

8 July 2008

Original: English

---

**Third Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the  
Implementation of the Programme of Action to  
Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in  
Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects**

New York, 14-18 July 2008

**Draft outcome paper on the implementation of the  
International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and  
Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms  
and Light Weapons**

**I. Introduction**

1. In the context of the third Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, States discussed<sup>1</sup> and considered the implementation of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons<sup>2</sup>. They noted that the third Biennial Meeting of States represented the first opportunity, since its adoption on 8 December 2005, to consider the implementation of the International Instrument, in accordance with its paragraph 37.

2. At the time of convening the third Biennial Meeting, \_\_\_\_ States had already submitted national reports that included a specific chapter on the implementation of the International Instrument. Through national reports, States provided information on their best practices for its implementation and provided information on bilateral, regional and international cooperation and assistance efforts they had provided or could provide. They also provided information on the difficulties they had encountered in implementing the International Instrument and highlighted areas where international cooperation and assistance could help to advance its implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See A/CONF.192/BMS/2008/WP.4.

<sup>2</sup> See A/60/88 and Corr.2, annex.



## **II. Implementation of the International Instrument**

3. States noted that laws, regulations and administrative procedures related to the implementation of the International Instrument have been integrated into the national processes of many States, in accordance with its paragraph 24, and that the process of strengthening national implementation in a number of States was under way. They noted, however, that more clarity was needed in reporting on measures adopted at the national level, including:

(a) Marking:<sup>3</sup> States considered the extent to which they had succeeded in enacting national regulations and procedures for marking small arms and light weapons within their territories, including marking at the time of their production or importation. They highlighted that import marking can greatly facilitate the tracing of illicit small arms and light weapons. In this regard, non-manufacturing States expressed the need for assistance;

(b) Record-keeping:<sup>4</sup> States considered accurate and comprehensive record-keeping for all marked small arms and light weapons on their territory to be necessary for the implementation of the International Instrument, in accordance with its paragraph 11. While many States maintained computerized registries of small arms and light weapons, others were either in the process of establishing registries or already had manual registries and were in the process of computerizing them, including through seeking assistance in the acquisition of hardware and software to improve national record-keeping capacity. Requests for support by some States in training national personnel in records management were noted;

(c) Cooperation in tracing:<sup>5</sup> States welcomed the fact that a significant number of countries had already nominated national focal points for the implementation of the International Instrument. They agreed that they could make greater use of the International Instrument, cooperating not only among themselves, but also in the context of regional organizations and with the United Nations and INTERPOL for this purpose, as necessary. States highlighted the importance of training law enforcement officials in the identification and tracing of small arms and light weapons and of putting in place effective tracing mechanisms, including for weapons recovered during or after armed conflicts.

## **III. International cooperation and assistance in implementation of the International Instrument**

4. States took note of existing bilateral cooperation efforts for the effective implementation of the International Instrument and encouraged further efforts in this regard.

5. They welcomed the regional workshops on the implementation of the International Instrument organized by the Office for Disarmament Affairs prior to the third Biennial Meeting, which had proved to be useful instruments for enhancing understanding of the instrument, familiarizing officials with some of the technical tools available for helping States in tracing illicit small arms and light weapons,

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., sect. III.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., sect. IV.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., sect. V.

including those developed by INTERPOL, and exchanging information on best practices. Those included the workshops in: Nairobi on 10 and 11 December 2007 for States of Northern, Eastern and Southern Africa; Lome on 17 and 18 April 2008 for States of West and Central Africa; in Seoul on 27 and 28 May 2008 for States of Asia and Pacific; and in Rio de Janeiro on 11 and 12 June 2008 for States of Latin America and the Caribbean.

6. States agreed that regional organizations could provide a useful institutional platform for information exchange and cooperation on the implementation of the International Instrument and took note of some examples of existing cooperation frameworks and mechanisms, including: exchange of information in the context of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) on national practices and regulations related to implementation of the International Instrument; exchange of information between the States members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) on best practices on illicit trafficking of arms and ammunitions throughout the Caribbean region; information exchange between national law enforcement agencies in the context of the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials; the practical assistance provided by the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region, the Horn of Africa and Bordering States, including the provision of marking machines and training to its member States; the work of the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization as part of a cooperation arrangement between the Southern African Development Community and INTERPOL; the cooperation framework established by the Economic Community of West African States under its Small Arms Control Programme; use of the Schengen Information System to share information on missing weapons in States belonging to the Schengen area; cooperation under the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes, which had developed common standards for the exchange of information on the tracing of weapons; the establishment and operation of a common weapons tracing system for Nordic countries; international cooperation between customs authorities in States of the Balkan region; and joint seminars, workshops and training programmes.

7. At the global level, States highlighted the importance of international cooperation, assistance and capacity-building for the effective implementation of the International Instrument, in accordance with its relevant paragraphs.

### **The way forward**

[Text to be *inserted*]

---