

OVERVIEW OF GOVERNMENTAL STATEMENTS MADE AT THE SMALL ARMS PREP COM

9-17 January 2006, New York



Overview of governmental statements made at the small arms PrepCom, 9-17 January 2006, New York¹

Introduction

After the adoption of the UN Programme of Action (PoA) on small arms control in 2001, States met twice (July 2003 and July 2005) at Biennial Meetings of States (BMS) to 'exchange information' on implementation efforts.

In preparation for the first formal Review Conference (RevCon) of the UN Programme of Action (PoA) in June/July 2006, a Preparatory Committee Meeting (PrepCom) was held at UN Headquarters in New York, 9-20 January 2006. The PrepCom was chaired by Ambassador Sylvester Rowe of Sierra Leone, and attended by most Member States, international organisations (IOs) and non-governmental (NGO) representatives from 43 countries.

The PrepCom aimed to reach agreement on substantive recommendations and a programme of work for the RevCon. Regrettably, this was not achieved, and this task now rests with the Chair-designate, who will undertake a series of consultations to do so.

The two-week meeting was divided into the following parts:

- Mon 9, Wed 11, Thurs 12² – National and regional statements
- Thurs 12 – presentations from international organisations and NGO
- Fri 13 – Thematic debate
- Mon 16, Tues 17 - Thematic debate
- Wed 18, Thurs 19, Fri 20 – 'Recommendations to the Review Conference on all relevant matters including the draft agenda, draft rules of procedure, draft final documents, background documentation and nominations for President and Secretary General of the Conference.'³

Most statements made during the meeting from States, IOs and NGOs, the Chair's final report⁴, and various thematic papers produced by States are available at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006

¹ This summary was written and compiled by Nicholas Marsh, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo; Cate Buchanan and Mireille Widmer, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Geneva; Anne-Kathrin Glatz, Small Arms Survey, Geneva; Maria Karapetyan, Franciscans International, Geneva. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, the lack of availability of all statements and interventions may result in some omissions beyond our control.

² Tuesday the 10th of January was a UN holiday.

³ See the 'indicative programme of work', A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.1 Available at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.1.pdf

⁴ A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.17, available at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.17.pdf. The official report of the meeting is available at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/RC.1.pdf

The thematic debate had been structured by the Chair, after consulting with States, in a way that each "*cluster contains a number of issues that are directly or indirectly related to the theme of the cluster. The list of issues... is not exhaustive. This format gives delegations the opportunity, indeed the right to raise any issue which, in their view, is relevant to the cluster and to the overall objective of preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.*"⁵

The Chair, in a December 2005 communiqué to States, had further identified that he hoped the debate would provide answers to questions such as:

- How adequate or effective are the measures taken so far at the national level to strengthen or develop agreed norms in our struggle to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects?
- What further action or measures can we take in this regard?
- In addition to those contained in the Programme of Action, what other measures, if any, do we need to increase the efficacy of the Programme of Action?
- Have we really done enough for the victims of the use of illicit and misuse of small arms and light weapons in conflict and organised crime?
- Given the human suffering and the devastating effects that illicit small arms and light weapons continue to have on sustainable development, what else can States do to integrate the problems of SALW into national development plans?
- Can we really deal effectively with the problems of illicit small arms and light weapons without considering possible measures for dealing with ammunition and explosives?

This document intends to provide an overview of key areas of discussion and does not represent an exhaustive analysis due to a lack of availability of all statements.

⁵ Letter of 19th December 2005 from Ambassador Sylvester Rowe to States. Available at: www.iansa.org/un/review2006/prepcom.htm

Wherever possible, an indication of the number of statements in support of an issue is given – it should be noted however that many statements were made by regional groupings (for example, the African Group comprising of 53 States⁶; the European Union and associated States comprising of 37 States⁷; Colombia on behalf of nine countries⁸; and the League of Arab States, comprising 22 States⁹). Where statements were made by regional groupings, these are always indicated.

This overview is structured in two parts:

- Part 1 - National and regional statements: Process and thematic related priorities and perspectives
- Part 2 - Thematic debate highlights, by cluster
- Annex - Publications and reports released or tabled on the occasion of the PrepCom

⁶ Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sahara Arab Democratic Republic, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe. See www.africa-union.org/root/au/memberstates/map.htm

⁷ Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands, United Kingdom; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, and Serbia and Montenegro, the EFTA countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova.

⁸ Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay

⁹ Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen

Acronyms and definitions

BMS	Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects
Brokering	The facilitation of arms transfers for financial gain
CRP	Conference room paper
DDR/DD&R	Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration
EU	European Union
EUC	End-user certificate
GGE	Group of Governmental Experts
IANSA	International Action Network on Small Arms
IO	International organisation
MANPADS	Man-portable air defence system
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
Non-state actor	Any armed actor with a basic structure of command operating outside state control that uses force to achieve its political or allegedly political objectives. ¹⁰
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD-DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
PBC	Peacebuilding Commission
PoA	2001 UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects
PrepCom	UN Preparatory Committee meeting, January 9-20, 2006
RECSA	Regional Centre for Small Arms for the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa
RevCon	2006 Review Conference on small arms, June 26 – July 7, 2006
SALW	Small arms and light weapons
SSR	Security sector reform
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
WP	Working Paper

¹⁰ Geneva Call (2005), *Armed non-state actors and landmines*, PSIO, Geneva, Volume I, p. 10. Available at: www.genevacall.org/resources/testi-publications/gc-ansal-oct05.pdf

Part 1: National and regional statements: Process and thematic related priorities and perspectives

Implementing existing PoA commitments

Thirty statements, including those by the African Group, the League of Arab States and the European Union (EU), noted that much progress is still to be made, and greater implementation efforts will require resolve, coordination, and consolidating various mechanisms. China spelled this out very clearly when it stated that *"we should also be aware that there is still a long way to go in the implementation of the PoA."*

Numerous statements suggested specific ways forward for multilateral action on small arms control. Notably, no statement recommended that the PoA be concluded at the RevCon. Indonesia noted *"we have to be realistic and recognize that four years is not sufficient to implement the PoA in all its aspects."*

Twelve statements suggested that better implementation of the PoA requires that its processes and procedures be consolidated and improved. A number of innovative suggestions were tabled, including the development of support mechanisms, meeting schedules, accountability, and a review of the PoA (see below and Cluster VI). The need for such mechanisms was best spelled out by the Solomon Islands, stating that it *"would like to see a more defined form of coordination within the UN system in implementing the Programme. The international framework has grown so huge and wide that at times [...] it is difficult to see who is doing what in the UN system in terms of assisting member states implementing the Programme, both in terms of resources and capacity building."*

Aiding the progress of implementation of the PoA by developing additional mechanisms on specific issues was suggested by some 47 States in nine statements (including those of the EU, Colombia on behalf of nine countries, and Sri Lanka). For example, Indonesia suggested that *"the establishment of specific international cooperation programmes and plans of action under the purview of the PoA could be thoroughly considered by the forthcoming Review Conference. These programmes and plans of action can cover issues in areas such as stockpile management and security; weapons collection and destruction; marking and tracing as well as transparency and information exchange."*

Clarifying and elaborating on PoA commitments

One suggested innovation was for some of the points contained in the PoA to be elaborated. This was explicitly suggested by 46 States in two statements (the EU, and Colombia on behalf of nine countries), and was implied by many more. Colombia's statement suggested the *"adoption of new documents on best practices or lessons learnt to be included in the PoA"*.

The creation of an implementation support mechanism (see also Cluster IV) was also suggested in five statements (including those of Colombia on behalf of nine countries, Switzerland, and the Solomon Islands). Brazil noted that it *"believes that*

the Conference should establish an effective follow-up mechanism able to safeguard the implementation of such measures."

Scope of discussion

Three statements explicitly stated that some aspects of the issue are insufficiently covered in the PoA (including those of the African Group, India, and Colombia on behalf of nine governments). India stated that *"the 2001 document does not preclude the consideration of a wide range of issues, including those on which convergence was not achieved at the time."* However, five statements, including those by the US, Russia and Cuba, stated that the RevCon should not discuss certain topics. The US was explicit when it stated that *"the United States continues to oppose measures that would constrain the legal trade and legal manufacturing of small arms and light weapons; impose domestic regulations or restrictions on the civilian ownership and use of SA/LW; include recommendations concerning ammunition and explosives; or a ban on transfers to non-state actors."* In addition, China insisted that *"we should try to avoid any premature and controversial new topics that will distract our attention and even undermine existing international consensus, which will complicate the review work and affect the orderly process of international community to combat the illicit trade in SALW."*

Renegotiating the PoA

Seven statements insisted that the PoA should not be renegotiated; including those by the African Group, the League of Arab States and the US. The EU made this point emphatically: *"It is clear that the goal of the Review Conference is not to renegotiate or re-open the existing Programme of Action. It is a comprehensive and positive document, and although it is not perfect, it is a key starting point for enhanced action on small arms. The key issue at this point is to identify which integrated and parallel measures might be agreed upon to compliment, elaborate upon, or enhance, the Programme of Action and its implementation."*

Information generation

The production of a review of the PoA was suggested by the 53 States of the African Group, Mozambique separately, and Colombia on behalf of nine countries. The statement by the African Group *"recommends that the Review Conference should produce a report on the progress made in the implementation of UNPOA."* Pakistan suggested discussing a *"survey to assess and quantify the scope and scale of the supply and demand problems of SALW; and draw up recommendations to address issues including modalities of financing, provision of financial and technical assistance required by States."*

Meeting cycles, structures and processes

There were differences concerning the consensus rule, with seven statements (including those of China, Japan and India) emphasising that decisions at the RevCon must be made on the basis of consensus. Norway, however, expressed the dilemma faced by the conference if consensus would be used to veto proposals enjoying broad support: *"To address all these issues, consensus decisions remain the best and most legitimate basis. It is our clear objective to reach global agreement on the framework for our efforts. We can, however, not set aside the heavy humanitarian considerations that constitute the root of our concern. If consensus cannot be reached on the way ahead in crucial areas, we*

will have to think carefully about how the best interest of the victims of violence can be served."

The development of inter-sessional meetings was suggested by three statements – Canada, Switzerland and Colombia on behalf of nine countries. Canada, for example, stated that *"the practice of meeting on a biennial basis except during a review year is simply inadequate, as it clearly does not afford the small arms and light weapons issue the time and attention that it warrants."* See also cluster VI for further statements on this issue and references to the Working Papers (WP) circulated by the Netherlands and Canada on this theme.

Reporting

Ten States, in two statements, suggested improved reporting on implementation of the PoA; they were delivered by Colombia on behalf of nine countries, and the Republic of Korea. In addition, four further statements emphasised openness and transparency (see also Cluster VI). Korea recommended that *"while we recognise the value of national reports, we would like to point out the need to improve the reporting mechanism. Reporting, though of a voluntary nature, is an indispensable tool to promote trust and cooperation among States as it enhances level of transparency by providing basic information on States' implementation of the PoA. As such, Reporting is in constant need of improvement in terms of substance, format and others."*

Thematic priorities

A range of thematic priorities were mentioned. Given that these were often elaborated upon in the thematic debate, they are only briefly referenced here:

- *International assistance.* There is a consensus that assistance is needed to build the capacity of governments to implement the PoA. Twenty-six statements, including those by the African Group, the League of Arab States, and the EU, expressed support for capacity development. Another seven statements endorsed international cooperation, and two statements encouraged international support for sharing information and technical expertise.

Potential areas in which international support may be beneficial included training law enforcement personnel; record-keeping; regional transfer control agreements; export control; border control; and weapons in exchange for developments assistance (see cluster IV).

- *Integrating small arms control activities into development assistance.* Five statements, including those by the EU and African Group, emphasised this issue. The UK and the Netherlands made a joint statement specifically noting that *"national action plans or other small arms reduction initiatives should be integrated into national security strategies and poverty reduction frameworks."*
- *Peace-building, conflict resolution, violence reduction and/or the development of a culture of peace* were emphasised by 15 statements, including the EU, the African Group, and the League of Arab States.
- *Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) of ex-combatants and those associated with fighting forces.* Ten statements, including the EU and the African Group, emphasised DDR.

- *Reducing demand.* Eight statements highlighted the need to focus upon reducing or better understanding the demand for small arms; these included Norway, China, Kenya, and Japan. Some statements were opposed to a focus upon governmental demand (see clusters III and IV).
- *National firearms legislation.* Regulating guns in the hands of civilians was highlighted in numerous statements, including Indonesia, Mexico and Norway, which noted the activities in this area since 2001. A focus on this issue at the RevCon was opposed by the US. Two statements, by the US and Canada, acknowledged legitimate civilian possession and use of small arms (see cluster II).
- *Legislation and governance strategies.* Eight statements, including that of the African Group, emphasised the importance of national legislative strategies and processes.
- *Stockpile management and/or the destruction of surplus weapons* were mentioned in numerous statements, including the US, China and Indonesia.
- *Transfers.* Twenty three statements (including the African Group, the EU, Colombia on behalf of nine States, and the US), called for stronger transfer controls. End user certification was raised by some 40 States in three statements (including the EU and Russia). Support for UN Security Council arms embargoes was highlighted by three statements, including the US and Egypt. Several statements stressed the right of States to self-defence.
- *Production.* Control over licensed production agreements was emphasised by Russia and Kazakhstan. The Solomon Islands also drew attention to craft production as an issue to be tackled by the UN process. Home-made guns are untraceable, it noted that a "*starting point is to deny the manufacturers from having access to ammunition for the guns.*"
- *Armed non-state actors.* Transfers to armed non-state groups was a topic included in numerous statements including from Colombia, Russia, Israel, India, Nigeria, the African Group, and Sri Lanka. Discussion of this issue at the RevCon was opposed by the US.
- *Brokering, and/or endorsement of the forthcoming Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on brokering,* was highlighted by twenty statements (including the EU, Egypt, US, India, Zambia, and Russia).
- *Marking and tracing, and/or endorsement of the recently negotiated instrument,* was emphasised by 26 statements (including those by the EU, Indonesia, US, Pakistan, and Zambia). Several statements also stated that the marking and tracing instrument should be strengthened in the future towards a legally-binding regime.
- *Transparency.* In addition, information exchange and/or transparency were supported by 6 statements, including the US, the League of Arab States, and Tanzania.
- *Regional approaches* were endorsed in 13 statements, including the League of Arab States, China, and New Zealand.
- *Survivors.* Several statements emphasised the importance of assistance to victims and survivors of small arms violence (see cluster I).

Part 2: Thematic debates

Cluster 1: Human/humanitarian and other dimensions

Discussion points¹¹:

- Victim assistance and rehabilitation
- Human and sustainable development
- Special needs of children, women and the elderly
- Reconciliation and conflict resolution
- Peace-building and conflict prevention
- Human rights
- Crime
- Terrorism

Assistance to survivors

Japan, India, Mexico, Canada and Kenya emphasised victim assistance in their statements. Mexico drew attention to the rights of people with disabilities. Norway, Indonesia and Colombia on behalf of nine States had already raised this issue in the general debate. Canada circulated a Conference Room Paper (CRP) detailing some of the implications and policy recommendations concerning victim assistance, which asserted that *“Small arms control debates and efforts have to date poorly addressed this aspect of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. The forthcoming Review Conference provides an opportunity to consider the issue and identify policy responses for States, civil society and international organisations to adopt.”*

The Canadian CRP *Assistance to survivors* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.3) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.3.pdf

Needs of children

Three statements (Canada, Mexico, and Sri Lanka) emphasised the special needs of children. The 37 States associated with the EU also recognised that effective solutions to the problem of small arms requires to understand the different needs and situations of boys and girls. UNICEF raised the need to include children better in disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programmes.

Gender considerations

Seven statements, including the EU, Mexico, Senegal and Finland, highlighted the importance of gender considerations in addressing armed violence, as well as effective DDR. Several statements (including Trinidad and Tobago) emphasised the importance of focusing upon concerns specific to men, as well as women. This was echoed in the statement by the EU, which maintained that *“the EU attaches great importance to the Review Conference paying due attention to gender and age in the context of SALW. Applying a gender perspective to the small arms issue means understanding the different ways that men, women, boys*

¹¹ As indicated in *Conference room paper submitted by the Chairman* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.17), available in English at www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.17.pdf

and girls engage in armed violence, are affected by it, and respond to it. This is key to developing effective solutions to the problem."

The EU went on to suggest concrete steps to translate these words into practice, including the full implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325¹², and training law officials to better understand the small arms issues related to the prevention of gender-based violence. In the general debate, there had been numerous references to 'women, children and the elderly'. Trinidad and Tobago, Canada, and UN Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) specifically mentioned the impact of gun violence on women *and* men, particularly young men.

Sustainable development

Fourteen statements emphasised the importance of consolidating development dimensions in the PoA, or recommended specific activities in this regard. These included the EU, Canada, India, the Holy See, Sri Lanka and Ghana. Two states, the US and Israel, questioned whether development concerns should be associated with the PoA. Various statements including those of the EU, Argentina, Africa Group, Canada, the UK and the Netherlands, emphasised the importance of integrating arms control issues into development assistance. A working paper submitted by the UK and the Netherlands stated that: *"We encourage the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, in his final statement, to make clear reference to the links between SALW and development and the consequent need to integrate SALW interventions into wider development programmes."*

Inclusion of small arms issues in national poverty reduction strategies was recommended by the EU and the Netherlands (see also Cluster III). Some 45 States (including the EU, Korea, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire), endorsed GA Resolution 60/68¹³, which consolidates the linkages between arms availability and misuse, security and development. In addition, Kenya and Canada also highlighted the benefits of a public health approach to small arms.

The WP from the UK and the Netherlands, *Preparing for the 2006 SALW Programme of Action Review Conference* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.2) is available in all UN languages at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/prepcom/off-docs.html

Peacebuilding and conflict prevention

Six statements, including the EU, India, the UK, Netherlands and Kenya, emphasised the importance of peacebuilding. Some suggested that the Peacebuilding Commission¹⁴ (PBC) should address small arms control and disarmament issues. Several other States (including Korea and Bangladesh) referred to the PBC in the general debate. Egypt noted it was *"look[ing] forward to the commission's role in providing much needed assistance in post-conflict situations and enhancing the capacity of states to combat the illicit trade in SALW through concrete measures, such as funding DDR programs."*

¹² See www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html for information

¹³ *Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation* Available at: www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r60.htm

¹⁴ See www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/

Terrorism

Six statements (including Israel, Cuba, and Pakistan) emphasised terrorism and in particular the need to prevent weapons transfers to non-state actors. India emphasised that attempts to eradicate the illicit trade in small arms should be integrated into broader anti-terrorism efforts, specifically via the development of an international norm forbidding the transfer of such weapons to non-state armed groups.

Human rights

A number of statements, including the Holy See, Sri Lanka, Canada, India, Palestine, and Argentina, pointed out the relationship between the misuse of weapons and violations of human rights. Venezuela however insisted that there should be no link between the illicit trade in small arms and human rights. Further statements on human rights were made under Cluster III, in discussions surrounding the appropriate use of firearms by authorised bodies. Argentina noted that some '*thought-provoking work*' has been done since 2001 on the connections between weapons availability and human rights that is worth examining at the RevCon.

Cluster II: Norms, regulations and administrative procedures

Discussion points:

- Strengthening/developing agreed norms
- Conclusion/ ratification of legally-binding instruments
- Tracing and marking/record keeping
- Illicit brokering
- End-user certificates
- Non-state actors and civilian possession
- Export/import control
- Criminalisation under domestic law
- Compliance with UN sanctions regimes
- Moratoria and other initiatives

Existing instruments and agreements

States took this opportunity to acknowledge several new instruments on small arms and light weapons control. The recently negotiated instrument on marking and tracing was endorsed in 22 statements. Six statements, including those by Kenya and Colombia, highlighted its lack of legally binding status by suggesting that it be strengthened in the future. Nigeria commented in the cluster III debate that "*we see the international instrument on tracing ... only as a stopgap measure, for we believe that it is only through a legally binding international instrument that the transfer of small arms and light weapons to illegal network(s) can be effectively controlled.*" South Africa regretted the lack of a central mechanism to facilitate the processing of tracing requests.

The UN Firearms Protocol was endorsed in various statements, including China, Brazil and the African Group, who noted that "*24 African States have signed or ratified the...Protocol, thus facilitating its entry into force in May 2005*". Two

countries emphasised the need to respect UN arms embargoes. Kenya recommended that embargo violations be criminalised at a national level. The importance of end-user controls was emphasised by nine countries, including the US, India and Tanzania.

Brokering controls

Twenty-one statements, including the EU, Russia and Norway, endorsed brokering controls and/or the GGE on brokering recently established by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). The EU added that *"it is essential to formulate common understandings on basic issues such as definitions of brokers, brokering and brokering related activities, options for extraterritorial controls, minimum standards for effective controls as well as international assistance and cooperation."* Cuba expressed some doubts - in spite of its support to the GGE - that it was possible to agree on a legally-binding instrument in light of the recent experience with marking and tracing. Some States also warned not to pre-judge the outcome of the GGE (China). In the general debate, the US had noted that *"we should not make any recommendations, as part of the RevCon process, that could possibly prejudice the work of the GGE, and any findings it may present, before that body even begins to meet."*

Transfer controls

Strong support was expressed for transfer controls, with 28 statements referring to the importance of addressing transfer controls, and 19 statements specifically stating that this must be a subject at the RevCon (including the EU, Argentina, Brazil, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Korea, Switzerland and Uganda). In the general debate, the US commented that *"We... support the goals of the Transfer Control Initiative that has been circulated by the United Kingdom, and we support the inclusion of a discussion on transfer controls in the Review Conference agenda, as it is critical to the implementation of the PoA."* The EU also noted *"the important linkages between transfer controls and brokering,"* and added that *"the issue of end-use certificates (EUCs) should be dealt with in the context of transfer controls."* In a separate statement, the UK expressed its wish to see *"the Preparatory Conference recommend for inclusion at the Review Conference the further development of transfer control guidelines at regional, sub-regional, and national level."*

Eight States maintained that the PoA should not consider authorised arms exports (China, Russia, Cuba, Pakistan, Venezuela, India, Indonesia, Egypt). Russia stated that expanding the scope of the PoA to legal transfers was 'premature', but recommended considering the issue at the regional level. Argentina suggested that annexes or best practices appended to the PoA could strengthen some of its provisions, including those on transfer controls, end-user certificates, customs control, licensing procedures and types of licenses, and other issues. Two statements emphasised the national right of self-defence.

The Brazilian CRP, *The Strengthening of Controls over Transfers (Import, Export and Transit) of Small Arms and Light Weapons* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.11) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.11.pdf

Transfers to non-state actors

Discussion of controls on arms transfers to non-state actors were recommended by nine statements, including the EU, Israel, Nigeria, Russia, and Colombia. South Africa stressed the need to address this issue even if it *"continues to be held hostage . . . in this forum."* Japan suggested transfers to non-state actors could usefully be discussed together with transfer controls. Four statements recommended preventing non-state actors from obtaining man portable air defence systems (MANPADS), including Australia and Russia.

The issue had also been raised in the general debate, most strongly by Sri Lanka, the EU, Indonesia and Switzerland. In addition, Israel had noted that *"we should concert our deliberations on ways to improve the implementation of the PoA's commitments, with particular focus on the following... A clear call for national policies to ban unlicensed civilian possession of SALW, as well as a clear call against transfer of SALW to unauthorised entities, especially terrorists."* India too stated that since the adoption of the PoA, *"the international community has become even more sensitised to the threat posed by terrorism. It should now be ready to express its firm commitment to prohibiting the supply of weapons to non-State actors."* In the general debate, the US rejected any discussion at the RevCon of controls on weapons transfers to non-state actors.

National firearms legislation

Eight statements, including Mexico, China and Brazil, advocated controls over guns in the hands of civilians. Canada recommended that *"National Regulation be included in the agenda for the Review Conference, with a view to further developing guidelines for action at the international, regional and national levels"*, and acknowledged the suggestions in the paper circulated by Mexico on this issue. South Africa added that although 'civilian possession' is a very broad term, national legislation is key, and already referred to in the PoA. It highlighted that possession by civilians of military-style small arms and light weapons is a *"puzzling issue"* if the purpose of private possession of firearms is self-defence, hunting or sports shooting. Three statements rejected bringing up this issue in the PoA process (US, India, and Japan). The Kenyan representative, also speaking on behalf of the Regional Centre on Small Arms in the Great Lakes Region and in the Horn of Africa (RECSA), noted that the *"Nairobi Protocol contains strong provisions to address guns in the hands of civilians. This is important as the Small Arms Survey tells us that 607 million of the world's guns are in civilian hands. We are keen to see this issue discussed at the Review Conference as norms and standards are developing all over the world."*

In the general debate, the issue of guns in the hands of civilians was raised various times, including by Colombia on behalf of nine States, Brazil, Jamaica, Canada, Israel, Norway, and Indonesia.

The Mexican CRP, *Importance of the Subject on Civilian Possession in the Combat Against the Illicit Trade of Small Arms And Light Weapons: Concept Paper (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.7)* is available in English only at:

www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.7.pdf

Cluster III: Excessive accumulation, misuse and uncontrolled spread

Discussion points:

- Management, safety and security of stockpile
- Supply-demand perspective
- National security needs
- Identification, confiscation, destruction/disposal of surplus weapons, ammunition and explosives
- Disarmament, demobilisation and weapons collection
- Post-conflict weapons problems
- Financing illegal manufacture, trade, acquisition and possession
- Diversion from legal to illegal trade
- Appropriate use by authorised bodies

Stockpile management

Several statements stressed the importance of stockpile management (including the EU, Canada and Korea), and some emphasised that assistance is available (US, EU). South Africa and Norway stressed that surpluses should be destroyed as soon as practicable. Canada put forward a CRP recommending consideration of a formal assistance clause, establishment of a working group, and integration of stockpile issues into security sector reform (SSR) and arms reduction programmes. Nicaragua expressed support for regional confidence-building measures, e.g. a Code of Conduct. However, some States also emphasised that the determination of appropriate levels of stockpiles is an individual state's prerogative (Venezuela, Egypt). Chile asked for other countries' expertise, and Cambodia and Namibia requested further assistance with stockpile management and destruction. Some States stressed that the question of ammunition must also be addressed in this regard (including Canada, India, the EU and Senegal).

The Canadian CRP, *Preparing for the 2006 Review Conference of the UN Programme of Action: Stockpile Management and Destruction* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.2) is available in English at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.2.pdf

Ammunition

Some 40 States emphasised the importance of including a focus on ammunition in the fight against the illicit trade (EU, India and Senegal), and the EU referred to the marking and tracing process, which "contains a recommendation to address the issue of SALW ammunition in a comprehensive manner as part of a separate process conducted within the framework of the UN."¹⁵ Brazil had noted earlier in the week in the general debate "that the Review Conference must deal with the problem of ammunition as an issue of utmost priority... it is time for the PoA to be brought in line with established jurisprudence set by regional and global instruments, which recognize the need to deal with small arms and light weapons in a coordinated manner." In the general debate, Kazakhstan stated that "... the international community does not pay due attention to the proliferation of

¹⁵ See A/60/88 for the report of the Open Ended Working Group
<http://disarmament2.un.org/cab/oewg/Report.pdf>

ammunition and explosives." The US, however, stated that the issue of ammunition and explosives was outside the scope of the PoA and therefore of the RevCon.

The CRP from France and Germany, *Draft elements on ammunition for a Final Document of the UN SALW Programme of Action Review Conference 2006* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.12) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.12.pdf

Demand reduction

Many statements mentioned the need to pay more attention to demand factors (Canada, Japan, Norway), including the root causes of conflict (Pakistan, Nigeria), poverty (Iran, Uganda), promotion of a culture of peace and non-violent conflict resolution (Benin, Uganda), police relations (Uganda) and broader development strategies (EU, Kenya, Malawi, Uganda). The RevCon should support governments in setting up laws to reduce the incentives for illegal weapon possession (Cambodia). Switzerland noted that demand and illicit trade are often fuelled by weapons misuse by security forces. Some States stressed that state demand is a national prerogative (Israel) or that national security needs should not be examined under the rubric of demand (Egypt). Japan emphasised that demand should not be limited to state demand, and circulated a CRP proposing a thematic session on "Best practices of SALW projects and demand factors" at the RevCon.

The Japanese CRP, *Best practices of SALW projects and demand factors in the Review Conference of PoA* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.5) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.5.pdf

See also the Canadian CRP, *Addressing the Demand for Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.15), available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.15.pdf

Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration

Several statements emphasised that DDR programmes should consider gender in all its aspects, and improve the status of women in decision-making processes (Netherlands, Côte d'Ivoire, Senegal and Canada). The EU in cluster 1 had noted that "*States could develop mechanisms to ensure that women are involved in decision-making and other activities that inform security policies, such as changes to national regulations and DDR.*" India indicated that local ownership of DDR projects is very important, especially for building trust in communities, and Brazil reiterated the important role that civil society already plays in DDR programmes. Regional and trans-border approaches to DDR (Côte d'Ivoire) as well as coordination of programmes between states (Korea) were recommended. Several States suggested that assistance (including financial and technical support) for DDR should be considered as a part of development and/or poverty reduction programmes (Uganda, Benin).

Sweden noted that in March 2005, the OECD-DAC agreed the use of its development funds for small arms control and armed violence reduction efforts.¹⁶

¹⁶ In March 2005 the OECD Development Assistance Committee agreed to permit Overseas Development Assistance to be spent on activities aimed at 'controlling, preventing and reducing the proliferation of small arms and light weapons'. See www.oecd.org/dac.

Korea emphasised the need to disconnect links between ex-combatants and criminal networks. Greater attention to reintegration was called for by Burundi, Senegal and Benin. Namibia, reflecting on its own DDR process, commented that *"the reintegration aspect continues to pose challenges to the government, as it is a long-term process that requires concerted and sustainable developmental intervention."* Sweden identified disarmament as an element of DDR programmes that required more attention. Sweden put forward a CRP stating that a DDR programme is one of several elements of a peace process and should be well integrated into the peace process as a whole. Switzerland pointed to the importance of training former combatants who are integrated into security forces on the appropriate use of firearms and force, and Namibia called for action-oriented research on such programmes.

The Swedish CRP, *Preparing for the 2006 SALW PoA Review Conference: Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.4) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.4.pdf

Post-conflict issues (see also Cluster II)

A representative from the Netherlands, in his capacity as a member of the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA)¹⁷, emphasised the multiple threats posed by the misuse of small arms in post-conflict settings, including through criminal and intimate partner violence. Côte d'Ivoire, drawing on its own experience, called on the RevCon to recognise the need for peace-keeping operations to address the proliferation of small arms; to address the specific needs of women and children; to acknowledge the trans-national nature of the small arms problem and devise trans-national responses; and to undertake national measures to regulate weapons flows amongst civilians in post-conflict situations, in line with UNGA Resolution 60/68.

Appropriate use of weapons by authorised bodies

Statements from Canada and Switzerland argued that appropriate use of guns by authorised bodies must be addressed, given the link with demand, stating that *"research shows that such misuse often spurs civilian demand for weapons and boosts the illicit trade in them"* (Switzerland). The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) emphasised the importance of further efforts to ensure that military, security and police forces, as well as other arms bearers, act in accordance with international humanitarian law and human rights law, including rules concerning the responsible use of weapons contained in Protocol 1 additional to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, the UN *Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms*¹⁸, and the UN *Code of Conduct on the Use of Force by Law Enforcement Officials*¹⁹ (these agreements were also mentioned by several other States, including Switzerland and Norway). Canada supported the Swiss recommendations that a reference to relevant international human rights instruments, including the *Basic Principles*, be incorporated in the 2006 outcome document; and that agreement be reached on specific commitments addressing issues related to appropriate use.

South Africa argued that, the PoA being limited to 'illicit weapons', this issue should not be addressed in the context of the PoA. Pakistan concurred and

¹⁷ www.iansa.org

¹⁸ See www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp43.htm

¹⁹ See www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_comp42.htm

expressed concern that this may become an additional issue that is likely to threaten consensus. Iran added that since misuse by authorised bodies is already dealt with in human rights frameworks, it has no place in this process. Israel supported this view.

The Swiss CRP, *Preparing for the 2006 SALW PoA Review Conference: Appropriate use of SALW by law enforcement officials* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.6) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.6.pdf

Some 18 statements (including from Kenya, Tanzania, Australia, Jamaica and Palestine) mentioned the need for reform and improvements to policing and provision of community security. Malawi described its positive experience with community-based policing as did several other States. Other comments addressed the need for improved training of police to promote more effective prevention of and response to armed violence and to promote greater public trust in the police.

Trafficking in other commodities

The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons is sometimes financed by illicit trafficking in natural resources, and the UN process on small arms should therefore also consider the exploitation of natural resources (Nigeria, Egypt, Pakistan), and drug trafficking (Iran).

Cluster IV: International cooperation and assistance

Discussion points:

- Capacity building and specialist training
- Technical assistance
- Resources mobilization
- Networks for information-sharing
- Coordination and partnership
- Lessons learned
- New technologies
- Action-oriented research

Assistance for activities

Many representatives emphasised the need for more international assistance – both financial and technical – to enable States to fulfil their obligations under the PoA. Indonesia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) stressed the need to match “*the required needs of affected countries with available assistance*” and the need for donor coordination. Canada stated that assistance on the problem of small arms has been much smaller than that of landmine action and listed four key areas for attention: the provision of relevant information and technical assistance to assist nations in generating appropriate legislation; the development of local capacities for DDR and marking and tracing; the proper management of stockpiles and destructions of surplus weapons; and responding to the needs of survivors of gun violence. Iran pointed out the discrepancy between the revenues generated by the arms trade and the amount allocated to assistance for curbing the proliferation of small arms. Egypt

noted that the RevCon was not a pledging conference, and argued that the meeting should limit itself to reemphasising States' common, yet differentiated, commitment to provide financial and technical assistance.

The CRP from the Non-Aligned Movement, *Enhancing International Assistance in the Implementation of the Programme of Action in SALW* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.13) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.13.pdf

Establishment of a trust fund on small arms activities

Indonesia, on behalf of the NAM, encouraged States to establish a 'SALW Trust Fund' through regional organisations and/or UN Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament. The fund would rely on voluntary contributions for arms control and disarmament programmes only. A number of other representatives endorsed the idea of a trust fund (Kenya, Chile, and Sudan). The UN Development Programme (UNDP) suggested that the outcome document of the RevCon should establish a mechanism to match needs with resources, and suggested that the UNDP Trust Fund may be a useful mechanism in this regard.

Action-oriented research

Switzerland emphasised the need for more action-oriented research, including the development of a set of indicators, in order for States to develop evidence-based policies. Togo suggested the need to assess, prior to the RevCon, how international assistance has been allocated to date, and to draw lessons from the findings. Indonesia suggested that UNIDIR should carry out a study on financial and technical needs of developing countries to fully implement the PoA.

Implementation mechanism(s)

Some States highlighted the need for an appropriate mechanism to provide independent useful information, analysis of implementation of the PoA, and to serve as a point of contact (Switzerland, Argentina, Chile and India). Finland stated that the agency acting as clearinghouse should be chosen according to four benchmarks: ability to match resources and needs; disseminate lessons learned; enhance capability of sponsors; and be cost-effective. Other States, including Japan, also highlighted the need to further disseminate best practices. Japan and a number of other States highlighted the need for ownership of the efforts on the ground by affected States.

Demand reduction

Japan noted the need to take demand factors into consideration when providing international assistance. With Canada, Japan also drew attention to the Small Arms Survey and Quaker United Nations Office research on the issue.²⁰ Egypt underscored the link between small arms action and development, and reemphasised the need for governments to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.²¹ The EU also pointed out that "assistance is most effective when it is conducted within development partnerships and aligned with broader development goals."

²⁰ See Annex 2 for details

²¹ See www.undp.org/mdg/ for more details

Cluster V: Communication

Discussion points:

- Engagement of civil society, including NGOs and parliamentarians
- Public awareness programmes
- Mobilising the political will of States
- Confidence-building measures/programmes
- Promotion of dialogue and culture of peace

Engaging civil society

“Civil society is the UN’s window to reality”, said the Holy See in its statement. A number of representatives, including the Philippines, Ghana, India, the EU, Uruguay, Canada, Argentina and Kenya, highlighted the importance of civil society’s participation and acknowledged its contributions to the UN process. The EU stated that *“Many of our aims cannot or at least not sufficiently be attained without appropriate engagement of civil society. In this context, the EU wishes to underscore that the PoA encourages non-governmental organisations and civil society to engage, as appropriate, in all aspects of international, regional, sub regional and national efforts to implement the Programme of Action.”*

Uruguay stressed the need to include civil society in developing, designing and implementing disarmament programmes in post-conflict situations and in peaceful contexts, as well as the need for civil society representatives on national commissions and committees. Nigeria stated that *“the best way to assess the importance of NGOs in the fight against illicit small arms is to imagine the implementation of the Programme of Action without them, an imagination that may likely turn out to be a nightmare.”*

Raising public awareness

Canada proposed the creation of a specialised group on communication and resource mobilisation to generate political will and cooperation with NGOs. The importance of education in raising public awareness was recognised in a number of statements, including the EU, the Holy See, and the Korea. In the general debate, Zambia had reminded delegates that *“the media also plays a major part in disseminating information on action taken by government(s).”*

France stressed the necessity to establish communication strategies at various levels to deal with the issue of small arms. The French CRP, *Communicating on the small arms issue: proposed guidelines* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.10) is available in English at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.10.pdf
In French at: [www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.10%20\(French\).pdf](http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.10%20(French).pdf)

India highlighted the importance of the International Gun Destruction Day (July 9th). Bangladesh also emphasised its commitment to this day in the general debate.

Promotion of a culture of peace

The Philippines stressed the importance of inter-faith dialogue in fostering a culture of peace and non-violence, observing that the *“problem of small arms*

goes beyond military and disarmament domains; it has humanitarian as well as socio-economic consequences." A number of representatives, including those from India, Pakistan and Korea, acknowledged the importance of fostering a culture of peace to prevent gun violence and misuse.

Engaging parliamentarians

Uruguay, Ghana and others stressed the need to involve parliamentarians in addressing the problem of small arms, and acknowledged the important role parliamentarians play in shaping political processes and engaging with civil society. Mozambique, in the general debate, had highlighted the "important role (of parliamentarians) in introducing or supporting legislation at the national level aimed at meeting the requirements of the Program of Action and/or regional instruments to regulate trade in small arms and light weapons." Ghana also proposed that the RevCon give a clear role to parliamentarians in the small arms control process.

Cluster VI: Follow-up, reporting mechanisms

Discussion points:

- Review processes
- Periodicity of national reporting
- Research and monitoring
- Points of contact
- National coordination agencies

Existing obligations

Many States emphasised the need to implement existing obligations under the PoA first (EU, China). For example, States should nominate national points of contact and commissions (EU), develop national action plans (Senegal), and support action-oriented research (Senegal, Ghana).

Format, periodicity, and purpose of meetings

India, the Netherlands and South Africa submitted a paper outlining three options for synchronising the BMS and the RevCon in the next cycle of the UN process on small arms control. Many States welcomed this paper (Japan, China, US). Some expressed concern about possible budgetary problems if a BMS was held as early as 2007, and about overloading the disarmament agenda in 2011 since two major conferences are already scheduled for that year. Many States supported holding the next RevCon in 2012. Some expressed reservations about also holding a BMS in the same year.

The CRP from India, the Netherlands and South Africa, *Synchronization of the Review Conference and Biennial Meetings of States* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.8) is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.5.pdf

Format and frequency of reporting

Several statements, including those by the EU, Senegal and India, expressed strong support for the submission of national reports every two years, to coincide with BMS meeting cycle. This appears to be the practice of many governments to date. Cuba emphasised that the submission of national reports should remain voluntary. Korea, among others, welcomed the reporting assistance package offered by UNDP, UNIDIR, UN Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA).²²

Some States expressed support for the development of a set of indicators to guide the drafting and facilitate the analysis of national reports (Senegal). Others, however, cautioned against the development of mandatory guidelines, and maintained that the format of reporting should remain discretionary (US). Mexico highlighted the need to address the capacity of the UN Secretariat to analyse national reports and to identify overall trends.

Inter-sessional meetings: International assistance and cooperation

A Dutch proposal for inter-sessional meetings focused specifically on assistance and cooperation. States, IOs and NGOs would come together between BMS's to build partnerships on the themes identified in the PoA and ensure that the PoA translates into action. In addition, the Netherlands proposed a small 'Implementation Support Cell' to connect project proposals with donors, take care of administrative procedures and communications, and organise implementation meetings. The Netherlands also advocated the formulation of 'concrete targets' in the same vein as the Millennium Development Goals. Argentina suggested the establishment of a permanent UN mechanism on assistance and cooperation. (See Cluster IV for more discussion of this issue).

The WP by the Netherlands, *Preparing for the 2006 SALW PoA Review Conference: Focusing on Implementation: A Concrete But Flexible Arrangement* is available in all UN languages at:

<http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/prepcom/off-docs.html>

Inter-sessional meetings: advancing discrete issues

Canada circulated a proposal for informal semi-annual inter-sessional meetings, to provide more visibility for the issue of small arms. It suggests the establishment of "four or five Standing Committees to address key thematic areas in depth, and to generate ideas and recommendations for consideration during formal meetings of States. The Standing Committees would be deliberative bodies with no decision making authority." Themes proposed for initial work include (i) Transfer controls, (ii) Stockpile management, (iii) Reducing demand, (iv) National regulation, and (v) Cooperation and assistance, including assistance to survivors. In addition, a contact group on resource mobilisation and communication would be established "to develop strategies to generate the political and popular will, and the human, technical and financial resources that are essential to putting our words into action." The contact group could advance implementation of issues under consideration by the Standing Committees.

The Canadian *Proposal for an Inter-sessional Programme of Work to Enhance Implementation* (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.9) is available in English only at:

www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.9.pdf

²² See www.undp.org/bcpr/smallarms/PoA.htm

However, some States were of the view that further meetings, in addition to BMS and RevCon, would overburden the agenda (South Africa, US, Egypt). Japan pointed out the financial and human resource burdens on each State as a result of more meetings and suggested *ad hoc* meetings on specific issues instead. The annual meeting of the UNGA First Committee (on 'disarmament and international security' matters) was suggested as a venue to reflect on progress achieved on the PoA (Spain, Netherlands). Mexico cautioned against using the First Committee as a venue, as many of the issues covered in the PoA are also appropriate for discussion in Second (on 'economic and financial' matters) or Third Committees (on 'social, humanitarian and cultural' matters).²³ Egypt also cautioned against dealing with the issue of small arms in the First Committee due to lack of time.

Thematic working groups

Other statements supported the idea of developing thematic working groups which could explore certain issues in more detail before reporting back on their work to the BMS (Senegal, Spain). Topics mentioned for examination by working groups included transfers, stockpile management, and national plans of action. Mexico added that the mandate of the working groups should be clearly defined for each session, so it is not too broad and that working groups can do detailed work.

Permanent Commission

Mexico, questioning whether the inter-sessional meetings proposed by the Netherlands and Canada would be enough to develop more concrete measures to tackle small arms, suggested the creation of a Commission, of permanent and institutional character. As a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, a Commission would also acknowledge the multidimensional character of the small arms issue, spanning over disarmament, human rights, economic and social matters.

Sponsorship programme

If the frequency of meetings were to increase, Canada and the Netherlands suggested the establishment of a sponsorship programme to ensure that all States would be able to participate with appropriate delegations.

²³ Information on all six UN General Assembly committees is available at: www.un.org/ga/60

Additional Conference Room and Working Papers

The CRP from the EU, *EU Strategy to combat illicit accumulation and trafficking of SALW and their ammunition (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.14)* is available in English at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.14.pdf In French at: [www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.14.\(French\).pdf](http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.14.(French).pdf)

The Angolan CRP *Elements to contribute for a Final Document of the UN SALW Programme of Action Review Conference 2006 (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/CRP.16)* is available in English only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.16.pdf

The Mexican CRP *Reserva de la Delegación de México respecto al documento (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/L.7)* is available in Spanish only at: www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/CRP.18-S.pdf

Suggestion of Recommendations for issues (Submitted by Argentina), contained in Cluster I (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.4), Cluster II (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.5), Cluster III (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.6), Cluster IV (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.7), Cluster V (A/CONF.192/2006/PC/WP.8), available in all UN languages at: <http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/prepcom/off-docs.html>

Annex

Reports and publications submitted or released on the occasion of the PrepCom

National reports on the implementation of the PoA have been received in 2006 from: Chile, Ecuador, Oman and Yemen and are available at <http://disarmament.un.org/cab/salw-nationalreports-2006.htm>

IANSA position papers on:

1. *Appropriate use of small arms by State officials*
2. *Assisting survivors of small arms misuse*
3. *Draining the existing pool of weapons*
4. *Gender-specific action to prevent small arms violence*
5. *Improving funding coordination*
6. *National regulation of small arms*
7. *Reducing the demand for small arms*
8. *Regulating small arms brokering*
9. *Regulating international transfers of small arms*
10. *Sustaining development through regulating small arms*

In English, available at: www.iansa.org/un/review2006/position-papers.htm

Biting the Bullet (International Alert, Saferworld and University of Bradford): *Promoting Effective Global Action on Small Arms: Priorities for the 2006 UN Review Conference*

In English, available at: www.international-alert.org/publications/241.php

Small Arms Survey and Quaker United Nations Office
Demanding Attention: Addressing the Dynamics of Small Arms Demand

In English, French and Spanish, available at:
<http://hei.unige.ch/sas/publications/occasional.htm> and
www.quno.org/disarmament/salw/smallarmsLinks.htm

Control Arms campaign (Amnesty International, IANSA and Oxfam International)
The call for tough arms controls: Case studies

1. *Voices from Sierra Leone*
2. *Voices from Haiti*
3. *Voices from the Democratic Republic of Congo*

In English, available at: www.controlarms.org

Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue

Small arms control: A focus on the 2005 Session of the UN First Committee

In English, available at:
www.hdcentre.org/UN+First+Committee+%28Disarmament%29+2005

Quaker United Nations Office, David Jackman & Marin O'Brien
A Clear Step Forward: Attention to Demand Issues at the UN Prep Com on Small Arms, January 2006

In English, available at: www.quno.org/disarmament/salw/smallarmsLinks.htm

The Global Gun Epidemic: From Saturday Night Specials to AK-47s – by Wendy Cukier and Victor W. Sidel

In English, available from the publisher: www.greenwood.com/catalog/C8256.aspx