms Protocol, the Arms Trade Treaty, and other regional instruments on small arms, have elements that reinforce and support each other. The same is true with the way these agreements interact with other international treaties, UN resolutions, and our broader body of customary international law. Separately, these instruments by small arms and light weapons. As in the first round of comments on the draft outcome document, two states have argued that gender equality is a “promise we can’t really keep”. One said that it’s too difficult to maintain a 50/50 split and that the call to do so is just “micromanaging”. These two states suggested changing the call for the “full” participation of women, rather than the equal participation. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of states speaking to this issue argued that not only must the outcome document “recognise the need for the equal participation of women and men in disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control processes,” as it does in draft paragraph 13, but it should actually be improved to match the language from the UN General Assembly resolution on Women, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, which calls for the “equal, full, and effective participation of both men and women”. Problematic reinforcing of binaries aside, this language is much more appropriate to reality and consistent with the development of internationally agreed language on the participation of women in disarmament, as seen in recent nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Chair’s summaries and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

States further called attention to the fact that gender-based violence is no longer referenced in the section of the draft outcome document addressing future actions (Section II), following statements from some countries that this is irrelevant. It is now being recognised only in the Section I Declaration, which is something akin to a preamble and less action-ori-



ented. It needs to be remembered that gender-based violence is prevalent and must be addressed from multiple directions. Small arms and light weapons have been used to facilitate the spectrum of gender-based violence including sexual violence, femicide, harassment and intimidation, domestic violence, rape, trafficking, forced prostitution, violence against LGBTQIA-identified people, and also the targeting of men on the basis of their being automatically categorised as militants. One state pointed out that if GBV is referenced in the Declaration than the other reference ought to remain as well.

The informal discussions on Monday and Tuesday this week have been increasingly interactive. Unfortunately, the discussions have been informal, which is why in this report we have not been attributing positions to particular governments. However, it is very positive that delegations are posing questions of one another and proposing new language in real time, all of which is being supplemented by bilateral and other discussions taking place outside the conference room.

continued on next page

Editorial, continued

The conference President has encouraged discussion in the room as much as possible however, so that all member states can be aware of each other's positions. It is evident that there are real efforts among states to understand one another, reach agreement, and also to be frank in questioning the nature of opposition to some proposals; such as was seen in relation the proposal to now merely consider a technical annex to the ITI over a six-year period.

Yet there have been concerning signals in the opposite direction too. In reference to ammunition, for example, one delegation made it clear that while inclusion of ammunition references may have the support of the floor, the UNPoA does not take decisions by simple majority—this is a process based on consensus.

It would be refreshing to see states shift

away from entrenched red lines that they are sometimes unable to even fully explain. This is particularly true of the states that are experiencing loss of life, human suffering, and the destruction of critical infrastructure due to small arms and light weapons, in some cases at devastating levels. It would also be refreshing to see a move away from a concept of consensus in which unanimity is required. This always results in a lowest common denominator, and means that those with human security at the focus of their efforts end up compromising much more than those who seek to make profits off death and destruction. The UNPoA process should instead treat consensus as it is treated in the UN General Assembly—as an aspiration pursued to bring as many countries along as possible, but not as an effective veto over the betterment of humanity. •

AMMUNITION CONTROL PRACTICES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Daniel Mack and Manuel Martinez Miralles | UNLIREC

The following is excerpted from a new report launched by the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (UNLIREC) during a side event on 21 June, authored by Daniel Mack and Manuel Martinez Miralles. For more information visit www.unlirec.org.

The scale of production, trade, and use of small arms ammunition worldwide is almost unfathomable, with a yearly production of over 12 billion units—almost two bullets per living human.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, the constant supply, availability and proliferation of ammunition to all potential actors of violence—either through use in criminal activity, misuse by state forces, interpersonal violence between civilians, or incidents with private security

forces—are a sine qua non to producing the region's macabre armed violence records. Not only are firearms more frequently used in homicides in Latin America and the Caribbean than elsewhere in the world, the same can be said of bullets. Semantics, perhaps, but these daily human tragedies are not only firearm-related homicides, but also, essentially, ammunition-related homicides and must be treated as such if policies seek to diminish the body count.

Yet more often than not, controls on the production and sale of ammunition are less stringent than those of firearms. Bullets tend to be less well marked, registered, kept, monitored and regulated than firearms, making diversion and misuse easier to conduct and more difficult to trace. At least eight countries in the region currently produce small arms cartridge-based ammunition

continued on next page



Ammunition controls, continued



Photo: Ammunition Control Practices in Latin America

though most industries in the region provide ammunition solely to their domestic armed and security forces, and thus usually only produce one to four different calibres.

In all countries, levels of production and internal consumption are mostly unknown due to national security concerns. Levels of export are likewise difficult to pinpoint, given the sector's lack of transparency and reporting obligations. For example, the most comprehensive database on international transfers of small arms (and its ammunition), NI-SAT-PRIO, has no data for small arms ammunition exports from Mexico between 2010 and 2015, and exports from Brazil in the period only show up, because of national import reports from Belgium, of a few million Euros between 2010-2012.

Yet, it is known that Mexican ammunition is widely available in the US and Latin American markets and Brazil's current production levels of ammunition, coupled with an 85 percent share towards exports, suggest that hundreds of millions of rounds of ammunition are exported per year.

While enormous and widespread, the ammunition trade is significantly clustered, facilitating both the full implementation and universalisation of

existing controls and standards, and the potential creation of new norms. For example, while over 100 countries produce small arms ammunition, about 90 percent of exports in 2011 originated in only 15 countries.

Moreover, the traditional lack of transparency surrounding the trade in ammunition also does not alone explain the relative neglect. Lack of recognition of the problem has likewise not been the issue. The Latin American and Caribbean nations have been among the least responsible for these omissions in the global arena however, perennially being at the forefront of UN discussions calling for greater attention to ammunition controls. The Organisation of American States' Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials (CIFTA), was adopted in 1997 as the first legally-binding international norm explicitly covering ammunition (and explosives), and was a major inspiration for both the Firearms Protocol and the UN Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons.

Several countries in the Americas have good general firearms laws. However, even some nations that have good basic firearms norms may lack the same level of specific controls on ammunition. Indeed, in several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, restriction levels on firearms are significantly higher than those on ammunition, which is often less covered in both laws and administrative norms.

Moreover, it should be noted that simply passing relatively strong legislation is necessary, but insufficient, as it is only the first step towards a robust ammunition control system. The actual implementation of the law depends on the operational aspects of governance, law enforcement, and criminal justice, which, in turn, are contingent on proper political prioritisation, budgeting, resource allocation, etc. It is here that many nations in Latin America and the Caribbean are often lacking.

continued on next page

Ammunition controls, continued

For example, though rightfully lauded as one of the continent's most comprehensive legislations on the matter, Brazil's 'Disarmament Statute' has a few prescriptions that have not been implemented in practice.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Latin American and Caribbean governments:

- Invest political capital in the creation of global political will for greater ammunition controls, in recognition that the Americas suffer disproportionate harm from lax international regulations and practices.
- Consider pushing for the creation of new international instruments—and/or plugging the holes in the ones that already exist, but have omitted ammunition control.
- Tackle ammunition diversion from government stockpiles as an urgent priority.
- Continue to further political interest and promote the active implementation of regional and sub-regional agreements pertaining to ammunition, particularly CIFTA.
- Aim to harmonise Automated Ballistic Identification System acquisition and searching protocols in the region, focusing Setting up of sub-regional Centre of Excellence where evidence could be processed for multiple member states should be contemplated as a way forward.
- Duly implement the IATGs seeking to reach Level 3 standards as feasible, but ensuring Level 1 compliance as a minimum requirement of basic governance and state responsibility.
- All states in the region that have not yet done so should conclude the online self-assessment to estimate risk of their stockpiles, the Risk Reduction Process Level (RRPL) from UN Safe-Guard and take all resulting necessary measures; on cooperation across jurisdictions.

Recommendations for the UN system and donor countries:

- Provide for the urgent translation of the IATGs into Spanish.
- Politically prioritise stockpile management and ammunition destruction in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Drastically increase funding for ammunition controls in the region, duly demanding national ownership and commitment at the highest possible level to programme and policy sustainability as a quid pro quo.
- Significantly increase investment particularly in destruction programmes.

Recommendations for civil society:

- Fully re-engage and prioritise the issue of ammunition controls, independent of whether it is in a political or diplomatic forum, or low or high level of a governmental forum.



Photo: Ammunition Control Practices in Latin America and the Caribbean



SIDE EVENT REPORT: GENDER LENSES ON—HOW DOES IT CHANGE THE IMPACT OF FIREARMS CONTROL?

Allison Pytlak | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

The side event “Gender lenses on: how does it change the impact of firearms control?” highlighted a diversity of insights and experiences across multiple sectors about how gender-sensitive approaches to arms control can reduce gender-based violence (GBV).

Joanne Adamson, the Deputy Head of the European Union (EU) delegation to the UN, reflected on her experience in negotiating the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) for the UK government and specifically how the criterion on GBV came to be included in the Treaty. She noted that it was largely a civil society driven process, premised on a strong research base. Unfortunately implementation of this aspect of the ATT has been challenging for some states parties, and there is not sufficient understanding about how to approach it. Further guidance, data, and other practical measures such as including a gender advisor in discussions on weapons issues, to inform in real-time, were recommended.

Clare Hutchinson, representing the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), described the organisation’s activities with respect to the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda, including a recent set of guidelines it has produced for gender mainstreaming. A lot of this is rooted in the organisation’s experience in Liberia, during which 22,000 women unexpectedly participated in the disarmament, demobilisation, and reintegration (DDR) programme. This underscored that there are many ways in which conflict involves and affects women that needs to be understood and accounted for in policy, law, and practice.

Adele Kirsten is a leader within Gun Free South Africa, who joined the event virtually. Ms. Kirsten built on other presentations by describing further the gendered impact of arms, particularly firearms, which includes many “invisible” effects, such as providing care for survivors. She also presented startling figures about the high rates of gun violence committed against women by their intimate partners in South Africa, and advocated for a stronger role for women at the decision-making table.

Speaking from national experiences with the peace and disarmament process in Colombia, Katherine Ronderos from WILPF-Colombia presented research that explores how women view, and have participated in, those processes. They have found that despite the impacts that stem from high rates of femicide, sexual violence, and living in a state of fear, as well as frequently having knowledge of where arms are being held, women are consistently left out of any committees or entities on security issues by the government. She ended by underscoring that as long as weapons symbolise power it would be difficult to reduce demand and enforce control.

Dragan Bozanic, of the South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC), was the final panelist. He emphasised what is largely a gender-blind approach to small arms control in the sub-region, and little to no effort to address notions of masculinity that are linked to weapons and/or violence. Improving knowledge among policymakers and producing more gender-disaggregated knowledge could facilitate more gender-responsive solutions, as would increasing the participation of women in policy-making processes. These activities have formed a focus of SEESAC’s work on gender.

Moderator Randy Davis, director of the UN Development Programme’s (UNDP) gender team facilitated a question and answer period that covered themes of closer government and civil society collaboration, particularly for implementing the ATT; engaging with a new generation of activists; the necessity of political will; and pushing back against portrayals in media that glamourise weapons and violence.

The event was convened by SEESAC, with the UNDP, and the EU.



NEWS IN BRIEF

Marina Kalligal | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

The positions conveyed here are not comprehensive but intended as a summary of the consultations on the third draft outcome document. Attribution is not given due to informal nature of the consultations.

SECTION I: The 2018 Declaration

Supply of SALW to unauthorised recipients

- A group of states proposed the inclusion of a ban on exporting weapons without the authorisation of the recipient state and expressed dissatisfaction that this amendment was not included in the third draft of the outcome document. Referring to this proposal, another state stressed the need for there to be a clear reference to the unauthorised, deliberate supply of small arms and light weapons (SALW) and not only its diversion.
- One state supported the proposal and suggested that it could be achieved by adding the words “supply and” to paragraph 7 of the 2018 declaration. An additional four states spoke in favour of including language on the illicit supply of SALW and the requirement for authorisation of SALW transfers by the state of the recipients. One state spoke against this proposal, explaining that it does not understand the concept of “international supply” within the UNPoA because states are in control of their export control systems, and including language on SALW transfers approved by recipient states goes beyond the scope of the UNPoA.
- Paragraph 7 was identified by the President as a particularly difficult one to find consensus on and was revisited in a later session. Three proposals on paragraph 7 emerged during that discussion. One is the proposal that has been made previously to on the prohibition of transfer of SALW to recipients without license by competent authority, which takes language from paragraph 6E of the International Tracing Instrument (ITI). The second proposal, aimed at bridging the divide on this paragraph, is to renew the commitment to prevent and combat diversion of SALW and to include language such as “as well as intentional supply to terrorists, transnational organised crime”. The third proposal is based on language from section II paragraph 2 of the UNPoA to renew the commitment to put in place, where they do not exist, adequate rules to exercise control over the export and import of SALW to unauthorised recipients.

Non-state actors

- Three states spoke against the addition of the term “non-state actors” in paragraph 7 of the 2018 Declaration of the third draft outcome document and asked for its deletion. Two of the states argued that there is no internationally agreed definition of non-state actors. One state noted that some non-state actors have authorisation from the government to hold arms.
- One state urged for the deletion of the entire paragraph as it stands, but stated that it would be willing to accept it if it is amended to reflect the language in the UNPoA itself, such as that in section II paragraph 2 of UNPoA. Another state said the term is too broad and agrees with the proposal to use language from the UNPoA.
- Two states spoke in favour of retaining this term. One state views “non-state actors” as a sub-group of unauthorised recipients and hopes that the term is kept because its core meaning is the commitment not to divert SALW to unauthorised recipients. The other state expressed support for the retention of “non-state actors”, and explained that it means people unauthorised by the government to use firearms, such as civilians and militias.

Illegal armed groups

- Three states called for the return of the term “illegal armed groups” in paragraph 4. The term was included in the second draft of the outcome document, but has been removed from the third draft. The states pointed out that the term has been used in the RevCon 2012 and BMS outcome documents, as well as in General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

International humanitarian law (IHL) and human rights law

- A proposal was made to separate the contents of paragraph 4 into two paragraphs in order to differentiate between the two concepts it currently contains, conflict and peacetime or law enforcement issues. It was argued that having two distinct paragraphs would provide clarity. Ten states voiced support for this proposal. Other states supported the proposal and added that the term “armed violence” should be added after crime and terrorism.

continued on next page



News in Brief, continued

Synergies

- One state suggested that the word “synergies” in paragraph 11 be replaced by “coordination”, and seven states support that amendment. Three states spoke in favour of maintaining the word synergies, one arguing that coordination is a broader term than synergy.

Ammunition

- A group of states calling for the deletion of paragraph 14 noted that incorporation of ammunition will lead to discrepancies in financing, tracking, and other activities of the UNPoA. Three more countries expressed the wish to delete all references to ammunition throughout the document. More than thirty states expressed support for including ammunition in the outcome document and retaining paragraph 14 of the 2018 Declaration.
- A proposal was made to add a reference to ammunition in paragraph 8 on the basis that all governments bear the responsibility of solving the problem of ammunition. One state spoke against this proposal because it does not support including ammunition anywhere in the document.
- A couple of states are unhappy that the reference to UNGA resolution 72/55 remains in this draft, and argued that the UNPoA is not the right context to discuss ammunition. One of them stated that it supports the establishment of a group of governmental experts (GGE) and only if it results in a consensual report that recommends that ammunition be addressed within the UNPoA should it be discussed in the UNPoA meetings, but it is now premature to do so. Ten states spoke in favour of maintaining the reference to the UNGA resolution, with one of them arguing that the GA process will have a clear impact on UNPoA implementation and the RevCon should find a way to link the two processes, such as coordinating meeting schedules. Several states highlighted the consensus-based nature of the GA resolution, while one pointed out that paragraph 14 does not make any commitments.
- An amendment was submitted to include a new paragraph after paragraph 14 that would reflect language from the BMS6 outcome document, which would reflect the different positions on the issue of ammunition. Twenty states supported this proposal.

Gender

- One state proposed replacing the word “equal” by “full” because an equal split is micromanaging and hard to maintain, and also proposed deleting the first sentence of paragraph 13, arguing that this is a

domestic issue beyond the issue of illicit trafficking of SALW. Another state proposed replacing “equal” with “promoting”.

- Nine states spoke in favour of paragraph 13 in its current formulation. Four states pointed out that the word “equal” is used in UNSCR 1325, which is a consensual text, thus it is the appropriate word to use. A group of states reiterated a proposal made earlier that the language be “equal, full, and effective participation,” which has been used in other resolutions. Four states supported the proposal to add that language in paragraph 13.
- Two states spoke about a group of states working together to submit an amendment to paragraph 13, which would include reference to UNSCR 1325. One of them stated that it sees merit in using the term. One state expressed the wish to strengthen the gender language in the outcome document.

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

- One state proposed the addition of a specific mention of SDG 16.4 in paragraph 12, arguing that it is the only relevant SDG for the UNPoA. A state stressed the importance of having reference to the entire Agenda 2030, and views the RevCon as a great opportunity to also recognise in the UNPoA the close interlinkages between the implementation of the UNPoA and the Agenda 2030. To that end, the state proposed that throughout the outcome document, including in paragraph 12, the words “in particular” be replaced by “including” in order to reflect that the entire Agenda 2030 is relevant to the UNPoA. The state described the UNPoA as an enabler for the 2030 Agenda more broadly. Twenty-three states expressed their support for references to the entire 2030 Agenda.

New technologies

- Three states proposed the deletion of the term “3D printing” from paragraph 17, one of them arguing that there is no credible study that proves that 3D printing is a challenge, and the other two that there is no need to mention specific technologies in this section of the document. Seventeen states wish to retain the reference to 3D printing, arguing that it poses a security threat. Two states stated their satisfaction with the inclusion of paragraph 17 in the outcome document because of the need to address new technologies at this conference, while two other states stressed the need to have a reference on avoiding restrictions to the transfer of technology.

continued on next page



News in Brief, continued

Section II: Implementation of the UNPoA

Synergies

- Around thirty states want to delete the references to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and the Firearms Protocol in paragraph 17, arguing they should not be mentioned because they are not universal instruments. Over fifty states support retaining the references on the ATT and Firearms Protocol. Among the arguments made in favour of keeping the current language of paragraph 17 were that it is made clear that it only applies to states that are parties to these instruments, that it is appropriate language within the spirit of the UNPoA, such as paragraph 11 of the UNPoA, and that the instruments mentioned are mutually reinforcing and complimentary to the UNPoA. One state pointed out that the UNPoA predates the ATT, thus the argument used by the states opposing its reference because it was not included in the original UNPoA text is not a reasonable one.
- One state voiced its opposition to paragraph 29 on the basis that the language is an imported commitment from a separate instrument.

Ammunition

- The group of states opposing the inclusion of ammunition anywhere in the outcome document called for the deletion of paragraphs 18 and 22. Responding to a comment made that the floor believes ammunition should be retained, a state argued that the UNPoA is a consensus-based process so even if there is a smaller number of states that oppose ammunition in every meeting since 2001, the previous statement is not an accurate one. Around sixty states supported retaining the paragraphs on ammunition, and three states pointed out that concessions have been made on this issue with the removal of several references to ammunition in the third draft of the outcome document, including the reference to the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines.
- One state proposed adding ammunition to several paragraphs in section II of the outcome document, including paragraphs 25 and 26, citing the inextricable nature of SALW and their ammunition. Two states spoke in favour of this proposal. One of them proposed an experiment; in order to observe whether the availability of ammunition has an impact on conflict the UN should impose an immediate

embargo on ammunition throughout the world for one year. The immediate response in the conference room was overwhelmingly positive.

Parts and components

- One state opposed the references to “parts and components” in paragraph 32 and “their essential and structural components” in paragraph 62 because the UNPoA does not cover parts and components. One state spoke in favour of retaining the language on essential components.

Unauthorised end-users

- It was argued that paragraph 19 of Section II would be strengthened if reference was made to prohibiting the supply of SALW to “recipients not duly authorised by their respective governments.” A state that spoke in favour of this proposal further suggested amending the title of sub-section C from “unauthorised end-users” to “end-use control”. Three states proposed the language here be changed from “end-users” to “recipients”, which is taken from the UNPoA. One state recommended adding the term “end-uses” to the title of this sub-section instead, stating that the term had been acknowledged in the UNPoA text. A proposal was made to split paragraph 28 into two paragraphs that would address separately the two aspects of paragraph 28, diversion and the end-user certification process. It was argued that there is a need to unpack these concepts, and to revert to paragraph 11 of the UNPoA on how to assess export applications using strict national regulations and procedures and address the two issues in paragraph 28 as separate ones. One state spoke in favour of retaining the term “unauthorised end-users” in the sub-section and the language in paragraph 28 as it is in the third draft.

Illicit supply of SALW

- One state reiterated its position on the need to add references to illicit transfers and illicit brokering, including in paragraph 13, in order to address the inexplicable omission of the concept of illicit transfer or supply of SALW in the outcome document.

2030 Agenda

- One state proposed adding the SDG Target 16.4 before every mention of the 2030 Agenda in the outcome document because it believes 16.4 is the only part of the 2030 Agenda that is relevant to the UNPoA.

continued on next page



News in Brief, continued

- Two states agreed with this proposal, with one arguing that the references to SDGs other than 16.4 are too ambitious and establish new commitments beyond the scope of the UNPoA. One state asked for a reference to be made to the UNPoA in the title of sub-section 1 in order to better connect the issues of the UNPoA and the SDGs.
- A counter-proposal was made to make all references to the SDGs inclusive of the entire 2030 Agenda instead of focusing solely on SDG 16.4, by replacing “in particular” that precede mention of “Goal 16 and Target 16.4” with the word “including”. Ten states spoke in favour of this proposal, and one of placed particular emphasis on the need for states to align all efforts to implement the UNPoA and the SDGs in order to have the best possible results. Four states supported the idea for a common approach to the implementation of the UNPoA and the SDGs.
- A recommendation was made to create a new paragraph with clear language on how national action plans should mainstream the SDGs and consider Target 16.4 in the implementation of the UNPoA

Violations of IHL

- An amendment was proposed to paragraph 40 to add after the sentence “or used to commit or facilitate a serious violation of IHL”, because this sentence had been included in the previous draft and there is a need to reflect international humanitarian law in the outcome document. Four states spoke in favour of this proposal, and one state made a further recommendation to add to the end of the paragraph: “and to undertake mitigating measures as appropriate”.

New technologies

- Two states reiterated their position that all references to 3D printing should be deleted in this section too. One state welcomed the inclusion of references to 3D printing and other new technologies.
- A proposal was made to delete the phrase “while avoiding undue restrictions” in paragraph 6. One state supported this proposal, while two states spoke against it and wish to see the concept of avoiding undue restrictions on transfers of technology kept in the outcome document. One of these states recommended removing the language “including their associated proliferation risks and options for control” from paragraph 61 because it will not accept attaching the idea that new forms of manufacturing constitute a proliferation risk at this point in time. Three states highlighted that the language on recent technological

developments has been weakened since the second draft outcome document, in particular in paragraphs 58 and 59.

Gender

- Three states expressed strong support for paragraphs 70 and 71 on gender, particularly the retention of reference to the collection of gender-disaggregated data because such data can help improve policies.
- One state suggested that the title of sub-section 2 should better reflect the paragraphs in the sub-section, in which there is no mention to men, girls, and boys, despite that language forming part of the title.
- A proposal was made to insert language on the involvement of women in the processes of the collection and destruction of illicit SALW in paragraph 81.
- A state expressed the wish to return to the word “ensure” rather than to “encourage” the equal participation of women, which was used in the previous draft. It would like to keep the word “equal” because it is important for participation to go further than the bare minimum and it is aspiring to the equal weight of contributions made by men and women and equal spaces for women in these fora. The state also noted that this is agreed language taken from UNSCR 1325. The state said it is working on language on the need to reference participatory research that accounts for gender dimensions, and resources for training and capacity building for women, which could be placed in the fourth section instead of in the second. Three states expressed support for this intervention, and a group of states that are supportive of reintroducing the word “ensure” added an amendment for the language to read “the full and meaningful participation and representation of women” which reflects language used in other UN resolutions.
- Three states expressed their regret that paragraph 92 of the second draft document on gender-based violence (GBV) was removed and called for it to be re-inserted in the next draft. One of the states argued that it has been established that illicit flows in SALW contribute to GBV thus it is relevant to include a paragraph on it. Another of the states pointed out that gender-based violence is still mentioned in Section I so it is natural to include it in this section too.
- Two states opposed any reference to UN Security Council resolution 1325 because they do not wish to see any links being made between the UNPoA and the Council.

continued on next page



News in Brief, continued

Section III: Implementation of the ITI

Proposal for a guidance document to the ITI

- A proposal was made for the addition of a new paragraph referring to a process leading up to BMS7 to consider possible elements to include in a guidance document to the ITI that would take into account new developments in technology, manufacture and design, particularly pertaining to modular and polymer weapons. The proposed paragraph would request the Secretary-General to include in his next report possible elements that could be included in a guidance document. The document should be fully developed and considered for adoption at the BMS7 in 2020. Three states supported this language on developing an ITI guidance document.

Proposal to split paragraph 4 into two paragraphs

- A proposal was made to split paragraph 4 of section III into two so as to reflect the two ideas it contains: ensuring the prohibition on illicit manufacture of firearms and taking measures to avoid the risk of obliteration or falsification of markings. The state making this proposal said that if agreement was not reached on this amendment it will seek the deletion of the entire paragraph because it is imported from another agreement. One country spoke against the deletion of paragraph 4. One state spoke in favour of splitting paragraph 4.

Tracing from the point of manufacture and import

- An amendment was proposed to paragraph 11 to add the language to begin tracing “from the point of manufacture or point of importation in accordance with provisions of ITI.” One state spoke in favour of this amendment, pointing out that the definition of tracing in the ITI establishes the beginning of tracing at the point of “manufacture or importation” and thus wishes to see these terms reflected in the outcome document.
- One state spoke against paragraph 11 in its current formulation, arguing that the language is too much like a directive and could undermine criminal investigations.
- An amendment was proposed to paragraph 7 to add the phrase “such as at import” to the end of the paragraph in order to underscore the importance of import marking. One state spoke in favour of the amendment per its existing legislation.

Section IV: International cooperation and assistance

Fellowship proposal

- Five states wish to amend language in paragraph 12 referring to the proposal made by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) to establish a fellowship programme on SALW that would replace the phrase “on all aspects of SALW” with “in further promotion of the implementation of the UNPoA and the ITI. Two states proposed that the current language be retained, arguing that the fellowship programme should not have in-built restrictions at this early stage. A group of states expressed their willingness to work with others on the idea of the fellowship program.

UN Secretary-General’s Trust Facility

- A group of states stated that they are in principle supportive of the idea of a dedicated multi-partner trust facility but are awaiting more information on this idea. The Secretariat responded to this request by giving a briefing on this proposal during the Tuesday afternoon session. One state emphasised that the trust facility proposed by the Secretary-General under the Peacebuilding Fund should not be restricted to assistance to states in conflict and post-conflict situations, while another state expressed the belief that the trust facility will be solely directed to developing countries. Two states argued that paragraph 17 on the trust facility should be deleted because it is premature to include it. One of these states stressed the need for proper discussion on how training and capacity building is delivered. It recommended that the Secretary-General should provide a report on capacity-building to the next UNPoA conference about this.

Proposal for a new paragraph

- A proposal was made to insert a new new paragraph after paragraph 10 of section IV on the crucial need for cooperation and assistance that is sustainable. Convinced that a number of capabilities need to be anchored in an organisation in order to handle a number of tasks, the proposal is to recognise that sustainable cooperation and assistance requires the development of adequate legal and normative frameworks and dedicated structures and procedures that are able to manage capabilities, such as those related to finances and infrastructure, inter alia.

continued on next page





News in Brief, continued

Section V: Follow-up

Schedule of meetings

- Four states reiterated their position that they do not want to add any more meetings to the schedule. One of them called for reducing the Biennial Meetings of States (BMS) to only one held triennially BMS meeting, citing concern about redundancy of meetings. Another state recommended deleting the suggestion of the one-week open-ended meeting of governmental experts in 2021 while another country stated that it does not object to this.

Annex to the ITI

- A proposal made earlier in the conference to delete a reference to an annex to the ITI made in paragraph 7 was reiterated by four states. They feel it is premature to enter into this process, and prefer to use the language “to consider the implications of recent developments” without mentioning a specific document.
- One state pointed out the need to clarify the relationship of this paragraph with the proposal on developing a guidance document, which is included in an earlier part of the outcome document. The state noted that there will be no costs involved with developing an annex, and that this reference in paragraph 7 is merely to consider a process for discussion at this stage, which not a major commitment for the next six years, for a guidance document that could potentially lead to an annex in 2024. Around five states spoke in favour of this proposal. One state emphasised the speed of technological developments.
- A group of states highlighted that developments in SALW technology and design need to be addressed by the ITI, because there is a risk that the ITI may become less effective in the future as a consequence of these new developments and it is the responsibility of this conference to keep the ITI relevant.
- One state suggested that the issue of an annex to the ITI could be discussed at the next BMS, and another state stated that if an inter-sessional process considering developments in technology takes place, it should be within an open process fostering the participation of all states.

Seventh Biennial Meeting of States (BMS7)

- An amendment was proposed to add the language “recipients not duly authorized by a competent national authority” taken from section E of ITI to paragraph 5 of section V on the BMS7 in 2020. Further amendments were suggested, to add “supply and”

before diversion in order to properly address the supply of SALW along with diversion at the next BMS, and to add the language “illegal armed groups”. One state supported these amendments. One state called for a focused discussion on the diversion of SALW only in the BMS7, without qualifying it, in order to keep the issue as broad as possible.

- A state referred to a proposal made earlier in the conference for the UN Secretary-General’s report on small arms and light weapons to be presented at BMS7.
- One state stated that paragraph 5 as it stands is problematic due to the number of issues it is covering and the inclusion of phrases it does not agree with, but if there is agreement on addressing diversion, it suggested a much shorter formulation that calls on states to “address illicit diversion of SALW” at the next BMS.
- One state called for the comprehensive review of all issues during the BMS.

Eighth Biennial Meeting of States (BMS8)

- The view that it is premature to decide on a topic for the BMS8 was reiterated in reference to paragraph 6. One state suggested that the topic for BMS8 be decided upon during the BMS7, and called for the deletion of this paragraph. One state voiced their opposition to ammunition being discussed at the BMS8. Two states expressed their support for the current formulation of paragraph 6.