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SALW: Mandates for national reporting

Programme of Action

States requested the UN to “collate and circulate data and information provided by States on a voluntary basis and including national reports, on implementation by those States of the Programme of Action.”

International Tracing Instrument

“States will report on a biennial basis to the Secretary-General on their implementation of this instrument […].”

UN General Assembly resolution on SALW (A/RES/74/60) encourages those States in a position to do so to use the reporting template made available by the Office for Disarmament Affairs
Overview: Thematic Issues — Trends, Challenges and Opportunities

Based on information provided through national reports covering 2018-2019

➢ National reporting
➢ National coordination agency, national point of contact
➢ National action plan
➢ Diversion – international transfer and national stockpiles
➢ Stockpile management and destruction
➢ Collection of weapons
➢ Marking and record-keeping
➢ International Tracing
➢ International Assistance
➢ Gender considerations
➢ Observations
National Reporting

➢ Trends
  • 174 States: 2002 - 2020 total
  • 120 States: 2018
  • 90 States: 2020

➢ Challenges
  • Reporting fatigue / Administrative burden
  • Overlap in reporting requirements with other instruments
  • Lack of capacity / lack of national coordination
  • Internet connection / Credentials (i.e. password issuance)

➢ Opportunities
  • See next slide.
Opportunities / benefits for reporting

- **Maximizes utilization of data / information**
- State of play / measure progress and gaps in PoA/ITI implementation / baselines / best practices
- Data collection for **SDG Target 16.4**
  - Indicator 16.4.2 “Proportion of seized, found or surrendered arms whose illicit origin or context has been traced or established by a competent authority in line with international instruments”
- National needs for **international assistance**: Ensures **national ownership**
- **Confidence-building measure**: Information exchange, transparency
- **Harmonization of global/regional reporting** (e.g. PoA – OSCE SALW Document)
- Reaffirmation of **States’ commitment** to the PoA process (political will)
- States’ capacity-building (e.g. national coordination)
- **Minimizes administrative burdens** on States (online reporting template)
  - 2012-2020: 128 States (90% of submitted reports) used the reporting template
  - Biennial submissions; Simple Yes/No questions; Available in all 6 official UN languages
  - Previously submitted report can be updated and revised for this year’s submission
### 2020 PoA/ITI national reports

**90 States: as of 19 July 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa (25/54)</th>
<th>Asia / the Pacific (15/54)</th>
<th>Eastern Europe (13/23)</th>
<th>Latin America / the Caribbean (14/33)</th>
<th>Western Europe / Other States (23/29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Antigua &amp; Barbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Belize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Coordination Agency / NPC

126/79 States (2018/2020 report)

➢ Trends
  • 79 national coordination agencies established
  • 126 national points of contact (NPCs) (officer or unit) are updated
  • MOSAIC 03.40: National coordinating mechanism
  • More NCAs/NatComs in Africa

➢ Challenges
  • Not inclusive (some relevant entities left out)
  • Weak institutional capacity / Lack of resources

➢ Opportunities
  • Enhance national ownership in small arms control
  • Harmonize national development policy / data collection
  • Promote participation of women / civil society
  • Enhance programme / project coordination
National Action Plan

➢ Trends
  • 21 national action plans established (i.e. high in Africa)
  • MOSAIC 04.10: Designing and implementing NAP

➢ Challenges
  • Institutional capacity for programming/implementation
  • Projection of available resources (national budget)
  • Utilization of international assistance

➢ Opportunities
  • Integrate NAP into CCAs and development frameworks
  • Establish 'national targets' in accordance with NAP
  • Align NAP with PoA/ITI and regional requirements
Diversion - national stockpiles / international transfers (90 report 2020)

➢ Trends
  • New data from 2020 reports

➢ Challenges
  • Many States unable to collect diversion data
  • Marking / record-keeping pre-requisite for prevention
  • Lost, stolen, smuggled weapons

➢ Opportunities
  • Support national capacity-building
  • Establish global/regional mechanisms for info exchange
  • Trace diverted weapons

Collect Information on Diversion

- National Stockpiles - 29
- International Transfers - 23

- Africa (54) 9 7
- Asia/Pacific (54) 3 2
- E. Europe (23) 6 2
- LAC (33) 3 4
- W. Europe+ (29) 8 8
Stockpile Management and Destruction

➢ Trends
  • 2016-2017: 41 States destroyed SALW
  • **36** States reported destroying **756,497** SALW
  • 2018-2019: 32 States destroyed SALW
  • **26** States reported destroying **463,747** SALW
  • Most States have procedures for state-owned SALW

➢ Challenges
  • Limited information available on possible diversion from national stockpiles
  • Consistently high demand for assistance
  • High costs and technical requirements
  • Low capacity for destruction in **Africa, Asia/Pacific**

➢ Opportunities
  • Identify source/means of diversion through national reports, to implement effective countermeasures
  • Bilateral assistance

Destruction of Weapons by Region

- **2018** (total 203,450)
- **2019** (total 260,297)
Collection of SALW  61 States [collected]

➢ Trends (2018-2019)
  • Over **360,000** weapons collected in 2018-2019 (61 MS)
  • Some **100,000+** weapons are consistently corrected in **Africa** since 2017
  • Online reporting template allows for reporting disaggregated data:
    • Seized / surrendered / found
    • Subsequent actions - marked/recorded/traced/destroyed
  • **50%+** collected weapons are recorded and/or destroyed

➢ Challenges
  • Difficulty in collecting and harmonizing national data

➢ Opportunities
  • Reducing diversion
  • Data collection contributes reporting on **SDG target 16.4**
  • International assistance for national data collection

Number of SALW collected, by region

- **Africa**
- **Asia/Pacific**
- **Eastern Europe**
- **LAC**
- **Western Europe and Others**
### SALW Collection 2018-2019

63 States collected SALW: 35 States [provided data]

Relevant data for SDG Indicator 16.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SALW Collected</th>
<th>SALW collected/seized/surrendered/found</th>
<th>SALW seized</th>
<th>SALW surrendered</th>
<th>SALW found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seized/surrendered/found</td>
<td>222,123</td>
<td>138,825</td>
<td>82,975</td>
<td>62,499</td>
<td>33,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action taken**

- **a) Marked**: 37,087 | 10,499 | 7,104 | 3,017 | 137 | 6,045 | 1,035 | 810
- **b) Recorded**: 116,348 | 77,540 | 31,307 | 26,111 | 45,013 | 14,893 | 703 | 598
- **c) Destroyed**: 109,053 | 79,388 | 66,379 | 63,674 | 8,148 | 6,045 | 1,729 | 4,651
- **d) Trace request issued**: 1,691 | 998 | 9,655 | 1,742 | 33 | 6,045 | 103 | 108
- **e) Other actions**: 24,876 | 23,113 | 18,559 | 20,929 | 9,042 | 6,045 | 1,723 | 1,557
- **f) No action taken (only stored)**: 25,509 | 25,055 | 981 | 1,009 | 1,636 | 6,045 | 0 | 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Trace request issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Other actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) No action taken (only stored)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marking and Record-Keeping

2020: 77 States (marking of state-owned SALW)

➢ **Trends** (2020)
  - 77 states: State-owned weapons are marked
  - Growing number of States capable of marking
    - major achievement of international assistance

➢ **Challenges**
  - Only 24 states mention technological considerations
  - No universal standard practice in marking
  - Craft manufacture of small arms – no mark / no record
  - Lack of capacity and equipment (32 requests for assistance)

➢ **Opportunities**
  - Enforce marking at the time of import
  - Ensure marking all state-owned weapons
  - Enable identification of state-owned weapons
International Tracing

➢ **Trends** (2018-2019: 90 reporting states)
  - 62 states: tracing procedures in place
  - 57 states: cooperating with INTERPOL
  - 32 states: use technologies for tracing

➢ **Challenges**
  - Highest needs for assistance
  - Marking/record-keeping prerequisites
  - Capacity to respond to tracing requests
  - Requires transparency, information sharing and cooperation

➢ **Opportunities**
  - Establish framework for regional cooperation
  - Participation of regional organizations

2020: 62/90 States (tracing procedures in place)
International Assistance – 52% of States need assistance (% of submitted reports)

➢ Trends
  • 2020: States requiring international assistance exceeded 52% of reporting states

➢ Challenges
  • Difficulty coordinating needs and funds/donors and recipients
  • Sustainability of funding
  • Tracing-related requests most needed

➢ Opportunities
  • More targeted projects
  • Capacity-building
  • Country-level holistic programming approach
  • Better coordination
  • Impactful funding

Assistance Requested, Assistance Received and Willingness to Assist
48 States (53% of reporting States) requested international assistance in 2020.

Request for assistance by country by theme:
https://smallarms.un-arm.org/international-assistance
Gender Considerations

➢ Trends

• Gender considerations taken into account: Increased from 48 States in 2018 (40%) to 57 in 2020 (63%)

• Sex-disaggregated data collected: Increased from 17 States in 2018 (16%) to 22 in 2020 (24%)

• 11 States: provided additional information e.g. national gender action plans or gender quotas

➢ Challenges

• New element of reporting

• Difficult to harmonize national data

➢ Opportunities

• Establish gender responsive programming, policy-setting and decision-making in national SA control

• Contribution to SDGs 5 and 16
1. Further leverage national reporting to enhance understanding of implementation challenges, gaps and monitor progress towards achieving SDG Indicator 16.4.2;

2. Reinforce PSSM, regulate import/export processes (certification regimes), including by informing of efforts through national reporting, with a view to addressing diversion risks;

3. Deepen exchanges on tracing practices, particularly in the context of challenges posed by new technologies;

4. Enhance international assistance through comprehensive and impactful programs, with priority on most-affected countries, including through dedicated funding mechanisms;

5. Integrate small arms control into national development frameworks, including CCAs, in line with the guiding principle of national ownership;

6. Addressing the issue of silo regimes: reducing duplication of efforts and resources;

7. Enhance gender considerations to strengthen implementation results and further contribute to the achievement of SDGs.
Annex: PoA Reporting Database

➢ https://smallarms.un-arm.com/

• **Country profiles** – ‘one-stop shop’ for country-specific data
  • To feed small arms-related data from PoA online reporting, UNROCA, UN COMTRADE, OECD-DAC databases

• **Statistics** - quantitative assessment with auto-generated graphs, charts and tables
  • To enhance measurability of PoA/ITI implementation: status & progress by country, by region and by year

• **International assistance** – visual presentation of national needs
  • To match assistance needs with resources by thematic issue and by requesting country

• **Databases** – 1071 National reports and 123 National Points of Contact

• **SDG section** – Target 16.4 and indicator 16.4.2
  • To present disaggregated quantitative data on collected weapons and relevant measures taken in 2018 and 2019

➢ Inquiries / passwords for online reporting conventionalarms-unoda@un.org