United Nations CASA
Coordinating Action on Small Arms

Broad-based Consultation on the Development of International Small Arms Control Standards

Domaine de Penthes, Geneva, Switzerland
24-25 November 2008

SUMMARY REPORT

CONTENTS

1.   Introduction to the UN Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) mechanism

The United Nations' *Coordinating Action on Small Arms* (CASA) mechanism strives to improve the UN's ability to work as one in delivering effective policy, programming and advice to Member States on curbing the uncontrolled proliferation and misuse of small arms and light weapons (SALW). Established by the Secretary-General in 1998 with the task of coordinating the small arms work of numerous UN Departments, Programmes, Funds, Offices, Institutes and Committees, CASA today unites 17 UN bodies active in policy development and/or programming related to SALW:

CASA Members:

CTED	United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate
DESA	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
DPA	Department of Political Affairs
DPI	Department of Public Information
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
OSRSG/CAAC	Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDIR	United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNODA	Office for Disarmament Affairs
UNODC	Office on Drugs and Crime
WHO	World Health Organization

The UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) acts as the focal point for CASA. In his 2008 report on small arms to the UN Security Council, the Secretary-General made strengthening CASA one of his disarmament priorities. [1] For further information on CASA, please visit www.un-casa.org.

2.   Background on International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS)

In October 2007, CASA members endorsed the idea of developing a set of International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) along the lines of the standards already developed by the United Nations in the areas of mine action (International Mine Action Standards) and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (Integrated DDR Standards). The purpose of this initiative is to develop a set of internationally accepted and validated standards that will provide comprehensive guidance to practitioners and policymakers on all aspects of small arms control.

CASA subsequently organized a number of consultations with States and other interested parties to develop this idea and drafted a concept paper. CASA formally launched the ISACS project in July 2008, on the margins of the third Biennial Meeting of States to consider implementation of the UN Programme of Action on small arms, where the appointment of a Project Coordinator to oversee the development of the standards was also announced. CASA organised additional briefings on the ISACS

---

[1] S/2008/258 of 17 April 2008, p. 14.

project in October 2008 during the Conference of Parties to the UN Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime in Vienna and during the First Committee of the General Assembly in New York.

The Secretary-General informed UN Member States of CASA's initiative to develop international small arms control standards in his 2008 reports on small arms to the Security Council[2] and the General Assembly.[3]

3. Purpose of the Consultation

On 24-25 November 2008, CASA organised a "Broad-based Consultation on the Development of International Small Arms Control Standards." The purpose of the consultation, hosted by UNDP at the *Domaine de Penthes* in Geneva, was to test the assumptions, content and methodology of CASA's project document on ISACS by discussing it in detail with a diverse range of small arms experts drawn from UN agencies, international and regional organisations, governments, NGOs and the small arms industry.

The consultation was also designed to provide an opportunity learn from the United Nations' considerable experience in developing human security-related standards (i.e. the International Mine Action Standards and the Integrated DDR Standards), as well as from the vast expertise in developing small arms-related standards and guidelines that exists at the regional and sub-regional levels, and to apply these lessons to the development of international standards on small arms control.

Following the initial development of the idea within CASA, the consultation provided an invaluable sounding board on CASA's vision of ISACS. It also acted as a solid platform from which launch the ISACS project into its operational drafting phase, which will commence at the beginning of 2009.

4. Participation and Structure

A total of 52 experts representing 39 organisations, States and companies participated in the consultation. Among these were representatives of 12 UN bodies or international organisations, 10 civil society organisations, 8 States, 7 regional organisations and 2 industry bodies (see Annex 2 for a full list).

The organisers had aimed for more geographical distribution in terms of participation by States. Unfortunately, many States were unable to be represented at the consultation due to a large multilateral meeting taking place at the same time in Geneva.

The consultation began with an overview of the rationale and expected benefits of international small arms control standards, as envisioned by CASA. The remainder of the consultation was divided into two parts:

---

[2] S/2008/258 of 17 April 2008, p. 15.
[3] A/63/261 of 11 August 2008, p. 10.

The first part, entitled *Building on Solid Foundations*, drew lessons from the UN's experience in developing standards on mine action and on disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration, as well as from the rich experience of regional organisations in developing standards, best practice guidelines, model regulations, etc. on small arms control.

The second part, entitled *Structuring and developing ISACS*, presented and discussed CASA's conceptualisation of the content and structure of ISACS, as well as the process by which CASA proposed to develop these standards (see Annex 1 for the consultation programme).

5.   Rationale and Benefits of ISACS

In his opening presentation, the ISACS Project Coordinator, Patrick Mc Carthy, provided an introduction to CASA (reflected in point 1 above) and sketched the path that the ISACS project had followed to date (reflected in point 2 above). He also elaborated on the following points:

a)   Introduction to Standards

International standards are ubiquitous – so much so that we don't usually think about them. But if they were not there, we would quickly notice. Whether it is the standardised size of credit cards, freight containers or CDs, international standards make our lives easier and more predictable and greatly facilitate international relations and the trade in goods, services and ideas. Not all standards are global, however. Some, such as paper sizes or plugs, are regional. And, of course, not everything is meant to be standardised. To be useful, standards must bring tangible benefits to the sectors and industries in which they are applied and to the people who work in them.

The International Organisation for Standardization (ISO), the global leader in developing international standards of all kinds, defines standards as "a documented agreement containing technical specifications or other precise criteria to be used consistently as rules, guidelines, or definitions."[4] The ISO stresses that international standards are not legally binding or obligatory in any way and can evolve over time as new technologies and knowledge become available.

A distinction should be drawn between standards, on the one hand, and more detailed 'technical guidelines' or 'standard operating procedures,' on the other. The latter are usually used to provide detailed guidance on how to go about achieving standards. The standards themselves specify *what* needs to be done but do not go into detail on *how* to go about doing it.

---

[4] See www.iso.org.

  b) *Standards and the United Nations*

The United Nations has accumulated considerable experience in developing international standards and guidelines on a wide range of issues including crime prevention and criminal justice,[5] trade and electronic business,[6] food,[7] international shipping,[8] the labelling of chemicals[9] and the transport of dangerous goods,[10] including by sea[11] and air.[12] Specifically in the area of peace and security, the United Nations has developed International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)[13] and Integrated Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS).[14]

  c) *Rationale of ISACS*

CASA members believe that the time has come to develop a set of internationally accepted and validated standards providing comprehensive guidance to practitioners and policy makers on all aspects of small arms control. Why is this?

The problem of how to deal with the uncontrolled proliferation and misuse of SALW has been on the international agenda for more than a decade, ever since UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali introduced the concept of "micro-disarmament" in his 1995 *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace*.[15]

Since then, a range of actors have implemented SALW control programme in over 50 countries, gaining practical experience and learning invaluable lessons along the way. At the same time, the international community has amassed an impressive body of knowledge and data on the scope and anatomy of SALW proliferation and misuse, as well as on the burden this places on vulnerable people throughout the world.

Action on SALW control has been particularly intensive at the regional and sub-regional levels, where much practical experience and lessons learned have been

---

[5] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Compendium of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice*. Available at http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/justice-and-prison-reform/compendium.html.

[6] United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). See http://www.unece.org/etrades.

[7] United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and World Health Organisation (WHO), *Codex Alimentarius*. Available at http://www.codexalimentarius.net/web/index_en.jsp.

[8] United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), *Minimum Standards for Shipping Agents*. Available at http://www.ihrelawfirm.se/regler/unctad.pdf.

[9] United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), *Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals*. Available at http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/ghs_welcome_e.html.

[10] United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), *UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods: Model Regulations*. Available at http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/unrec/rev13/13nature_e.html.

[11] International Maritime Organisation (IMO), *International Maritime Dangerous Good Code*. Available at http://www.imo.org/TCD/mainframe.asp?topic_id=158.

[12] International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air*. Availbale at http://www.icao.int/icaonet/dcs/9284.html.

[13] Available at http://www.mineactionstandards.org.

[14] Available at http://www.unddr.org.

[15] Available at http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agsupp.html.

codified into standards, best practice guidelines, codes of conduct and model legislation (see Annex 3 for a listing).

At the global level too, much as been achieved. The UN *Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects* (UNPoA) was adopted by the General Assembly by consensus in 2001. In 2005, the *Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (the Firearms Protocol) entered into force. Also in 2005, the General Assembly adopted by consensus an *International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons* (International Tracing Instrument).

In sum, the small arms issue has by now reached a sufficient level of maturity to make it possible to develop standards on small arms control at the global level. We have extensive knowledge of the scope and anatomy of the problem and extensive experience of implementing programmes to address it. At the global level, three multilateral agreements provide a solid framework around which to build. At the regional level, a dense network of codes, best practices and guidelines provide a solid foundation upon which to build.

d)   *Benefits of ISACS*

International Small Arms Control Standards will bring a number of benefits to a range of beneficiaries. The main benefits include:

- Enabling the United Nations to "deliver as one" on SALW policy and programming;

- Improving the design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SALW control programmes by all stakeholders;

- Helping to disseminate knowledge and effective practices globally;

- Establishing an agreed level of performance within the global small arms *community of practice;*

- Helping to identify capacity-building needs and to evaluate the effectiveness of assistance programmes;

- Establishing a set of benchmarks against which to measure the implementation of global small arms commitments; and

- Providing a basis for the development of national small arms control standards.

The primary beneficiaries of ISACS will be:

- *People affected by the misuse of SALW:* The primary beneficiaries of ISACS will be people all over the world who live in fear of their lives, as well as those of family and loved ones, because of the easy availability and widespread misuse of SALW. Because ISACS will contribute to making SALW control more effective across the board, the standards will make a significant contribution to reducing the burden of armed violence felt by millions of people around the world.

- *The United Nations:* By strengthening coordination and establishing an agreed level of performance for the UN bodies that make up the CASA mechanism, ISACS will enable the United Nations to "deliver as one" on SALW control both at the programmatic and policymaking levels.

- *SALW policymakers and practitioners:* SALW policymakers and practitioners, whether they work with the United Nations, government agencies, international/regional organisations or NGOs, will benefit from having access to a set of internationally agreed and validated standards that will provide them with guidance on all aspects of SALW control. As well as helping to improve the overall level of performance of individual actors, these standards will also facilitate cooperation among actors, especially in the field.

- *UN Member States:* By providing a clear set of voluntary, technically validated, international standards on small arms control, this project will provide valuable guidance to UN Member States on the implementation of their commitments under the UN Programme of Action, the International Tracing Instrument and, where applicable, the Firearms Protocol. Developing countries will be able to use the standards to help them identify their specific cooperation and assistance needs in meeting their international commitments. Donor governments will be able to use them to help decide on the most effective investment of their resources and also to evaluate the effectiveness of cooperation and assistance provided. Any government will be able to use them as a basis for developing SALW policies or even its own set of national small arms control standards (as IMAS have been used as the basis for developing national mine action standards).

- *The Small Arms Industry:* International standards on small arms control would also benefit the small arms industry by helping to curb the illicit trade in SALW, which undermines the legal small arms trade to the tune of about one billion US dollars a year. In addition, clear international standards on such things as marking, record-keeping, end-use certification, etc. would provide industry with a transparent framework for action and a more level playing field on which to operate.

e) *Feedback from participants on ISACS rationale and benefits*

Following the presentation of the rationale and benefits of ISACS, initial perspectives on the project were first invited from a panel of participants:

• Julie Myers, Project Officer in the Landmines and Small Arms cluster of UNICEF, provided a UN perspective.

• Meir Itzchaki, Counsellor for Disarmament Affairs and Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, provided a government perspective.

• Rebecca Peters, Director of the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA), provide a civil society perspective.

• Jonathan Sandy, Programme Manager with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Small Arms Control Programme (ECOSAP), provided a regional perspective.

• Mark A. Westrom, President of the Defense Small Arms Advisory Council (DSAAC), provided an industry perspective.

The main points to emerge from these presentations, as well as from the open discussion that followed, were as follows:

i) *Demand for ISACS*

CASA has taken the initiative to develop ISACS in large part as a result of the strong demand coming from the field operations of CASA members to do more to curb the uncontrolled proliferation and misuse of small arms. This demand is being expressed both by the people whom these UN agencies seek to help and also by UN personnel in the field who work to implement small arms control programmes or whose work in other areas is disrupted or reversed by the easy availability and misuse of small arms.

ii) *Benefits of ISACS*

In addition to the benefits outlined during the presentation of ISACS, a number of other potential benefits also emerged during the discussion:

It was pointed out that ISACS would develop a "common language" on small arms control that would be very beneficial to the international small arms community of practice and that ISACS could also be a useful resource in helping States to report on their implementation of international commitments.

From the perspective of States, it is important to understand that ISACS will not be legally binding or mandatory in any way. The standards will not dictate anything to States but will rather offer guidance that States will be free to use should they find it useful.

From the perspective of civil society, ISACS could prove to be an important additional tool for NGOs to use to use when advocating for more effective action to curb the proliferation and misuse of small arms, especially when attempting to reach out to potentially influential actors such as parliamentarians.

ISACS could be instrumental in filling the "policy gap" that currently exists between the overarching norms established by global small arms agreements, on the one hand, and attempts to deal with the small arms problem at field level, on the other.

ISACS will also ensure that operational knowledge gained by Project Managers is not lost when they leave the small arms community.

From the perspective of the small arms industry, it was pointed out that ISACS could contribute to making the legal trade in SALW smoother and more transparent.

iii)   *Scope and format of ISACS*

There was some difference of opinion among participants on the scope of the standards to be developed. Some preferred a narrower scope that would concentrate on issues related specifically to the illicit trade in SALW while others favoured a broader scope that would encompass a wider range of issues related to their production, possession, proliferation, misuse, etc.

It was emphasised that ISACS would at least need to make linkages with disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (on which international standards already exist), as well as with the area of security sector reform. It was underlined, however, that the scope of ISACS should be determined by the overarching priority of addressing the needs of affected States and of the organisations, UN and otherwise, that seek to assist them.

There are numerous practical, technical areas of small arms control on which it should prove relatively uncontroversial to develop international standards. However, since the issue of small arms is more politicised than, for example, mine action or DDR, there are also areas that could prove more controversial. CASA will need to remain cognisant of this fact as it proceeds with developing ISACS.

A number of participants supported the idea of structuring ISACS according to the ISO format given its familiarity, wide application in other areas and the extra implementation incentive this could provide.

iv)   *Level of detail and voluntary nature of ISACS*

There was some discussion on the level of detail that ISACS would need to have in order to make them applicable in a variety of local settings. In

general, it was thought that the appropriate level of detail would fall somewhere between that of broad norms (such as those set out in global small arms agreements) on the one hand, and the level of detail that is usually contained in technical guidelines or standard operating procedures, on the other.

It was suggested that the level of detail of each individual standard would likely be determined by a number of factors, including the political aspects of the issue, the technical requirements of the functional area, the proven operational knowledge that exists and what the expert reference groups decide. This could vary for each individual standard.

v)   *Relationship of ISACS with legal and political norms*

It was pointed out that there exists a real danger that ISACS, avowedly non-binding in nature, could undermine legal obligations in the UN Firearms Protocol and firm political commitments in the UN Programme of Action and International Tracing Instrument if they simply replicate legal and political norms contained in those instruments. This could be avoided by having ISACS restate the legally- or politically-binding nature of specific norms but then proceed to unpack these in greater (albeit non-binding) detail. In this way, the standards would, in essence, constitute suggested interpretations of broader legal and political norms related to SALW control.

vi)   *Single or multiple standards?*

A discussion developed on whether it would be best for ISACS to propose single or multiple standards on the various issues-areas covered. Some participants argued in favour of developing multiple standards on each issue-area, ranging from minimum standards to be applied in low capacity settings to more ambitious standards to be applied where possible.

Others favoured setting a single standard in each issue-area that would be both effective in achieving the desired result and achievable by all States. Setting a single standard would most likely mean that, while most States would have to work to achieve it, some States would already meet or surpass it. It was suggested that States that meet or surpass a standard could be encouraged to assist other States to achieve it.

It was also suggested that a flexible approach could be taken, seeking to establish a high, single standard where possible, but allowing for different levels of standards in areas where context or capacity dictate that a single standard achievable by all would have to be set very low.

It was pointed out, however, that the terminology prescribed by the ISO standard format – namely, "shall," "should," "may" and "can" – could be used to convey a range of possible actions within each individual standard.

According to the ISO "rules for the structure and drafting of international standards:"[16]

- *Shall* is "used to indicate requirements strictly to be followed in order to conform to the document and from which no deviation is permitted."

- *Should* is "used to indicate that among several possibilities one is recommended as particularly suitable, without mentioning or excluding others, or that a certain course of action is preferred but not necessarily required, or that (in the negative form) a certain possibility or course of action is deprecated but not prohibited."

- *May* is "used to indicate a course of action permissible within the limits of the document."

- *Can* is "used for statements of possibility and capability, whether material, physical or causal."

vii) *ISACS Development process*

The importance of establishing a consultative process for developing ISACS was underlined. The CASA-led development process should involve input from international and regional organisations, interested governments, the small arms industry and all relevant areas of civil society (including, for example, civilian shooting associations, gun-control advocacy organisations and women's groups). It was pointed out that, since developing ISACS will be a political as well as a technical process, it will be particularly important to keep governments informed and involved.

It was also suggested that the ISACS project could benefit from analysing how other standards-related initiatives have encouraged industry self-regulation. An example cited was the Kimberly Process Certification Scheme for rough diamonds.

6. Building on Solid Foundations: Main lessons from UN and regional experience

Following the initial presentation and discussion of the rationale and expected benefits of ISACS, the consultation turned to examining and drawing lessons from the UN's experience in developing standards on mine action and DDR, as well as the experience of regional organisations in developing small arms-related standards and guidelines.

a) *Learning from existing UN standards initiatives: IMAS & IDDRS*

Noel Mulliner, Technology Coordinator with the UN Mine Action Service, provided an overview of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Glaucia Boyer, DDR Policy Specialist with UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention

---

[16] ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2. Fifth edition, 2004.

and Recovery, provided an overview of the Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS). Both presentations focused on why and how the UN developed these standards, the impact they have had in their respective practice areas and relevant lessons that might be applied the initiative to develop international standards for small arms control.

The following were the main points to emerge from the presentations and from the discussion that followed:

i)   *Impetus for standards*

IMAS and IDDRS were developed by their respective communities of practice for their respective communities of practice. The impetus for them came from the necessity to meet specific needs, including ensuring the safe implementation of programmes; learning systematically and sharing lessons consistently; increasing cooperation and decreasing duplication in field operations; and responding to growing criticism from partners (including donors) that the lack of common standards was reducing the effectiveness of programmes.

The development of these standards was also made necessary by a significant increase over time in the number and diversity of relevant actors (national, international, military, policy, civilian, etc.), as well as in the range of contexts in which it was necessary to implement programmes (peacekeeping, non-peacekeeping and mixed environments).

It was recognised that developing international standards in these areas could contribute to moving from a fragmented approach to a more integrated one; and from providing reactive, ad hoc guidance to providing timely, clear and standardised guidance. It was also recognised that developing international standards would increase the support, monitoring and review of programming by headquarters and would also make it easier to develop joint funding strategies.

ii)   *Benefits of standards*

An important benefit of international standards, in addition to those outlined above, is that they provide 'top cover' to practitioners who, in the event of inevitable setbacks, may at least claim to have been operating according to the agreed standard.

The process of successfully creating international standards can be very beneficial for a community of practice. Internally, it demonstrates common purpose and creates consensus among issue-area specialists. Externally, it can win respect and recognition for a community of practice and boost the profile of its work.

iii)   *International standards and national action*

The existence of international standards should not deflect attention away from the fact that individual States have the primary responsibility of addressing problems related to mine action and DDR. It is therefore imperative that international standards be applicable in a variety of settings and that States be encouraged to use them as a basis for developing their own national policies and standards.

National standards are not international standards whose title has simply been changed. It requires a lot of effort to transform international standards into national ones. National standards need to be specific and adapted to the national circumstances. Ideally, they should be supported by national legislation.

iv)   *Management of Standards*

The following bodies may play a role in identifying, developing, reviewing and modifying international standards:

- A 'custodian' organisation hosts the standards and provides primary support for drafting and modifying standards.

- Focus groups comprising a range of technical experts provide initial feedback on the usefulness, clarity, technical content and applicability of draft standards.

- A review board comprising leading policy staff from a range of interested bodies reviews draft standards.

- A UN inter-agency body meeting at the Principals level approves the standards.

Also, to be effective and safe, international standards should have built-in quality- and risk-management systems.

v)   *Adoption and impact of standards*

As is the case with all international standards, IMAS and IDDRS are voluntary in nature. Some governments and organisations have opted, however, to specify compliance with these standards as a condition for receiving funding or contracts to carry out work in these areas. This has helped in the overall adoption of the standards by practitioners and policymakers.

The adoption of IMAS was further boosted when the UN Security Council recommended that all troop contributing countries should comply with

IMAS when conducting humanitarian mine action as part of UN peacekeeping operations.

Like any actor, the armed forces of States have no legal obligation to adopt international standards. The experience of mine action has been that, in general and as a result of sustained persuasion efforts, State militaries are coming to see the benefits of applying IMAS. In cases where military forces do not clear mined areas according to IMAS, humanitarian demining organisations have to return to those areas in order to ensure that they have been cleared according to international standards.

The experience of IDDRS, gained as a result of an assessment conducted one year after the standards where launched, is that the IDDRS have led to a much greater understanding of DDR operations among practitioners and policymakers. There is an overall recognition that the IDDRS has filled a gap and that they are useful at two levels – in improving the personal understanding of relevant actors of how DDR programmes should work and because of their applicability in the design and implementation of programmes. The IDDRS have also been successful in highlighting the integration of crosscutting issues, especially gender, into DDR programmes.

vi)   *Supplementing standards*

In the area mine action, IMAS have been supplemented by "Technical Notes on Mine Action" (TNMA), which provide specific information related to safety issues that should be taken into account when implementing IMAS. These TNMAs pass though a more abbreviated development process than would a mine action standard. SEESAC's Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines have also followed this model, developing 'technical notes' to support the implementation of the standards/guidelines.

In order to help users to find their way through the IDDRS, the UN has developed an "Operational Guide to the IDDRS" that briefly explains key guidance. In addition, an even briefer "Senior Managers Note" extracts key strategic and policy guidance for the IDDRS to support decision-making by senior managers.

vii)   *Timelines for developing standards*

Developing international standards is a time consuming process – a first set of IMAS took about four years to develop and IDDRS took about three years. This is time well spent, however, since the *process* of developing international standards can be as beneficial to the community of practice in question as the final *product* of the standards themselves.

Meticulously consulting on and validating draft standards as they are being developed is also an extremely important aspect of the standards

development process but is also very time consuming. This time investment is crucial, however, to ensuring the eventual adoption and use of the standards by the widest possible range of actors.

viii)   *Other lessons from the IMAS and IDDRS experiences*

- Be clear about whom the standards are for, who has responsibility for maintaining them and who can change or add to them.

- Capture field experiences in the standards in order to ensure that they are relevant and to increase their "field ownership."

- Secure a mandate from an authoritative source to help propel the development of the standards.

- Secure the support of a donor or group of donors. Standards can be expensive to produce and maintain and the financial commitment to them must be long-term because of the extensive review and updating that is necessary to keep them alive and relevant.

- Establish a mechanism for the efficient coordination of electronic inputs to the standards development process, as well as solid leadership and decision making that will keep the process moving forward.

- Choose a simple system for referring to the various versions of standards. This becomes extremely important over time as standards are increasingly reviewed and modified.

- Establish clear terms of reference for all bodies involved in the process of developing and reviewing standards.

- Pay particular attention to the rollout and dissemination of international standards, as well as to conducting proper training on them.

ix)   *Open questions*

- *Translation*: Translating international standards makes them available to a wider audience but also brings significant problems; such as how to maintain the accuracy of translated versions of standards as they are reviewed and modified and how to cover the very significant costs involved. It also complicates the question of which is the official version of the standards.

- *Production formats*: The primary source of international standards should be a website on which all up-to-date versions of the standards are stored. Additional electronic production options include CD's or memory-sticks but these can be expensive, can have distribution problems and become out of date as soon as standards are revised.

Printing the standards is also an option but hard copies have the same drawbacks as electronic versions mentioned above and are also much more expensive. Ensuring that ISACS are easily accessible where they are most needed should be the primary factor guiding the decision on production formats.

b)   Learning from existing regional standards initiatives

Following a thorough discussion of IMAS and IDDRS, the consultation turned its attention to examining regional initiatives to develop standards and guidelines on small arms control. The goal of this segment of the consultation was to ascertain the extent and nature of the regional action that has taken place, as well as to discuss how best ISACS could build on the regional foundation that already exists.

The ISACS Project Coordinator first presented an overview of global, regional and sub-regional agreements, standards, guidelines and recommendations that exist on SALW. Participants were invited to comment on this list with a view to making it more complete (an updated list is contained in Annex 3). Case studies of three regional organisations (OSCE, SEESAC and OAS) and one export control regime (Wassenaar Arrangement) were then presented and discussed:

- **Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE):** *Handbooks of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons and on Conventional Ammunition.* Presentation by Ms. Elli Kytömäki, OSCE Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC) Support Officer.

- **Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies:** *Best practice guidelines related to SALW.* Presentation by Mr. Sergei Zamyatin, Senior Officer, Wassenaar Arrangement Secretariat.

- **Organisation of American States (OAS):** *Model Regulations for the Control of the International Movement of Firearms, their Parts and Components and Ammunition.* Presentation by Ms. Alison August Treppel, Section Chief, Transnational Organised Crime, Department of Public Security, OAS.

- **South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC):** *Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines (RMDS/G).* Presentation by Mr. Adrian Wilkinson, Director, Explosive Capabilities Limited (formerly SEESAC Team Leader).

The following were the main points to emerge from these presentations and from the discussion that followed:

i)   Impetus for regional and other guidelines

The development of the SEESAC Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines grew out of a recognition that knowledge relating to

small arms control in the region was not being systematically recorded and codified. There was also no career management system in place for SALW practitioners, which led to a high turnover of professionals and, as a result, the loss of much valuable knowledge and experience. The RMDS/G were seen as a way of addressing these problems.

The impetus for the OSCE best practice guidelines followed from the agreement of OSCE documents on SALW and conventional ammunition in 2000 and 2003, respectively. The SALW Document called for information exchanges between OSCE participating States, which in turn provided the information necessary to identify best practice on a range of issues.

ii)   *Nature of regional guidelines and standards*

The OSCE best practice guidelines on SALW and conventional ammunition are not legally binding on participating States. They were also not adopted by consensus although they were welcomed by the OSCE's Forum for Security Cooperation. The guidelines aim to provide a model for national policy-making and to encourage higher common standards of practice among OSCE participating States. They also aim to have international relevance and usefulness beyond the OSCE region.

As all other conventional weapon systems, transfers of SALW are strictly controlled by the Wassenaar Arrangement's Participating States. Such transfers are subject to licensing. Besides the weapons themselves, the Wassenaar control list also covers all specially designed components, accessories and ammunition for SALW. Furthermore, related production equipment and technology is also controlled in order to prevent inappropriate transfers of "know-how" as well as the possibility of reverse engineering for the purposes of indigenous manufacturing of such weapons.

The Wassenaar Arrangement does not prohibit transfers of particular conventional weapons systems nor does it prohibit transfers to particular destinations. However, since Participating States are required to notify their Wassenaar partners about certain types of transfers, such decisions are open to wider scrutiny. In 2003, SALW (including MANPADS) were added to the list of conventional arms that require mandatory notification of transfer. The 'best practices' and 'elements' that have been produced by the Wassenaar Arrangement provide guidance to national licensing authorities on a wide range of issues related to controls of SALW exports (see the full list at the end of annex 3).

The OAS approved its first model regulations – to control the international movement of firearms –in 1997, the same year as it adopted the *Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials* (CIFTA). An arms brokering scandal in the region led to the amendment of these model regulations to incorporate brokering controls. Recognising the value of model legislation as a tool to assist States Parties in implementing

CIFTA, the OAS has developed additional model legislation on a range of issues covered by the Convention and has plans to continue doing so (see Annex 3 for a full listing). As their name suggests, OAS model regulations and legislation are guidelines for States to follow on a voluntary basis. They are not legally binding in any way. Each model is prefaced by a text that makes this clear.

SEESAC's Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines (RMDS/G) are also voluntary in nature. Some of the RMDS/G are operational, i.e. they focus on 'doing things' on the ground. Some are strategic in that they focus on changing the environment in which small arms programmes take place, e.g. by shaping legislation. The different nature of the standards means that each has a different target. Some focus, for example, on governments or policymakers while others focus on practitioners. The specific target for each individual standard must always be kept in mind during the process of developing them.

iii)   *Development process methodologies*

The impetus for developing the OSCE best practice guidelines came from OSCE participating States themselves through their Forum for Security Cooperation (FSC). The stated goal of the exercise was to assist participating States in implementing the 2000 OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons.

Participating States tasked the OSCE's Conflict Prevention Centre to coordinate the development of the guidelines. Interested States took the lead, either singly or as part of a small group, in drafting individual guidelines. An Editorial Board comprising all interested OSCE participating States reviewed the draft guidelines. Immediately following their launch in 2003, the guidelines were translated into all official OSCE languages (English, Russian, Spanish, French, Italian and German). In 2006, the guidelines were also translated into Arabic.

The OAS employs a methodology for developing model legislation that addresses thematic areas, procedures, organization and operation of the Expert Group, reporting, contributions of other actors, distribution and promotion of the model legislation, and funding.

The OAS General Secretariat researches and prepares a draft of the model legislation to be considered. It is then translated and circulated to all member states for their review and consideration. Comments and revisions are generally submitted in writing. Approximately 6-8 weeks after receiving the draft, the Expert Group, which is composed of at least one technical authority from each of the 34 Member States, then meets over a 2-day period to debate the document. The composition of the Expert Group may, and usually does, change depending on the subject matter being addressed. Ideally the Expert Group approves the text on their final day of deliberations, although the process has continued after the meeting through

electronic discussion. Once finalized by the Expert Group, the text is submitted to CIFTA's Consultative Committee for final review and approval who in turn submits it to the OAS General Assembly.

The SEESAC Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines (RMDS/G) are structured according to the ISO format and were produced using a similar methodology to that used to develop the International Mine Action Standards. In developing them, SEESAC drew on existing technical standards, from IMAS and the OSCE best practice guidelines, and from NATO manuals and existing national standards. An important feature of the RMDS/G is that they contain an integrated quality and risk management system that ensures, on a step-by-step basis, that the standards are implemented effectively and safely.

iv) *Impact of regional guidelines and standards*

While the impact of regional standards and guidelines can be difficult to ascertain in concrete terms, the available evidence suggests that they have made a significant contribution to curbing the uncontrolled proliferation and misuse of small arms in their respective regions and that they have helped governments to address the problem in a more effective and coordinated manner. Having said this, regional organisations themselves recognise that more work remains to be done.

The early development and wide dissemination of the OSCE best practice guidelines on SALW, as well as the fact that they focus on important practical issues, means that they have become a source and a model for a number of other regional initiatives to develop standards and guidelines. The same will most likely also be the case for the OSCE's more recent best practice guidelines on conventional ammunition.

OAS model legislation has been influential in the Americas and has contributed to the development of national legislation on firearms in a number of countries, including Brazil, Paraguay, Argentina, Peru, Colombia, Nicaragua and Guatemala. Priority areas for future work in the region include brokering controls and end-user certificates.

SEESAC's Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines have been widely adopted by small arms practitioners working in the region and beyond and their application has been shown to decrease the likelihood of failure of small arms control programmes.

Regional guidelines and standards also have an impact on each other. As noted above, the OSCE best practice guidelines on SALW have acted as a key source and model for the development of others. But the OSCE has also drawn inspiration from other organisations – most recently from the Wassenaar Arrangement's best practices on preventing the illicit air transportation of SALW. Through an interactive process, regional organisations are learning from each other and building on each other's

work. This bodes well for the development of international standards on small arms control.

7.   Proposed content and structure of ISACS

Table 1 Possible structure and content of ISACS (as presented at the consultation)

SERIES	GENERIC AREA	MODULES
01	**General**	• Introduction to ISACS and SALW control theory • Glossary and definitions
02	**Concept and Policy**	• The UN approach to SALW control • Overview of international and regional SALW frameworks • Linkages to DDR, SSR and Mine Action
03	**Legislative and Regulatory**	• National Coordinating Agencies and Points of Contact • SALW transfers (import, export, transit, transhipment, etc.) • National controls over manufacture of SALW • National controls over SALW brokering activities • National controls over access of civilians to SALW • Criminal offences and sanctions • End use certification
04	**Management**	• Design of SALW control programmes • Management of SALW control programmes • Finance and budgeting • Personnel and staffing • Roles and responsibilities
05	**Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting**	• Monitoring & Verification of SALW control programmes • Evaluation of SALW control programmes • Reporting on SALW control programmes
06	**Operational Support**	• SALW baseline surveys • SALW collection • SALW destruction • Stockpile management and security: Weapons • Stockpile management, security and safety: Ammunition • Identifying surplus SALW • Marking, record-keeping and tracing of SALW • Border controls and law enforcement cooperation • International cooperation and assistance (including financial & technical assistance • National Action Plans
07	**Awareness & Communication**	• Public information and strategic communication • Development and implementation of SALW awareness campaigns
08	**Cross-Cutting Issues**	• Gender and SALW • Children and SALW • Youth and SALW • Victim/survivor assistance • Crime (common criminality and organized crime) and SALW • Development programming and SALW • Civil society action and SALW • Human rights and associated UN instruments and standards

A possible structure and content of ISACS, developed by CASA, was presented for discussion (see Table 1). This outline follows the International Organisations for Standardisation (ISO) format and is based on the structure of IMAS, IDDRS and a number of regional small arms standards and guidelines.

During the course of the discussion on this proposed content and structure of ISACS, participants made numerous suggestions to modify modules, to add new modules and to make changes to the overall proposed structure of ISACS. Some of these suggestions enjoyed general support while others were subject to lively discussion. The suggestions made are too numerous and disparate to list individually in this report but have been recorded and will be taken into account when finalising the content and structure of ISACS. The following, however, were some of the main points to emerge from the discussion:

a)   *Scope of the definition of SALW*

A number of participants stressed the importance of defining SALW broadly to include the weapons themselves, but also their ammunition, parts and components.

b)   *Cross-cutting issues*

Crosscutting issues (series 08) are issues that are relevant to a range of policy and programmatic aspects of small arms control. Examples include gender, children, youth, etc. These issues will be dealt with in two ways in ISACS. First, they will be integrated into all relevant ISACS modules. Second, they will appear as a stand-alone module in series 08 on crosscutting issues. In this way, these important issues will be doubly highlighted in ISACS.

One participant characterised series 08 on crosscutting issues as a 'tool for efficiency' whose aim should be to ensure that ISACS emphasises particularly important issues and particularly vulnerable groups.

It was pointed out that many of the issues covered by series 06 on operational support would have a legislative element. This raised the question of whether legislation might better be conceptualised as a crosscutting issue. An opposing view was that one of the functional areas of SALW control, which requires project support, is legislation and regulatory system development and so this would need to be dealt with in its own right.

Some participants wondered how easy it would be to establish standards for many of the cross cutting issues listed. While agreeing that cross-cutting issues should be integrated into each individual ISACS module, it was suggested that, as stand-alone issues, these might better be characterised as 'guidance' rather than cross-cutting 'standards.'

c) *International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) format*

Some participants were unsure of the benefits of using the proposed structure and suggested instead arranging ISACS around thematic areas, such as those contained in series 08 on operational support, and incorporating other modules as appropriate under each thematic area. Others pointed out that the proposed structure, which follows the International Organisations for Standardisation (ISO) format, is based on hard-won experience and is preferred by field-based practitioners. It was also suggested that if ISACS were organised as a database, both approaches might be possible.

d) *Supply- vs. demand-side focus*

Some participants pointed out that the proposed ISACS modules focused primarily on supply-side measures and suggested introducing more demand-side elements. Others pointed out that the greater maturity of supply-side measures made it possible in the first place to develop international standards on them. A number of participants pointed out that a lot more work remains to be done to control the supply of SALW and that international standards would make a significant contribution to this work. It was suggested, however, that ISACS could incorporate some demand-side elements:

i) ISACS could make linkages with DDR, SSR and armed violence reduction, for example by including guidance on developing safer community plans, including plans to address the issue of youth in gangs.

ii) The series 04 module on the 'design of SALW control programmes' could address demand-side issues.

iii) The series 07 module on 'development and implementation of SALW awareness campaigns' would have an obvious demand-side focus.

iv) The series 05 module on evaluating SALW control programmes would use changes in levels of armed violence as a means of assessing the effectiveness of programmes.

e) *Relationship with UN processes on an Arms Trade Treaty and on conventional ammunition*

The General Assembly recently set in motion two separate UN processes leading towards the development of common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms (an Arms Trade Treaty)[17] and the development of technical guidelines for the management of conventional

---

[17] A/RES/63/240 of 8 January 2009

ammunition stockpiles.[18] It was suggested that the ISACS project should not pre-empt the outcomes of these processes.

Specifically in relation to the ATT process, it was suggested that ISACS could omit from its framework for the time being the issue of criteria to be taken into account when considering applications for SALW export licences and focus instead on preventing the diversion of SALW. Similarly, ISACS could also, for the time being, omit SALW ammunition from its modules relating to stockpile management.

Once the UN processes on an ATT and on conventional ammunition have reached their respective conclusions, the ISACS project could, where appropriate, develop international standards based on the outcomes of both. Regarding an ATT, this could involve disaggregating the broad global norms set by such a treaty into more detailed international standards. Regarding conventional ammunition, it could involve aggregating the detailed technical guidelines developed into more general international standards.

f) *Prioritisation*

Participants were also asked to fill out a form prioritising the proposed ISACS series and, within them, the individual ISACS modules. Responses were received from 16 participants. Taken together, these rank the individual ISACS series in the following order of perceived importance (from higher to lower):

- Legislative and regulatory
- Operational Support
- Management
- Concept and policy
- Crosscutting issues
- Awareness and communication
- General
- Monitoring, evaluation and reporting

---

[18] A/RES/63/61 of 2 December 2008

8. **Proposed methodology and timeline for developing ISACS**

The ISACS Project Coordinator presented the proposed methodology and timeline for developing ISACS, as envisioned by CASA. The organigram outlining the proposed ISACS development process is contained in Annex 4.

a) *The larger project*

It is important to understand that the development of ISACS constitutes the initial development phase of a larger undertaking that it is proposed would unfold as follows:

- *Phase 1* (2 years: 1 October 2008 – 30 September 2010): Development of ISACS (the consultation covered only phase 1).

- *Phase 2* (1 year: 1 October 2010 – 30 September 2011): Translation, dissemination, awareness-raising and training on ISACS.[19]

- *Phase 3* (Ongoing: from 1 October 2011): Assessment, periodic review, updating and supplementing of ISACS.

b) *Role of CASA*

CASA would have the overall responsibility for developing ISACS. At the end of the development process, the finalised ISACS would be adopted by a meeting of Principals of CASA members.

To oversee the development of ISACS, a 'CASA Working Group on ISACS' would be created comprising all interested CASA members and co-chaired by UNDP and UNODA. The working group would meet about every two months, mainly by videoconference, and would oversee the development of ISACS. The working group would report to CASA.

Members of the working group would be given the opportunity of taking the lead in drafting individual ISACS modules. For the remaining modules, consultants would be hired to lead the drafting process.

c) *Expert Reference Groups*

Expert Reference Groups comprising globally recognised experts from a range of backgrounds would peer review draft modules developed by CASA members and consultants. The composition of Expert Reference Groups would depend on the specific subject matter of the module(s) in question. The Expert Reference

---

[19] It was suggested that individual draft ISACS modules should be released once they have passed though an appropriate level of expert review so that they can benefit from the feedback of as broad a range of stakeholders as possible before being finally approved. This would make it necessary to engage in some dissemination and awareness-raising activities already during phase 1.

Groups could also provide additional research support to the lead drafters as required.

d)   *Regional validation workshops*

Once a critical mass of ISACS modules has been drafted and has passed through the review process a number of times, regional workshops would be organised involving SALW practitioners and policymakers from UN agencies, international and regional organisations, governments, civil society and the small arms industry. The purpose of these workshops would be to test the clarity and applicability of ISACS in a variety of regional settings and to make necessary modifications based on feedback received.

e)   *Timeline*

The proposed timeline for the development of ISACS (phase 1) is as follows:

*   October - December 2008 (3 months): Gearing up, consultation, resource mobilisation

*   January 2009 - March 2010 (15 months): Drafting of ISACS

*   April - July 2010 (4 months): Finalisation, production and presentation of ISACS

*   August - September 2010 (2 months): Phase 1 wrap-up

The following were the main points to emerge from the discussion that took place on the methodology and timeline for developing ISACS:

f)   *Website*

It will be important to develop a website to house ISACS relatively early in the development process so as not to slow down progress later on.

g)   *Experts and users*

It was pointed out that an 'expert reference group' is not the same thing as a 'user focus group' since users are not necessarily all experts. Viewed in this way, the foreseen regional validation workshops could fulfil some of the functions of user focus groups.

It was suggested that there should be only one expert reference group, as members will need to see what impact one standard may have on another. The ERG should

have core membership with other specialists being invited where appropriate to discuss standards in their respective areas of expertise.

h)   *Templates*

It will be important for CASA to employ templates that lead authors must follow when drafting ISACS modules in order to ensure consistency of structure, style and language across modules, as well as to cut down on the time needed for subsequent editing.

i)   *Editing*

CASA might wish to consider appointing a substantive editor to finalise the draft ISACS modules. An editor with expertise in one or more of the cross-cutting issues (gender, children, youth, etc.) would be able to ensure that these issues were properly incorporated into the full range of appropriate modules. It would be equally important to ensure, however, that any such final editing does not introduce errors or technical inaccuracies to the ISACS modules.

j)   *Timeline*

The timeline proposed is ambitious – a comprehensive set of ISACS by the 4th Biennial Meeting of States in 2010 (probably July). On the one hand, the richness of the material from which the ISACS project can draw, particularly at the regional level, suggests that this is achievable. On the other, the fact that the *process* of developing ISACS should be a valuable exercise for the global SALW community of practice and should therefore not be rushed too much, suggests that the proposed timeline might be overly ambitious. It was pointed out that opportunities exist to present ISACS in 2010 (4th BMS), 2011 (SALW Meeting of Experts) and 2012 (second Programme of Action Review Conference).

9.   Next Steps

The broad-based consultation on developing international small arms control standards provided CASA with invaluable advice and ideas on how to move forward with this project. It also demonstrated that CASA's initiative to develop ISACS is both timely and welcomed by a range of relevant actors, who also expressed their willingness to contribute to this endeavour.

CASA will draw on the advice and ideas shared during the consultation to finalise its plan for developing ISACS and will initiate the drafting phase of the project early in 2009.

CASA expresses its sincere appreciation to all participants in the consultation for their active engagement in the discussion and for the open, frank and constructive manner in which they shared their considerable experience and expertise. CASA will keep participants in the consultation updated on the development of the project and will rely on their continued support and inputs as the project develops.

ANNEX 1

Consultation Programme

	Monday, November 24
09:00	Welcome coffee
09:15	**Overview of the Purpose and goals of the consultation** *Peter Batchelor – United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)*
	PART 1: BUILDING ON SOLID FOUNDATIONS
09:30	**Session I: Why international standards for small arms control?** <u>Chair:</u> *Daniël Prins –United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA)* <u>Goals</u>: • To present CASA's vision of ISACS • To demonstrate that ISACS are both needed and feasible • To take note of perspectives on ISACS from a variety of actors <u>Structure</u>: • **The rationale and expected benefits of ISACS** *Patrick Mc Carthy – ISACS Project Coordinator* • **A UN perspective** *Julie Myers – United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)* • **A government perspective** *Meir Itzchaki - Israel* • **A civil society perspective** *Rebecca Peters – International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA)* • **A regional perspective** *Jonathan Sandy – ECOWAS Small Arms Control Programme (ECOSAP)* • **An industry perspective** *Mark A. Westrom – Defense Small Arms Advisory Council (DSAAC)* <u>Timing</u>: ISACS presentation, 30 minutes | subsequent presentations, 10 minutes | buffer, 10 minutes | total, 90 minutes
11:00	Refreshments
11:30	**Session I (continued):** • Discussion
12:30	Lunch

14:00	**Session II: Learning from existing UN standards initiatives**
	
	Chair: *Christiane Agboton Johnson – United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)*
	
	Goals:
	• To examine why and how other UN security-related standards have been developed
	• To look at the impact they have had
	• To take note of relevant lessons for the development of ISACS
	
	Structure:
	• **International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)**
	  Noel Mulliner – United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS)
	  Faiz Paktian – Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD)
	• **Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS)**
	  Glaucia Boyer – United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
	• **Discussion: What can the ISACS project learn from IMAS and IDDRS?**
	
	Timing: 20 minutes each on IMAS and IDDRS | discussion, 40 minutes | buffer, 10 minutes | total, 90 minutes

15:30	Refreshments

16:00	**Session III: Learning from existing regional standards initiatives**
	
	Chair: *Yuriy Kryvonos – UN Register of Conventional Arms*
	
	Goals:
	• To achieve an overview of existing small arms-related standards at the regional level
	• To examine a number of them in-depth
	• To explore how new international standards could best build upon existing regional standards
	
	Structure:
	• **Overview of existing regional SALW-related standards, guidelines and principles**
	  Patrick Mc Carthy – ISACS Project Coordinator
	• **Input from participants on other existing SALW-related standards**
	CASE-STUDIES
	• **OSCE – Handbooks of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons and on Conventional Ammunition**
	  Elli Kytömäki– Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)
	• **Wassenaar Arrangement – Best practice guidelines related to SALW**
	  Sergei Zamyatin – Wassenaar Arrangement
	• **OAS - Model Regulations for the Control of the International Movement of Firearms, their Parts and Components and Ammunition**
	  Alison August Treppel – Organisation of American States (OAS)
	• **SEESAC - Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines**
	  Adrian Wilkinson – Explosive Capabilities Limited
	• **Discussion: How can ISACS best build upon existing regional standards?**
	
	Timing: Overview (including participant inputs), 15 minutes | case-studies, 15 minutes each | discussion, 45 minutes | total, 120 minutes

18:00	End
19:30	**Dinner**

	Tuesday, November 25
09:00	Coffee
	PART 2: STRUCTURING AND DEVELOPING ISACS
09:30	**Session IV: Review of day 1 – underlining lessons learned** <u>Chair</u>: *Jean-Philippe Morange – UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED)* <u>Goals</u>: • Synthesise previous day's discussion on "building on solid foundations" • Highlight main lessons of relevance to the ISACS project • Segue to a focussed discussion on the content, structure, and development of ISACS <u>Structure</u>: • **Reflections on first day's discussion** *Patrick Mc Carthy – ISACS Project Coordinator* • **Further input from participants** <u>Timing</u>: Presentation, 20 minutes | discussion 30 minutes | buffer, 10 minutes | total, 60 minutes
10:30	Refreshments
11:00	**Session V: Proposed content and structure of ISACS** <u>Chair</u>: *Simonetta Grassi – United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)* <u>Goals</u>: • Receive feedback on the proposed content and structure of the ISACS modules • Identify existing resources on each module (principles, guidelines, etc.) • Prioritise modules <u>Structure</u>: • **Presentation of proposed content, structure and prioritisation of ISACS** *Patrick Mc Carthy – ISACS Project Coordinator* • **Discussion** <u>Timing</u>: Presentation, 20 minutes | discussion, 60 minutes | buffer, 10 minutes | total, 90 minutes
12:30	Lunch
14:00	**Session VI: Proposed methodology and timeline for developing ISACS** <u>Chair</u>: *Paul Eavis – United Nations Development Programme* <u>Goals</u>: • Receive feedback on the proposed methodology and timeline for developing ISACS • Encourage CASA members and other participants to join the CASA Working Group on ISACS • Encourage CASA members and other participants to become involved in developing individual modules <u>Structure</u> • **Presentation of the proposed methodology and timeline for developing ISACS** *Patrick Mc Carthy – ISACS Project Coordinator* • **Discussion** <u>Timing</u>: Presentation, 20 minutes | discussion, 60 minutes | buffer, 10 minutes | total, 90 minutes

15:30	Refreshments
16:00	**Session VII: Next steps** Goals: • Outline the next steps in the development of ISACS • Address the question of financing • Encourage active participation by CASA members and other participants in the development of ISACS
17:00	End

ANNEX 2

Participating Organisations, States and Companies

United Nations & International Organisations
1. Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD)
2. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
3. International Labour Organisation (ILO)
4. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
5. United Nations Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) mechanism
6. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
7. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR)
8. United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)
9. United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA)
10. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
11. United Nations Security Council Counter Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED)
12. Wassenaar Arrangement

Regional Organisations
1. Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Small Arms Control Programme (ECOSAP)
2. League of Arab States
3. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)
4. Organisation of American States (OAS)
5. Proyecto Centroamercano para el Control de Armas Pequenas y Ligeras (CASAC)
6. Regional Centre on Small Arms (RECSA), Great Lakes Region and Horn of Africa
7. Southern African Regional Police Chief's Cooperation Organisation (SARPCCO)

States
1. Austria
2. Canada
3. France
4. Ireland
5. Israel
6. Japan
7. Switzerland
8. United Kingdom

Civil Society
1. Amnesty International
2. Geneva Forum
3. Groupe de recherche et d'Information sur la paix et la sécurité (GRIP)
4. Institute for Security Studies (ISS)
5. International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA)
6. International Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)
7. Mines Advisory Group (MAG)
8. Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO)
9. Saferworld
10. Small Arms Survey

Industry
1. Defense Small Arms Advisory Council (DSAAC)
2. Explosive Capabilities Limited

ANNEX 3

Controlling Small Arms and Light Weapons:

Global, regional and sub-regional agreements, standards, guidelines and recommendations

I.   GLOBAL

- United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illict Trade in Small Arms and light Weapons in All its Aspects

- Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

- International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons

- UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials

- UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials

- United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

- Report of the Group of Governmental Experts established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/81 to consider further steps to enhance international cooperation in preventing, combating and eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons (A/62/163)

- Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus (A/63/182)

- Legislative Guide for the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto (UNODC)

- Compendium of United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice (UNODC)

- How to Guide: Small Arms and Light Weapons Legislation (UNDP)

- How to Guide: The establishment and functioning of national small arms and light weapons commissions (UNDP)

- Revised Principles and Guidelines for the collection and destruction of ammunition (DPKO)

- Integrated Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS) – module 04.10 on Disarmament and module 04.11 on SALW Control, Security and Development

- Handbook for the documentation of interpersonal violence prevention programmes (WHO)

- Guidelines for reporting on the UN Programme of Action

- Implementation of the International Tracing Instrument – Guidelines for National Reporting

- A Destruction Handbook: small arms, light weapons, ammunition and explosives (UNODA)

- World Customs Organisation (WCO): SAFE Framework of Standards to Secure and Facilitate Global Trade

- International Air Transport Association (IATA): Dangerous Goods Regulations

- International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO): Technical instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air

- International Maritime Organisation (IMO): International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code

- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE): Recommendations on the transport of Dangerous Goods: Model Regulations

- INTERPOL Weapons Electronic Tracing System (IWETS)

II.   REGIONAL / SUB-REGIONAL

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)

- Guidelines On Controls And Security Of Man-Portable Air Defense Systems (MANPADS)

Andean Community

- Andean Community Plan to Prevent, Fight and Eradicate Illicit Trafficking in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all its Aspects (2003)

Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS)

- Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition and other Related Materials (2006)

- Code of Conduct for the Implementation of the Moratorium on the Importation, Exportation and Manufacture of Light Weapons in West Africa

European Union

- EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports

- EU Strategy to combat illicit accumulation and trafficking of SALW and their ammunition

- European Council Common Position on the Control of Arms Brokering

- European Council Joint Action on the European Union's contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons

Great Lakes Region and Horn of Africa

- Nairobi Protocol for the Prevention, Control and Reduction of Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa

- Best Practice Guidelines for the Implementation of the Nairobi Declaration and Nairobi Protocol on Small Arms and Light Weapons – *produced by the Regional Centre on Small Arms – RECSA*

- Guidelines for Regional Harmonisation of Legislation on Firearms and Ammunition – *produced by the Regional Centre on Small Arms – RECSA*

League of Arab States

- Arab Model Law on Weapons, Ammunitions, Explosives and Hazardous Material

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

- Manual of NATO Safety Principles for the Transport of Military Ammunition and Explosives

- Manual of NATO Safety Principles for the Storage of Military Ammunition and Explosives

- Manual of NATO Principles for the Hazard Classification of Military Ammunition and Explosives

• Manual on NATO principles for the application of risk analysis to the storage and transportation of military ammunition and explosives

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

• Development Assistance Cooperation (DAC) Handbook on Security Sector Reform

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

• OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons (2000)

• OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (2003)

• Handbook of Best Practices on Small Arms and Light Weapons

  o *National Controls over manufacture of SALW*

  o *Marking, record-keeping and traceability of SALW*

  o *National Procedures for Stockpile management and security (including Annex on MANPADS Stockpile Management and Security)*

  o *National Control of brokering activities*

  o *Export control of SALW*

  o *Definition and Indicators of a surplus SALW*

  o *National Procedures for the destruction of SALW*

  o *SALW in Disarmament, Demobilization & Reintegration (DD&R) Processes*

  o *Illicit air transportation of SALW*

• Handbook of Best Practices on Conventional Ammunition

  o *Marking, Registration and Record-Keeping*

  o *Procedures for Management of Stockpiles*

  o *Physical Security of Stockpiles*

  o *Transportation*

  o *Destruction*

• OSCE Principles on the Control of Brokering in Small Arms and Light Weapons

• OSCE Principles for Export Controls of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems

- Standard Elements of End-User Certificates and Verification Procedures for SALW Exports

- Expert Advice on Implementation of Section V of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons

- Best Practices to Prevent Destabilizing Transfers of Small Arms and Light Weapons Through Air Transport

Organisation of American States (OAS)

- Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials (CIFTA) (1997)

- Model Regulations for the Control of the International Movement of Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition - Updated

- Amendments to the Model Regulation for the Control of the International Movement of Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition - Broker Regulations

- Model Legislation on the Marking and Tracing of Firearms

- Model Legislation and Commentaries for Strengthening Controls at Export Points

- Model Legislation and Commentaries on Legislative Measures to Establish Criminal Offences in Relation to the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and other Related Materials

- Recommended Guidelines for Control and Security of Man-Portable Air Defense Systems

- Forthcoming model legislation (2009-2010)

  - *Confiscation and forfeiture*

  - *Record-keeping, confidentiality and exchange of information*

  - *Security measures and controlled delivery*

Pacific Islands Forum

- Legal Framework for a Common Approach to Weapons Control Measures (Nadi Framework)

- Nadi Framework Model Regulations on Weapons Control

Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana (SICA)

- Code of Conduct of Central American States on the Transfer of Arms, Ammunition and Other Related Materiel

South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC)

- Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines

- Cost Benefit Analysis Model for SALW Stockpile Management

- Techniques of Clandestine Arms Delivery and Detection

- Strategic overview of armed violence data collection and analysis mechanisms

- Performance Indicators for the Monitoring and Evaluation of SALW Control Programmes

- Biting the Bullet - Ammunition Stocks: Promoting Safe and Secure Storage and Disposal

- Temporary Storage of Ammunition in Emergency Situations

- SALW Ammunition Destruction - Environmental Releases from Open Burning (OB) and Open Detonation (OD) events

- Principles and Philosophy of Community Based Policing

- SALW Awareness Support Pack

- Arms Exports Reporting CD

- The 'Sarajevo Process Code of Conduct' for Private Security Companies (PSC)

- Children and Small Arms Resource Guide: Public Health Approaches

Southern African Development Community (SADC)

- Protocol on Control of Firearms, Ammunition and other related materials in the Southern African Development Community

- Standard Operating Procedures for the implementation of the SADC Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and other related materials – P*roduced by the Interpol Sub-regional Bureau for Southern Africa / Secretariat of the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organisation (SARPCCO)*

Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe

- Regional Implementation Plan - Combating the Proliferation and Impact of Small Arms and Light Weapons (Revised May 2006)

Wassenaar Arrangement on Exports Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies

- Best Practice Guidelines for Exports of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)

- Best Practices for Implementing Intangible Transfer of Technology Controls

- Best Practices to Prevent Destabilising Transfers of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) through Air Transport

- Best Practices for effective enforcement of export controls

- Best Practices for Surplus/Demilitarized Military Equipment

- Elements for Objective Analysis and Advice Concerning Potentially Destabilising Accumulations of Conventional Weapons

- Elements for Export Controls of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS)

- Elements for Effective Legislation on Arms Brokering

- List of end-use assurances

- Statement of Understanding on Control of Non-Listed Dual-Use Items

ANNEX 4

Organigram for ISACS development process

(as presented at the consultation)