Introduction

The PoA mandates the involvement of NGOs in the UN small arms process by referring to the partnership between States and civil society in efforts to reduce the illicit trade in small arms. Following the precedent established in 2003, NGOs were permitted to address the conference during a single plenary session, the morning of 13 July.

The 3-hour session was divided into two slots. During the first half hour, six representatives from the pro-gun lobby, the World Forum on the future of Shooting Sports Activities (WFSA) made brief presentations. Then a selection of IANSA members took the floor for the remaining 2+ hours.

The IANSA presentation was structured as a moderated discussion, with the moderator asking questions of panel speakers from 16 countries. The presentation attempted to illustrate a wide range of interests and concerns from across the network.

IANSA members spoke in four official UN languages: English, French, Spanish and Arabic. Speaking was interspersed with short visual presentations including IPPNW’s ‘One Bullet Story’ and videos from the Control Arms campaign.

Moderator: Loretta Bondi (Johns Hopkins University, USA)

Theme 1: Human cost of small arms proliferation and misuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The human cost</th>
<th>Development costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims and survivors</td>
<td>Assistance to survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A threat to public health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speakers: Baffour D Amoa (Fellowship of Christian Councils & Churches in West Africa - FECCIWA and Chair of West Africa Action Network on Small Arms, Ghana), Folade Mutota (Women’s Institute for Alternative Development, Trinidad & Tobago), Dr Emperatriz Crespín (Asociación Médica para la Responsabilidad Social, MESARES; and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War - El Salvador), Dr Robert Mtonga (International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, IPPNW - Zambia), Dr Christiane Agboton-Johnson (Mouvement contre les Armes Légères en Afrique de l'Ouest - MALAO, Senegal), Rebecca Peters (IANSA), Karin Wilson (Million Mom March, USA).

Theme 2: Regulating small arms users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small arms users</th>
<th>Civilian possession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State forces</td>
<td>Gun culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private security</td>
<td>DDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Theme 3: Disarmament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production / transfers</th>
<th>Weapons Collection &amp; Destruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN arms embargoes</td>
<td>Control Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokering</td>
<td>Review Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking &amp; Tracing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speakers: Luis Alberto Cordero (Fundación Arias para la Paz y el Progreso Humano, Costa Rica), Daniel Luz Álvarez (L’Escola de Cultura de Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain), Christiane Agboton-Johnson (Mouvement contre les Armes Légères en Afrique de l'Ouest - MALAO, Senegal), Noel Stott (Institute for Security Studies, South Africa), Ilhan Berkol (Groupe de Recherche et d’Information sur la Paix et la Sécurité - GRIP, Belgium), Olga Palinkasev (Centre for Security Studies, Bosnia & Herzegovina), Rebecca Peters (IANSA).
Theme 1: Human cost of small arms proliferation and misuse

What do NGOs mean by ‘the human cost’?

*Baffour Amoa (Ghana):*

When NGOs talk of the human cost of small arms and light weapons, we measure that cost in terms of death, injuries, trauma, displacement and the lack of development. It is therefore imperative that we all put our hands to the wheel and intensify our collective effort to reduce the human cost of small arms.

Do you have some examples?

*Baffour Amoa (Ghana):*

At the end of the Sierra Leone war, I was privileged to pay a solidarity visit to the churches and people in Freetown. Our team visited victims of the civil war in camps and hospitals.

At one of the Government hospitals in Freetown, we came to the bed of a ten-year-old boy who had machete wounds from head to toe. The cuts were very deep indeed. Let us call him Ceesay. His story brought tears to our eyes.

‘The soldiers broke down the door to our house in the night,’ he told us. “They came to the living room shouting and yelling to wake up everyone. My father left the bedroom to the hall and moments later there was a gunshot. My mother ran out to see what had happened and the gun rang out again. I hid under the bed trembling with fear. For some time, I heard nothing but gunshots, cries of the dying and shouts of the soldiers. Then they entered the room where I was. I felt them turning things upside down and checking for any survivors. Luck was not on my side, they found me, pulled me from under the bed with force and started arguing among themselves about whether to finish me off or not. In the end, one of them suggested that I not be shot but “be given a treat.” They started to cut me all over and eventually I collapsed. When I gained consciousness, I found myself in this hospital bed...’ Then he started crying.

What mother could put a price on this boy Ceesay’s life? Like countless child survivors of gun violence he has been disabled for life. God has preserved his life but how is he going to face the future? Violence has cost him his future. He and many others like him will pay the human costs of poor education, minimal health care, forced migration, the lost opportunity to be independent and productive.

The clearest affirmation of the value of this boy’s life is to reduce the availability and demand for small arms. How do the human costs of gun violence compare with an industry with an annual authorised international trade worth $US 4 billion?

Why are the churches involved in small arms issues?

*Baffour Amoa (Ghana):*

As a faith-based network we have joined the fight against the proliferation of small arms and light weapons because of our deep conviction that love for one’s neighbour is key to freeing the world of human-generated violence, of wanton destruction of lives and communities.

We are in this struggle because of the carnage we see around us and our desire to show compassion towards victims of gun violence. From Mozambique to Montenegro, from Colombia to Kenya, small arms and light weapons have indeed become the weapons of mass destruction of our time. All must act against this carnage to uphold the sanctity of human life.

The churches – in partnership with civil society and willing authorities – are doing a lot. In some places churches are even pioneering the road to a future of hope. For instance, a global ecumenical effort has enabled the Christian Council of Mozambique to collect and destroy 600,000 weapons! People who turn in their guns receive tools to rebuild lives and livelihoods. And the programme predicts that it can collect a
million more weapons in the years ahead. If others follow the Mozambique example, the ratio of guns available to guns destroyed will fall significantly.

**Where do we go from here?**

*Baffour Amoa (Ghana):*

I hope that, by building firmly on the 2001 Programme of Action, the 2006 instrument will ensure better implementation of existing plans, while adding new and binding agreements that

- curb transfers to non-state actors,
- govern the licensed trade in small arms,
- regulate brokers
- limit civilian possession
- control the arms already present in communities.

Such provisions are not dreams. In my region, for example, civil society has proposed an ECOWAS Convention that contains all these provisions. Let us remember that it is Ceesay’s region as well.

It is also worth noting that informed communities in every region of the world are now looking to their governments at the United Nations to deliver credible progress on disarmament.

**What do we know about victims and users?**

*Folade Mutota (Trinidad & Tobago):*

We know that men are the main victims and users of guns. The World Health Organisation tells us that globally, men account for over 90% of the homicide victims. In the Caribbean region that I come from, we also know that it is young, financially poor and socially marginalised men who are the largest group of victims and perpetrators of gun violence.

We must however acknowledge that men’s behaviour is the product of society and not biology so it is important not to stereotype. We know this because the behaviour is repeated across cultures.

Women are victims of small arms too. They are not only victims – research on the extent of women’s involvement as users and perpetrators of gun related violence needs to be undertaken. And certainly women are increasingly acting as agents of change globally on this issue.

But we do know that women are murdered – most of them by men they know or men who are their intimate partners. Women are also intimidated and sexually abused, and we know that women’s health and wellbeing are threatened in situations of violence.

There is also evidence that children and elderly people are victims. In situations of violence, the entire society is traumatised.

**Could you expand a little on the roles of women?**

*Folade Mutota (Trinidad & Tobago):*

Women are involved in leading weapons collection initiatives. Women are developing popular campaigns and mobilising communities. Women are implementing peace education programmes in schools. Women are robustly rejecting the notion of masculinity associated with guns and violence, for example in Brazil. Unfortunately, women are largely excluded from formal security policymaking – a situation that needs to be reversed.

The important role of men in refusing to endorse the stereotype of maleness which is associated with violence must also be acknowledged. Many men are acting to end violence against women. Men are also taking action to build peaceful communities and protect the human rights of men and women.
**What can be done?**

*Folade Mutota (Trinidad & Tobago):*

We have a number of recommendations; some of them are made in the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue’s publication *Missing Pieces*, released this week.

For example:

- States should fully meet existing international norms relating to gender and gun violence.
- States should direct attention to young men as a group particularly vulnerable to gun violence.
- States should train law enforcement officials to understand better the small arms issues related to the prevention of gender-based violence.
- States should restrict the acquisition of guns and ammunition by those who commit intimate partner or family violence.
- States should include the perspectives of men and women in the development of policies to prevent gun violence.
- DDR programmers and planners should give particular attention to Article 13 of Security Council Resolution 1325.

**What is the impact of small arms violence on the health care system?**

*Dr Emperatriz Crespín (El Salvador):*

Ante todo como médicos debemos cumplir con nuestra responsabilidad de defender el derecho a la vida. Es por eso que intercedemos ante cualquier circunstancia o hecho que amenaza la salud y la defensa a la vida.

Las armas de fuego impactan a los sistemas de salud de las naciones de dos formas: directa e indirecta.

**El impacto directo:**

- La sobrecarga continua de pacientes heridos que solicitan atención médica deteriora los servicios de salud que tienen una capacidad instalada determinada con insumos médicos y recursos humanos limitados, especialmente en aquellos países en vías de desarrollo. Tratar lesiones de violencia armada es costoso en términos económicos aun para las naciones saludables del mundo, forzando a los servicios de salud a derivar la atención médica a estas necesidades. Ejemplo: En 3 días de vacaciones en El Salvador, el principal hospital público atendió 60 pacientes lesionados, lo que da un promedio de 20 pacientes por día.
- En países bajo conflictos armados y en países post conflicto, dada la letalidad y daño a órganos de este tipo de lesiones las oportunidades de sobrevivir son menores, lo que también incrementa la mortalidad.
- La mortalidad y la morbilidad en poblaciones jóvenes que ante otro contexto no violento, no estarían demandando los servicios de salud.
- Impacto en la Salud Mental Individual y Comunitaria: Lo cual deteriora la capacidad no solamente del paciente sino también de su familia incrementando el sufrimiento humano, lo que genera perdida de confianza y deterioro en las relaciones dentro de la comunidad.
- Discapacidades y Pérdida de Funciones:
- Un estimado de 350,000 personas que mueren por el mal uso de las armas de fuego cada año, la Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS) advirtió que puede ser 3 veces el número de sobrevivientes con lesiones físicas, trauma mental y emocional. Las discapacidades reducen las habilidades para ser económicamente independiente y productivos. La familia asume el cuidado de las víctimas y son las mujeres en la mayoría las cuidadoras de los lesionados, esto reduce la capacidad de la familia del auto cuidado de salud y la prevención de enfermedades en otros miembros como los niños.

**El impacto indirecto:**

- Perdida de jóvenes que representan la población económicamente activa. En El Salvador las lesiones por armas de fuego utilizan más de 7% del presupuesto del sistema público hospitalario, la mitad de esto representa el presupuesto de medicamentos para la red de servicios locales de salud. Los recursos son desviados a la atención de lesionados, siendo reducida la disponibilidad de recursos para programas de prevención de enfermedades como el dengue y otros como vacunación infantil, control de embarazo, salud de la mujer y el niño, etc.
Con la investigación realizada en un hospital de San Salvador, se encontró que en un año este hospital gasto en atender a los lesionados por armas de fuego, el presupuesto con que se podría hacer funcionar durante un año un Hospital General que atienda todas las enfermedades en un área rural.

- Reduce acceso a la educación, empleo, genera migración forzada y perdida de oportunidades lo que impacta en la salud de las comunidades y su desarrollo.

**What is your experience as a physician in dealing with small arms violence?**

*Dr Robert Mtonga (Zambia):*

There are a number of reasons that caused me to get involved in the small arms Campaign; Here I share just three experiences as a Physician.

1. A son of Zambia’s former Republican President, Dr Kenneth Kaunda, was shot in a politically motivated attack. He was brought to our casualty unit, where we worked hours on end, trying to remove the lodged bullets and stop the bleeding. He was given a blood transfusion in addition to all the surgery and was transferred to the Intensive Care Unit, but he later died.

2. The second experience concerns one of my patients. This man is a driver with one of Zambia’s local banks. One fateful day, he was transporting bank workers and cheques when bandits ambushed him and shot him in the shoulder and face. This happened at the University of Zambia where this Bank’s branch was located.

   We took time to attend to this man at our hospital. He recovered, although 8 years later he still has a bullet lodged into his shoulder. He has also developed psychological complications and he has bad dreams about the incident where he sees the bandits coming back to kill him. He is occasionally depressed, his sexual life has changed and he often has mood swings. Medically, this condition is called Post-traumatic Stress Disorder. Police later said that the assault rifle used was traceable to the war in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

3. I was part of a medical help team to Northern Kenya in 1992/1993 where Somali refugees were camped. Three of our lady doctor colleagues with MSF were ambushed and raped at gunpoint by bandits known as “Shiftas.” Later on our convoy was also shot at.

These illustrations cause me to agree with Dr. Robin Coupland, a field surgeon with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) that “guns are bad for people’s health” in whatever setting.

**How does a public approach help governments prevent small arms violence?**

*Dr Emperatriz Crespín (El Salvador):*

Las lecciones aprendidas desde abordajes de salud pública, son preventivas en su naturaleza, ya que se identifican factores de riesgo lo que permite neutralizarlos y evitar que se produzcan las lesiones más que tratarlas.

La salud pública puede orientar a los gobiernos a diseñar estrategias y programas de prevención dirigidos a cada grupo de población en riesgo, así como a ir evaluando los resultados obtenidos de intervenciones específicas y programas implementados por el gobierno, ej. en El Salvador, el plan mano dura. La salud pública puede evaluar el proceso y resultado de las intervenciones permitiendo cambiar rumbo si esto es necesario. Existen otras experiencias de abordajes de salud pública que han sido exitosos reduciendo otros problemas complejos incluyendo lesiones por vehículos automotores, tabaco, también como enfermedades de tipo infeccioso.

Claramente la disponibilidad de armas de fuego es un factor primario de riesgo. La salud publica ayuda a la prevención por los gobiernos siendo un instrumento en la sistemático de recolección de datos de muertes y lesiones, para una mejor comprensión de lo que puede hacerse para reducir el costo humano de las armas.
How can we use public health to monitor the progress of the UN PoA?

Dr Robert Mtonga (Zambia):

Public Health (PH) helps to document injuries and other social impacts of small arms violence. This helps not only to measure the extent of the problem in deaths and injuries, but also helps governments to understand the social impacts with a view to preventing the problem, so that money spent on the consequences of gun violence could instead be channelled to combating HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and provision of food to the undernourished, orphans etc.

When IANSA member doctors in El Salvador produced documentary evidence of injuries and deaths arising from the misuse of small arms, the Government of El Salvador introduced new policies including the establishment of a fund to help gun victims, improve police control of small arms etc.

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), a member physician of IPPNW has been documenting incidents of gun violence in terms of who is injured, where the injury is, why it happened and the kind of weapons used. This information helps understand the problem of proliferation and diffusion of small arms from the point of view of social impact. This approach also helps monitor current interventions and may help authorities to mount preventive measures, allocate more resources to public health, change practices etc.

These are some of the many ways that public health can contribute to the PoA. Other ways that we can help monitor the PoA include:

- Giving a public health dimension to the impacts of small arms if doctors are included on National Focal Points
- Helping victims and survivors with medical care
- Helping victims and survivors with rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration
- Helping victims and survivors raise public awareness

How can we best tell the stories of the victims?

Dr Robert Mtonga (Zambia):

[Presented the One Bullet Story: See Annex.]

We’ve heard mention of sustainable development. How are poverty and development associated with weapons availability?

Dr Christiane Agboton-Johnson (Senegal):

Mr le Président, honorables délégues, mesdames messieurs,

Depuis la fin de la guerre froide, les conséquences des conflits armés et de l’utilisation abusive des ALPC, ne serait ce qu’en termes de développement économique, sont tout simplement incommensurables.

Sans entrer dans un décompte et des statistiques qui bien souvent anesthésient, les récents travaux du PNUD, de la Banque Mondiale, du Small Arms Survey, de la Coalition IANSA, Oxfam, Amnesty International pour un Traité sur le commerce des armes, de la Croix Rouge, et de bien d’autres structures de recherche permettent de faire le lien entre le développement et la disponibilité des ALPC ; ces ALPC ont des effets directs qui se comptent en pertes de vies humaines et donc en perte de potentiel de développement du pays – mais aussi en effet indirects tant sur l’économie, la productivité, les investissements, les infrastructures, les exploitations, etc etc.

Quelques chiffres si vous permettez :

Selon la Banque inter américaine de Développement, les pays d’Amérique Latine dépensent 14% de leur PIB pour lutter contre la violence armée et le crime ;
87 milliards de dollars ont été dépenses par l’Afrique, l’Asie, l’Amérique latine en armement ces quatre dernières années, tout récemment les événements en Afrique de l’ouest constituent l’exemple patent de la déstabilisation socio économique résultant d’un climat d’insécurité.

La plupart (56 % selon Vies Brisées) des pays faiblement développés ont été marques par un conflit armé ; la pauvreté attise les conflits et les conflits attisent la pauvreté. Une guerre civile typique réduit d’environ 15% la richesse d’un pays et alors 30% vit dans la pauvreté absolue. Une étude récente de CCIS fait un lien plus précis : la relation entre la disponibilité et la pauvreté est souvent fonction de la durée du conflit, de l’état de pauvreté du pays et de la dissémination des armes.

On pourrait penser que cela n’affecte que les pays pauvres, zones privilégiées des conflits actuels (90% des conflits des dix dernières années se sont déroulés dans des pays dits pauvres, qui ne fabriquent pas pour la plupart d’armes légères et qui sont souvent très riches en ressources naturelles).

Mais non, les ALPC sont également nocives dans les pays développés avec les taux de suicides, d’homicide et les divers abus des armes à feu à l’origine de pertes humaines et matérielles ; en fait personne n’est en réalité épargné.

Rien de très original, me direz vous ; la communauté internationale a pris la mesure du problème avec la notion de développement qui a évolué, passant de la notion économique stricto sensu, à une notion plus large de développement humain, incluant les aspects sociaux, environnementaux... puis depuis les années 90, à une vison incluant les aspects de sécurité et on parle de sécurité humaine.


Pour me rapprocher de l’Afrique, je rappellerai également que le NEPAD a dans ses requis en priorité la question de la lutte contre les ALPC; un proverbe sénégalais dit que l’on ne peut semer, on ne peut planter dans un feu de brousse...

Donc le lien existe, il est reconnu et des solutions théoriques ont été préconisées, mais comment comprendre que tout cet arsenal existe et que nous demeurions impuissants à juguler une menace qui peut être facilement prise en compte ? Comment mesdames et messieurs arriverons nous à répondre efficacement au terrorisme, la menace des armes biologiques et chimiques ou des armes nucléaires, si nous ne réglons pas cette problématique ?

Il nous faut réussir améliorer le partenariat avec la société civile, les ONG pour enfin mettre la sécurité humaine sur les piliers de la sécurité, du désarmement et du développement.

**But isn’t the arms industry a source of employment and economic development?**

*Dr Christiane Agboton-Johnson (Senegal):*

Oui il faut le reconnaître, les armes ont fabriquées et vendues comme une marchandise et donc bien entendu sont source d’emploi et de revenus pour les pays producteurs même si les plus gros bénéfices se font sur des armes de plus en plus sophistiquées. On estime à environ 4 milliards de dollars les ventes légales d’ALPC par an.

Les pays producteurs vendent des armes et paient ensuite en opérations de maintien de la paix ou en processus de DDR interminables ; bien souvent, l’aggravation de la situation de misère dans les pays en...
conflit pousse les jeunes à s’exiler et souvent à aller grossir le peloton de candidats à l’émigration frauduleuse ou disons le au terrorisme.

Finalement, le développement ne se fait pas par les armes ni pour les pays producteurs ni pour les pays terrains de conflits armes.

Il faut donc de plus en plus et vous l’avez déjà réaffirmé à plusieurs reprises, renforcer les mesures de contrôle des armements, assurer une reforme du secteur de la sécurité, lutter contre la circulation et la prolifération des ALPC en appliquant tous les textes votes ; il serait opportun d’en faire des éléments des stratégies de lutte contre la pauvreté et surtout de régulariser le transfert avec des instruments tels le Traité sur le commerce des armes, les diverses conventions régionales, le Programme d’Action des Nations Unies.

Et c’est là qu’il faut certainement ensemble redire notre foi en un développement global du monde dans la sécurité, et continuer à bâtir des pistes d’action concrètes, des partenariats constructifs avec la société civile.

Karin Wilson, you’re someone who really knows about the costs of gun violence. Please tell us about the price you’ve paid.

Karin Wilson (USA):

I’m honoured to have this opportunity to talk to such an esteemed audience about how my life was forever changed by a single gunshot.

I lost my beloved son, my only child Christian on Dec 3, 1999. Just 28 days after he turned 19, he was a man-child, not quite an adult but past adolescence. This millennium came in a way I could have never imagined. The pain is indescribable, the magnitude of my loss makes me inconsolable. I’ve been wronged and robbed! I’m from the United States, I live in the state of New York, born and raised in the borough of Brooklyn, which is just across the river from here. The US is one of the most powerful and technologically advanced countries on this planet. We haven’t fought a war in this country since the American Civil War, a war that was fought from 1861-1865.

Yet in my neighbourhood and many others in this country we hear gunshots at night. Parents start doing silent headcounts of their children after hearing the sound of gunshots. We have neighbours, friends and family members who was either maimed or killed with a firearm. Because of my son’s death I became part of the largest grassroots anti-gun violence movement in the United States.

Let me tell you how my life has changed. I won’t have the comfort of my son looking after me in my old age. I won’t have my son around making sure I’m eating well, taking my medications properly, taking care of my bills, making sure that my house is warm in winter, and sidewalks shovelled and de-iced when it snows. I don’t have any more graduations to attend, or opportunities to applaud successful career achievements. I no longer hear funny stories or jokes (and I was told my son was one of the funniest guys around, he kept people laughing and feeling good.) But worst of all I can’t look or touch him anymore. When you people leave here, and fly back home to your country, you probably have wives and husbands, children and grandchildren. You know it’s through our children we get a little bit of immortality. You know your face, your body type, your values are going to be around long after you’re gone…because of your children. Children are our legacy.

Well I was robbed, and it looks like I won’t have a legacy now. My face, my body type, my values will probably disappear when I die, doesn’t look like anything of me will appear in the future. In the next century it will be kind of like I never, ever existed. And that’s pretty sad.

I’ve learned that there is nothing like definite, overt action to overcome the inertia of grief. Most of us have someone who needs us. If we haven’t, we can find someone! So instead of praying for the strength to survive, I prayed for strength to give away. Then I joined The Million Mom March. I went from being a victim of gun-violence to a survivor of gun-violence. And now I’m an advocate for survivors. I’m thoroughly committed to saving other children, though I couldn’t save my own child’s life I’m going to do all I can to save yours.
I know it is possible to reduce the number of deaths and injuries caused by gun violence. Our children have the right to grow up in environments free from the threat of gun violence. My son certainly had that right which he didn’t get. Our children want to grow old. All humans have the right to be safe from gun violence in their homes, neighbourhoods, schools and places of work and worship. Gun violence is a public health crisis of global proportions that harms not only the physical, but the spiritual, social and economic health of our families and communities. The Million Mom March has a slogan of which I subscribe to 100%. Which is “No child’s life should end with a bang”.

I’m trying to understand why my child had to die by gunshot, but I don’t understand. I know that you people listening to me have very powerful positions in your governments, and you’ll probably never cross paths with women like me again. So I implore to listen compassionately to what we have said today.

And if I had one wish I wish that all governments would take the same care and close monitoring of the manufacturing and distribution of firearms and bullets as you take with the removing nuclear waste water from reactors. We have an opportunity to change laws and create real accountability on these items. We have to stand up now and be counted on to do the right thing!

What can governments do to help the survivors of gun violence?

Rebecca Peters (Australia):

Courageous people like Karin Wilson help us recognise the true cost of gun violence. It's not only the people that are killed by guns, though that is terrible enough. For every person shot dead, three others are severely wounded by gunshot. We hear very little about this aspect of the impact of gun violence – the needs of those victims who survive with serious physical and psychological injuries. As our medical colleagues will attest, gunshot wounds are especially damaging to human tissue, and therefore especially disabling, and especially resource-intensive in terms of treatment, requiring large quantities of blood and expensive equipment like respirators. In most countries the support systems for people with disabilities are grossly inadequate or non-existent, and this has the effect of denying gunshot survivors their rights as citizens. For example, one of IANSA’s member groups in Guatemala, Transiciones, has pointed out that in Guatemala a young person paralysed by gunshot is very unlikely to have a wheelchair. This means that this young person – generally a young man – is doomed to spend the rest of his life inside the house, except on the rare occasion when a strong uncle is visiting who can carry him out into the sunshine. The same story can be told about other developing countries, and even some rich countries where the lack of health insurance means that gunshot victims cannot get the services they need.

And every shooting creates a ripple effect as the shock waves spread out – emotional, psychological and economic – affecting the victim’s family, friends, colleagues and community.

There are steps that governments can take to help survivors. To start, in most countries the police are likely to be the first people to arrive at the scene of a shooting. If police were equipped with first-aid training, lives could be saved and the severity of injuries could be reduced. And governments must allocate resources not only for immediate medical treatment but also for longer-term care and rehabilitation of survivors, including trauma counselling for witnesses and relatives, and counselling and mediation to prevent re-victimisation – because so often we see a pattern of one shooting being followed by another shooting in retribution – and assistance to the primary caregivers of the injured, who as Folade has pointed out are most often women.

But is this relevant to the UN process on small arms?

Rebecca Peters (Australia):

It is relevant, because in this process UN Member states are weighing up the cost of armed violence against the benefits that governments perceive from allowing the arms trade to continue without regulation. If the true cost of violence is taken into account, including the responsibility of governments to provide for the needs of victims and survivors, that calculation will change dramatically. We believe that one reason why the global small arms process has progressed so slowly is because governments have been able ignore or
discount the true cost of gun violence. We are pleased that victim assistance has been identified as a priority in Article 6 of the 1998 EU Joint Action on small arms. Links could be built to other processes, for example the UN Disability Convention. Another important point: Including the topic of victim assistance in the UN small arms deliberations would encourage funders to see this as a priority.

**Theme 2: Regulating small arms users**

**So if States are to address this human cost, you are arguing that they should seek to control how weapons are used?**

*Rebecca Peters (Australia):*

Absolutely. And that means including all the different categories of users: combatants – including armed groups of non-state actors – but also private citizens, sporting shooters, security companies, and law enforcement agencies. Small arms are easily passed from one user to another, so any category of user that is exempted from regulation becomes a likely source of guns for the illegal market.

**Let's start with law enforcement agencies. Why should the international community regulate the use of force by the police forces?**

*Ema Tagicakibau (Fiji):*

Police officers are tasked with ensuring the safety and security of communities, but in many instances this does not happen. This is well documented in reports by the UN Special Rapporteurs as well as those of NGOs like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch.

Although many countries allow police to use ‘minimum force,’ even when unarmed, police officers have often abused this right, and used excessive and arbitrary force on criminal suspects or members of the public.

Having access to guns increases the likelihood of abuse of their powers, as police officers have used these as instruments of torture, bullying, intimidation and ill-treatment of suspects.

While police officers may be trained on how to handle guns, they are often not trained on human rights standards that govern when and where a gun can be fired or whether it should be fired at all, resulting in fatal shootings.

**What needs to be done by governments to address this problem?**

*Ema Tagicakibau (Fiji):*

International standards do exist to control the use of guns and other methods of force by police and law enforcement officials – but in many countries around the world these standards are not being followed. Minimum standards on the use of force have been incorporated into instruments such as:

- The UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials
- The UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials

According to these standards, law enforcement officials have the right to use lethal force only if strictly necessary to protect life and only if the use of force is proportional to the threat.

Governments should
- Ensure that these standards are fully complied with and effectively monitored at all levels.
- Implement adequate selection criteria and training procedures
- Support and promote greater police accountability to the people they serve
- Firearms should be the exception in policing and not the rule.
Can you illustrate with an example from your own experience?
*Ema Tagicakibau (Fiji):*

In 2000, I was part of the Fiji government that was overthrown by armed soldiers. Together with my colleagues we were held hostage for up to 56 days.

Following this, I have become involved in working with civil society to enhance its role in combating the gun culture and militarism that gives rise to the mentality that conflicts can be resolved with the use of armed force.

Research conducted by Small Arms Survey in the Pacific shows that the main sources of arms in the Pacific region came from legal transfers, for example the leakage from police and military armouries for criminal purposes.

I therefore urge governments and bilateral donors to ensure that any military aid and training provided to security forces not only focuses on how to use firearms, but more importantly to educate officials on human rights standards and respect for human life and dignity.

When the police are not willing or able to catch criminals and protect people, citizens turn to private security companies don't they?
*Jessica Soto (Philippines):*

Yes, but only people with money can afford to employ a private security Company and they often do so not to protect people but rather to protect property or businesses, and sometimes to advance political agendas during election campaigning. For instance, I come from Nueva Eciia, a province in the Philippines, where private security companies and private armies are hired by some traditional politicians that have been known to intimidate and abuse innocent people – leading in some cases to fatalities – including of political opponents and their supporters.

So are these private security companies not regulated or held accountable for these kinds of violations using small arms and light weapons?
*Jessica Soto (Philippines):*

Only a few governments have specific laws to regulate private security companies. Often these companies and private armies are not held accountable for committing human rights abuses with their firearms. Fortunately, the Philippines has a law that regulates operation and conduct of the private security companies, however the challenge to monitor individual compliance by these companies needs to be emphasised and that the lack of resources from the government is a concern to conduct proper monitoring programs.

What about private military companies used by governments? Are they regulated in terms of their use of small arms and light weapons?
*Jessica Soto (Philippines):*

Whilst the international community has sought to prohibit the activities of mercenaries outright, this has not been the case with private military companies. A recent report by Amnesty International for example identified 51 companies in eight EU Member States and new member countries providing military services or training. There is a lack of regulation of these private military companies in much the same way as there is a lack of regulation of private security companies.
What should be done to prevent and respond to these abuses by private security and military companies?

*Jessica Soto (Philippines)*:

The same minimum standards of conduct that are applied to state forces – which have already been referred to by Ema – should be applied to these companies. Governments have an obligation to act with due diligence to prevent these abuses and to hold these companies fully accountable when they commit them – just as should do with their own armed forces and police.

If we had an international Arms Trade Treaty the activities of these companies – including their acquisition, transfer and use of small arms and light weapons – could be effectively controlled. Under such a treaty, governments would be committed to refrain from allowing the transfer of small arms and light weapons to contexts in which these arms would likely to be used by these companies to commit abuses.

How does regulating civilian access relate to the illicit trade in small arms?

*Rebecca Peters (Australia)*:

If you don’t regulate guns within each country, you don’t have any chance of regulating their movement between countries, because guns easily cross borders. The legal sale of guns to civilians in one country becomes a source of illicit guns in the country next door. For example, Mexican authorities estimate that 80% of guns used in crimes in Mexico originate in the US, and in Toronto, Canada some 50% of the guns used in crime came from across the border in the US.

60% of the world’s guns are in the hands of civilians, according to the Small Arms Survey; and civilians are the principal victims and perpetrators of gun violence. Illicit weapons almost always start as legal guns, and a minimum standard to regulate legal gun ownership is therefore a crucial component of combating the illicit trade – a point that was reinforced by the 1997 UN Crime Commission.

Most states recognise that regulating civilian possession is essential to stopping small arms proliferation and misuse. In 2003, two thirds of States reported on their progress on national regulations along with their reporting on the PoA. This year, the new Biting the Bullet / IANSA report on implementation of the PoA shows that at least 133 states have laws criminalising civilian possession.

We know that the availability of guns is a problem in conflict zones. Is private ownership of guns really such a threat in peaceful societies?

*Denis Mizne (Brazil)*:

Guns are as much a problem in countries not at war as those in conflict. According to the Small Arms Survey more people are killed by small arms in crime than in armed conflict.

Consider Brazil, where new research compares the rate of gun death in Brazil unfavourably to many conflict zones – there are 40,000 people shot dead every year in Brazil. This is mostly homicides, some are suicides and some are accidents. If guns are present in homes, there will always be fatal accidents. One child is killed by a gun every day.

Can regulating gun ownership really reduce the level of violence?

*Rebecca Peters (Australia)*:

Tighter gun regulations can be very effective in reducing gun deaths. Since Canada and Australia tightened their gun laws, their gun homicide rates have dropped by 15% and 40% respectively. The gun homicide rate for women dropped even more dramatically, by 40% and 50%. Of course, you need to establish laws that are sensible and comprehensive laws, not full of loopholes likes so many national gun laws are today.
 Aren’t guns used to make people safer?  
Rebecca Peters (Australia):

People who have guns for self-defence are no safer than people without guns. In El Salvador, for example, research has shown that you are four times more likely to be killed if you have a gun to defend yourself against criminals than if you do not have a gun.

Having guns around makes us less safe, whether at the level of a household, a community or a country. The UN Special Rapporteur on small arms and human rights has suggested that states which do not adequately regulate possession and use of small arms may be failing to meet their obligations to protect civilians.

Does regulating small arms mean that guns should be banned?  
Denis Mizne (Brazil):

Regulation is not prohibition. We are not talking about preventing people from hunting or pursuing recreational activities safely. However, guns are dangerous devices and they need to be regulated. And there need to be minimum standards for all countries. If a country with strong regulations is next to a country with weak regulations, the guns flow from one region to the other. As was said earlier, 80% of the crime guns recovered in Mexico have come from the US.

Licensing of guns and individuals owning guns is important. Can you tell us something about the licensing problem in Lebanon?  
Fadi Abi Allam (Lebanon):

ان أهمية الترخيص يأتي من إحسانات إله في بلدي تقول بأن معظم حوادث إطلاق النار متاتية من أبن يحملون رخص لحمل السلاح، فكيف تعني هذه الرخص:

أولاً: تعداد المراعي المانحة لهذه الرخص، فقد تكون وزارة الدفاع، قيادة الجيش، وزارة الداخلية، المخابرات، جهاز أمن الدولة، إضافة إلى أوافق خاصة بأمر المهمة أو حتى تسهيل المرور التي يمكن من خلالها حمل ما شئت من سلاح.

ثانياً: عدم تحديد نوع السلاح المرخص ورقمه على الإجازة المعطاة.

ثالثاً: تور رخص بيضاء بحيث يمكن تبديلها لنتمشى وهذا يساعد المجرمين وحتى الأرهابيين من استخدامها في عمليات تسهيل.

رابعاً: اعتبار الرخصة بمثابة أداة لزيادة وكتب المناصرة، وهذا يقوم به العديد من المسؤولين ولا سيما على المستوى الوزاري، والمغذلون من النواب وإذا كان تطبيق الوزير تسهيلاً ما يقارب المنتج الرخصة فين يغني عن ثلاثة وزراء يمكن أن يصل العدد إلى ثلاثة آلاف حامل رخصة، وقد تكون هذه الرخصة دون وجود السلاح أصلاً بحيث تمنع تحمل هذا السلاح إلى شراء سلاح لاحقاً وتحتى استخدامه.

فهنا بادرنا بمعالجة العديد من الجهات المعتنية بالطلب من الحكومة لوقف مبادرات هذه الرخصة، والحمد لله استجابت لنا انا الآن الأمر لم يصل إلى حد تنظيم هذا الموضوع بشكل الكامل خدمة لأمن الناس.

In reducing civilian possession, there need to be possibilities for civilians to turn these weapons in. What problems are posed in Lebanon for civilians to dispose of their guns?  
Fadi Abi Allam (Lebanon):

حقيقة الأمر ان هذا الموضوع يأتي من رصد للحوادث المتاتية من السلاح يعني أنه في البلد وخصاً الطارح من حرب دولية يمكن ان يتوف السلاح في كل منزل، وعلى أعراف من الأسلحة، خفيها لابن القتلى وغيرها من المتقاتلين، أو إذا أردت أن تخليص من هذا السلاح الذي بحوثك، أو الذي قد يكون وصل البك على طريق الوراثة، ضمن المنزل أو شارك أو منازل الأساسى هاجر، أو إذا ذهبت بهذا السلاح إلى أي من المراكز الأمنية، تسهيلك أن تعرضت نفسك إلى السرايات القانونية، وهذا قد توقف لساعات أو يوم، أو حتى إلى أيام، من اين هذا السلاح وما اين أنت حالياً؟ ما هو الخيار؟ ليس هناك أكثر من خيارين:
Guns are traditionally part of the culture in the Middle East. What are the consequences of this?

Fadi Abi Allam (Lebanon):

La thématique du DDR est un sujet extrêmement sensible et difficile à traiter d’une manière intégrée. Il est vrai qu’une évolution est en cours mais qui nécessite la révision de nombreux concepts. L’Afrique de l’Ouest et bien d’autres régions du monde sont actuellement un « laboratoire » avec de nombreuses opérations de maintien de la paix et des opérations de DDR. Celles-ci posent problème aussi bien dans la forme, que dans la conception et dans l’approche. Nous en citrons quelques uns même si ce thème pourrait nécessiter à lui seul une conférence.

- Il faudrait y intégrer très tôt des structures et des acteurs du terrain, mieux au fait des réalités et des spécificités de chaque zone ; l’exemple de la Sierra Léone est à considérer ;
- Les séquences D (démobilisation), D désarmement, R (réintégration…) ne sont pas réalistes, une des grandes questions étant la sécurité des diverses factions ;
- Le DDR doit être considéré comme un phénomène complexe alliant des aspects militaires à une prise en charge du développement et le financement devrait alors tenir compte de cette complexité et de la difficulté d’une reconstruction globale ;
- Les opérations de DDR incomplètes alimentent la circulation des armes et des mercenaires qui se déplacent d’un terrain de conflits à l’autre ;
- Elles révèlent également les conséquences des transferts à des acteurs non étatiques eu égard à tous les groupes armés dans les conflits armés actuels ; le récent ouvrage de Small Arms Survey sur les groupes armés en Afrique de l’Ouest en est une illustration.

Ceci nous permet alors d’aborder la question des enfants soldats qui est une catastrophe et un crime contre l’humanité. Que dire quand des adultes se font défendre par des enfants, que des producteurs fabriquent des
Les jeunes de moins de 20 ans constituent plus de 50% de la population africaine et nombreux ont déjà été associés à des conflits armés, sous l’emprise de la drogue, par appât de gains faciles ou de force. Leur réinsertion est un sujet délicat et sérieux à prendre en compte par tous car le phénomène de la violence armée est universel. Nous saluons le travail fait par des agences des NU telles l’UNICEF et de nombreuses ONG, le Représentant spécial du SG en charge des enfants dans les conflits armés, mais il faudrait encore plus.

Les programmes de DDR, d’éducation à la paix et tout simplement les programmes de développement devraient s’intéresser préférentiellement à cette cible. Il faudrait arriver à mieux étudier l’ampleur de ce triste phénomène et surtout à le prévenir car dans 20 ans nos états seront gouvernées par des jeunes qui auront appris le pouvoir illusoire de la violence, des armes ! Le futur UN PoA devrait contenir des éléments spécifiques relatifs à ces questions afin de réduire la prolifération et la circulation des armes légères et de petit calibre.

**Theme 3: Disarmament**

**Why should the “legal” trade in small arms be of concern to the international community when States have the right to acquire weapons for self defence?**

*Luís Alberto Cordero (Costa Rica):*

Según el Small Arms Survey (Encuesta de Armas Pequeñas,) el comercio mundial en armas y munición vale aproximadamente 4 mil millones de dólares por año, mientras que el comercio ilícito a lo mejor vale menos de mil millón de dólares. Aproximadamente el cincuenta por ciento de los países en el mundo producen armas y todos los países del mundo son consumidores de armas.

Si bien los estados tienen el derecho de adquirir armas para defensa propia, también tienen obligaciones bajo las leyes internacionales de transferir y usar las armas con responsabilidad. Los estados vendedores o que transfieren armas deben asegurar que el recipiente final no las utilice para violar leyes internacionales relacionadas al derecho humanitario, ni para atentar contra los estándares de derechos humanos o embargos de armas especificados por las Naciones Unidas.

Sin regulaciones adecuadas, el comercio legal de armas pequeñas desemboca directamente en el comercio ilícito, así que es sumamente importante prevenir la desviación de armas y municiones a usuarios finales no autorizados. Se requiere revisiones rigurosas antes de conceder una licencia de exportación; acuerdos de certificación de uso final legalmente vinculantes; e investigaciones de seguimiento para asegurar que se respete los términos de la licencia de exportación y el certificado de uso final. Se ha logrado poco en el desarrollo de un proceso de certificación para usuarios finales, a pesar de las preocupaciones manifestadas por el gobierno de Suecia.

La soberanía de los estados es un principio consagrado en la Carta de las Naciones Unidas, y siempre ha sido respetado en la historia de esa organización. Sin embargo, como han expresado varias organizaciones y gobiernos, los derechos también implican responsabilidades. La Comunicadora Especial sobre armas pequeñas y derechos humanos de la ONU también ha manifestado que bajo el derecho internacional los Estados están obligados a ejercer toda diligencia para prevenir abusos contra personas dentro de su territorio, aún cuando los abusos sean cometidos por individuos particulares.

**NGOs talk a lot about transparency and confidence building: Are these buzz words or are there actual policy implications for governments to consider?**

*Daniel Luz Alvarez (Spain):*

Un tema vital para una mayor rendición de cuentas y para poner fin al tráfico ilícito de armas pequeñas viene por la necesidad de que los Estados informen sobre sus transferencias. Esto es importante si realmente queremos construir unas medidas efectivas de control de armas que regulen el flujo de armas y municiones. De todos modos, hay que reconocer que en los últimos años se ha avanzado mucho en esta materia, gracias al impulso del Plan de Acción así como a diversas iniciativas nacionales y regionales.
Would you seriously advocate restricting arms transfers to states because of the actions of a small number of policemen?

Rebecca Peters (Australia):

In some cases, certainly. The recent massacre in Andijan, Uzbekistan, is a clear example where government forces were involved in grave human rights abuses. Human Rights Watch reports that hundreds of people were shot dead by State security forces.

When it is likely that arms transfers will be used to commit human rights abuses, then the arms transfer should be stopped. An international Arms Trade Treaty would ensure that this basic rule was followed by all States. This would help prevent massacres like Andijan.

We’re hearing more and more about this Arms Trade Treaty – especially last week when the G8 met. Why should governments pay attention to this campaign when there are so many pressing issues to deal with?

Luis Alberto Cordero (Costa Rica):

En su esencia, el Tratado de Armas es una aclaración de las obligaciones de los Estados bajo el derecho público humanitario. Establece un código de estándares mínimos para todo tipo de transferencia internacional, y así asegura que cada paso del comercio en armas pequeñas y livianas, aún a nivel global, sea realizado dentro de un marco legal. Por lo tanto, es imprescindible la adopción del Tratado de Armas como un instrumento legalmente vinculante.

El Programa de Acción obliga a los Estados cumplir con “sus responsabilidades previas bajo leyes internacionales pertinentes,” (sección II, párrafo 11,) incluyendo el derecho humanitario internacional. Para cumplir con sus obligaciones bajo el Programa de Acción, los Estados deben ponerse de acuerdo durante la Conferencia de Revisión sobre una lista de principios globales para regir la transferencia internacional de armas. Esta lista debe incluir: autorización gubernamental escrita para todas las transferencias; respeto a los limites especificados en tratados y en resoluciones del Consejo de Seguridad, como los embargos de armas; y la negación de transferencias si hay una probabilidad de que estas sean utilizadas para violar los derechos humanos.

A discussion of UN arms embargoes is very timely given this year’s report by the Secretary-General, ‘in larger freedom’. How could they be strengthened?

Rebecca Peters (Australia):

Firstly, governments should make violations of an arms embargo a criminal offence under national law. It seems incredible that most countries will not prosecute gunrunners who violate arms embargoes, because it isn’t a crime against their national laws. The UN should establish a dedicated and properly-resourced Sanctions Unit. There has to be proper logistical and financial support for the enforcement of arms embargoes. In the eastern DRC, where 750 people are dying every day because of the conflict, the UN sanctions committee has reported that the peacekeeping forces do not have sufficient financial support to do their job properly.

Why address these activities, especially import, since it is the discretion of states and the tool for control on trade should be on the first movement from a country, i.e. exports?

Noel Stott (South Africa):

That is true in a sense but it is important to remember that the international trade in small arms and ammunition includes many links and steps. At many points along the production and supply chain there are many opportunities for weapons to be diverted into the illegal trade or to be misused. There are a number of ways to deal with this. One way, of course, is to make sure that the proper documentation is completed and that end user certificates are in place. Another way is to improve the regulation of brokers and brokering activities.
The problem is that brokers often operate in countries with weak or non-existent controls on arms brokers. It is important that countries develop registration systems and develop extraterritorial controls amongst states that have taken steps to control this problem. This year’s Biting the Bullet / IANSA report [on implementation of the PoA] reveals that just 32 states have brokering controls, and only a few of these include extraterritorial provisions. This means that brokers can easily sidestep controls by relocating to one of the 150 countries with little or no controls.

**Why target brokers, they are doing their business in accordance with national law?**

*Noel Stott (South Africa):*

Most, if not all international and regional agreements recognise the need to regulate brokers and there is a growing recognition that all countries – not just arms producers – need to do this. Civil society welcomes the work of the Dutch-Norwegian Initiative in furthering discussions on brokering as well as the UK government’s support for an Arms Trade Treaty that would include provisions to regulate arms brokers.

**Can you give us an example?**

*Noel Stott (South Africa):*

There are many examples of brokers living in one country and brokering deals between citizens of two other countries. To give an example, Nicaraguan AK47s were exported to Colombia, through Costa Rica and Panama, organised by two nationals from Israel acting as brokers, living in Guatemala. The AK47s ended up in paramilitary groups in Colombia.

**What can be done?**

*Noel Stott (South Africa):*

Given that an arms broker really only needs a fax and a phone to operate – they are often one man shows (and they usually are men) – it is vital that states establish extraterritorial laws and policies to regulate this activity so that citizens and those residing on their soil are held to account for any activities that may be illicit. Similar agreements have been reached in other areas such as child sex tourism and terrorism. The NGO community is thus looking forward the establishment of the group of experts in 2006.

**What is the point of insisting on a marking and tracing instrument?**

*Ilhan Berkol (Belgium):*

Un tel instrument doit être un outil préventif. Il devrait permettre d’identifier le point où l’arme a été détournée vers le marché illicite de telle manière que des mesures proactives puissent être prises afin d’éviter des déviations ultérieures.

Le Préambule du PoA engage les Etats à prévenir, combattre et éradiquer le commerce illicite des armes. L’instrument finalisé ne sera pas un outil préventif parce que les requêtes de traçage n’auront lieu qu’une fois l’arme sera détournée, utilisée dans le crime et sera éventuellement récupérée. De plus, les requêtes de traçage seront volontaires et ne seront conduites que sur base bilatérale, ce qui est très difficile à mener dans la pratique au niveau global. Un système obligatoire et multilatéral était nécessaire.

**What is IANSA’s view of the recent round of negotiations?**

*Ilhan Berkol (Belgium):*

Le caractère politiquement contraignant affaiblit considérablement l’instrument parce que le marquage et le traçage permettent principalement de vérifier physiquement si les armes transférées légalement arrivent dans les mains de leur utilisateur final. Afin d’assurer ceci dans la pratique une contrainte légale est absolument nécessaire.
Quant aux munitions, elles sont la seule connexion entre le crime et l’arme qui y est impliquée. Elles sont les seuls paramètres qui peuvent encore mener aux armes illicites car celles-ci ont besoin d’être alimentées. Les armes sans munitions sont comme des voitures sans essence. Les exclure vide l’instrument de sa substance.

Enfin, avec un bon mécanisme de suivi il aurait été possible de renforcer l’instrument ultérieurement, ce qui ne sera pas le cas. Toutefois, si les Etats arrivent à négocier un futur Traité international sur les transferts d’armes, il serait nécessaire de lui associer un Protocole légalement contraignant sur le marquage et le traçage, ce qui devrait être de même, d’ailleurs, pour un éventuel instrument sur le courtage.

**Could you give an example where the marking and tracing could have made a difference?**

*Ilhan Berkol (Belgium):*

Un exemple récent est le massacre du camp de Gatumba en août 2004 au Burundi où il y a eu 150 morts et une centaine de blessés civils. Plusieurs cartouches de munitions ont été récupérées avec les marquages du fabricant et/ou le pays d’origine ainsi que l’année de production. Pour donner un exemple, en 1998 les données sur les exportations d’un de ces pays producteurs montrent qu’il y a eu des ventes de munitions vers 7 pays africains, parmi d’autres. Mais ceci ne permet pas de déterminer les vendeurs et les intermédiaires ni les utilisateurs. Parce qu’il n’existe pas de normes internationales communes, il n’a donc pas été possible de tracer ces munitions. S’il y avait eu un numéro de lot unique avec des registres adéquats comprenant les détails de chaque transfert, le point de déviation vers le marché illicite aurait pu être déterminé. Ainsi un tel crime contre l’humanité ne serait pas resté impuni.

Ici, concernant l’exclusion des munitions de l’instrument international sur la traçabilité, je dois tout de même souligner le fait que le préambule de la résolution qui a désigné le Groupe de travail pour développer cet instrument se réfère à la résolution qui a conduit à la définition des armes légères du premier Groupe d’experts de l’ONU de 1997 qui inclut les munitions. Exclure les munitions sur base du mandat n’est donc pas correct. Elles ont été exclues parce qu’il n’y avait pas de consensus mais les vraies raisons n’ont pas été données par ceux qui ne les voulaient pas. On peut espérer que ce vide sera rapidement comblé par le développement d’un Protocole réglementant les munitions.

**Have the efforts to collect weapons and ammunition really paid off?**

*Daniel Luz Alvarez (Spain):*

Sólo se puede entender un programa que pretenda reducir el impacto de las armas de manera efectiva, si forma parte de una política más amplia y ambiciosa.

Pero también es importante tener en cuenta otras medidas, como el control al acceso a las armas, la creación de medidas de confianza, el DDR de antiguos combatientes, la reforma del sector de seguridad, así como las restricciones sobre la producción y las transferencias. Estos aspectos constituyen pilares para que este tipo de iniciativas tengan un verdadero éxito.

La importancia de la cantidad de armas es relativa. Según el Small Arms Survey, los países de la Unión Europea tienen un porcentaje de armas per cápita superior a América Latina o África, sin embargo, la sensación de seguridad no es comparable. La idea de un programa de recolección de armas es la de reforzar la sensación de seguridad. Por ejemplo, en San Rafael (Argentina) donde se ha llevado a cabo el programa más exitoso hasta el momento de recolección de armas, la reducción de la violencia y del crimen dobló la de armas recolectadas.

**Why should individuals disarm when they don’t trust their governments to protect them and their families?**

*Daniel Luz Alvarez (Spain):*

Los Gobiernos tienen la responsabilidad de brindar seguridad a las personas. Pero para lograr la seguridad humana es necesario promover un desarrollo sostenible, la prestación de servicios sociales básicos, y el logro
de unos objetivos de desarrollo centrado en las personas. Tanto la falta de estos elementos de desarrollo humano, como unas culturas de uso y aceptación de las armas para la resolución de disputas, constituyen la base de la demanda de armas.

**Why would people give up their guns for money or goods?**  
*Daniel Luz Alvarez (Spain):*

Es por ello por lo que el tipo de incentivos que se ha de fomentar en este tipo de programa son los productivos (mejor que los de consumo, o la recompra); y los colectivos (mejor que los individuales), ya que la creación de seguridad es un elemento compartido.

No nos podemos concentrar únicamente en la cantidad de armas recolectadas. Esto, sin lugar a duda es importante, puesto que cada arma (y cada bala) recolectada y destruida, es un arma que va a dejar de matar.

**Why is it necessary to destroy weapons?**  
*Olga Palinkasev (Bosnia Herzegovina):*

Each destroyed weapon reduces the possibility of a death. Destruction is the only truly safe method of dealing with surplus weapons. As noted in this year’s Biting the Bullet / IANSA report [on implementation of the PoA], destroying collected weapons publicly can serve as a confidence building measure between the government and civilians and crucially ensures that weapons do not re-enter circulation or fall into criminal hands.

NGOs with local knowledge and credibility should be involved in the process to collect weapons including in the conception, design and implementation of weapons collection initiatives.

Collection and destruction of ammunition are elements of a more ambitious policy for peace and security. A global target of one million guns per year would be a modest target representing just 13% of the new guns sold every year.

**Why would people hand over their guns if they don't trust the system?**  
*Olga Palinkasev (Bosnia Herzegovina):*

People may fear that the guns they hand over to the government will not be destroyed and will instead be resold or used by police forces that they do not trust. Measures to improve trust include increasing SALW stockpile security (including proper resources before and after the destruction); reducing the number of guns stockpiled; and raising awareness. Awareness-raising in South East Europe has occurred through the Red Cross, the South-Eastern Europe Small Arms Clearinghouse (SEESAC) and the UNDP. Lately, the Bosnian Centre for Security Studies is helping Handicap International prepare lectures for incorporation into the national curriculum on SALW and mines.

**Tell me about the Control Arms Campaign**  
*Luis Alberto Cordero (Costa Rica):*

Armas Bajo Control es la campaña más extensa en la historia dirigida al control del comercio de armas. Somos un grupo de 600 ONGs de Norte y Sur, representando a cientos de miles de personas alrededor de mundo quienes exigen acción inmediata para controlar el comercio de armas.

Hasta ahora, más de 300.000 personas se han unido a la petición Millón de Rostros, la petición fotográfica más grande de la historia, como parte de la campaña Armas Bajo Control.
Why is it important for civil society and governments to cooperate on small arms?
Rebecca Peters (Australia)

Put simply, governments need civil society to help tackle small arms. You can’t do it without us. This work is not just about stockpiles and regulations, it is about people – people injured or killed, people grieving or traumatised, and most of all people who are afraid. The PoA requires governments to take action and it asks the civilian population to cooperate, to disarm their communities, to solve disputes non-violently, to trust the process… The involvement of civil society makes all of this more likely – because civil society organisations have the knowledge and contacts, we provide credibility and build confidence that the problem can be solved. This is why the PoA explicitly requires a partnership between governments and NGOs.

The Biting the Bullet / IANSA report on implementation of the PoA is itself an illustration of government-civil society cooperation, and it contains many examples of such cooperation. These include research, awareness raising, developing policy, producing information and mediation. An example of the need for civil society comes from the ceasefire in northwest Uganda between the government and the second Uganda National Rescue Front rebel group. In 2002, with violations of the ceasefire increasingly common, the international community asked Stella Sabiiti from the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CECORE), an IANSA member in Uganda, to step in and help mediate a peace. CECORE had credibility from all side of the conflict and was able to analyse the situation and build trust between the rebels and the governments, resulting in a peaceful settlement. Now there are DDR and peace training programs active in the region.

What does IANSA want for the upcoming Review Conference in 2006?
Rebecca Peters (Australia):

We’re concerned that the momentum has flagged since 2003. The new Biting the Bullet / IANSA report on implementation of the PoA shows that some of the good signs of progress we saw in 2003 have not been built upon.

However, we are very pleased with the positive comments coming out of the plenary this week. It’s clear that there are some governments that are really serious about tackling the problem. Member States that have made positive statements included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African Union</th>
<th>Guinea</th>
<th>Mali</th>
<th>Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>European Union +</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>associates</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another thing we are pleased about this year is that a number of governments agreed to include NGO representatives on their national delegations, responding to the suggestion from Ambassador Patokallio. We had hoped that NGOs would be able to participate fully in the thematic debates later in the week, but we were disappointed on that count. However, it’s a good start to have some NGOs on the official delegations and we hope that next year there will be even more. This year they included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Sierra Leone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We want to work with these governments and to pressure other governments to live up to their responsibility and their commitment under the PoA to work as partners with civil society.

Everyone agrees that the PoA as it stands is a compromise. It was the best we could do at the time, in 2001. The Review Conference in 2006 gives us the opportunity to refine it, to work on it, to strengthen it into the global agreement that will really meet the needs of the millions of people who are suffering from gun violence. Whether it’s a question of amendment or annexes or extending our interpretation of the PoA, we need global agreement on the aspects of the issue which were neglected in 2001. The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue’s publication Missing Pieces outlines some of these.

Global principles for arms transfers need to be agreed in line with international human rights, international humanitarian law and concern for regional stability, as embodied in the draft Arms Trade Treaty.

Global principles for the regulation of civilian possession of small arms are already emerging as international norms. But the UN process should provide guidelines.

The demand dimension needs to be considered, as does the gender perspective. It is as important to tackle the misuse of small arms as their proliferation. We can’t just count the bodies of the dead, we need to focus on the survivors. We need to recognise that human security is more important than national security.

Most of all, we need you the representatives of governments to show courage. If Karin Wilson, a grieving mother, can find the courage to come to the United Nations to tell her story; if Dr Mtonga and Dr Crespin, busy doctors from gun-ridden countries, can find the courage to travel here to address you on behalf of their patients – then you can find the courage to take bold action to stop the carnage that is resulting from the flood of guns around the world. You are the ones who have the power to do it. And meanwhile ordinary people back home, in your own countries and in other countries, are watching and waiting anxiously for you to use that power to make them safe. We know it’s not easy, and we’ll help you as much as we can, but in the end we are all depending on you. As we approach the 2006 Review Conference, please keep in mind that so many mothers like Karen Wilson, so many doctors like Dr Mtonga and Dr Crespin and their patients, are depending on you. Please find your courage, and don’t let them down.
One Bullet Story: Kenya
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The Human Face of Small Arms Violence

The costs of injuries are high:
- Medical
- Psychological
- Social
- Community
- Economic

Slide 3

Focus on:
IPPNW
Kenya
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We present the story of a 17-year-old Congolese boy referred to Nairobi University Hospital for surgical treatment and management of a gunshot injury to the face...
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The son of a diamond prospector, he was suspected to have diamonds by rebel soldiers, who shot him in the face in anger, after they failed to get any from him.

He was fortunate to receive first aid treatment, but had to travel to Nairobi for proper medical care.
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A journey of 1,000 km through Uganda by road
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It took him over one year to raise the money from family and friends for travel and treatment.

During this period he kept his mouth, which was disfigured by the bullet, covered with a handkerchief in public.
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9 hours of surgery, at a cost of USD $3,000.00
Slide 10: Stainless steel bone plate inserted.

Slide 11: After 9 hours of surgery.

Slide 12: Five days after surgery.

Slide 13: 9 Hours of theatre time
+ 9 Hours of theatre drugs
+ Reconecetion plate
+ Surgeon and nurses
+ Travel expenses from injury site in DR Congo
+ Pre-admission hotel expenses
+ Post operative care

= $6,000.00 USD
+ Psychological & social cost like post-traumatic stress disorder.

Slide 14: SALW injuries are an burden on health care facilties.

Slide 15: $6,000 = One year of salary to 1 midwife
$5,000 = Full immunisations for 250 children
$4,000 =1 1/2 years education for 2 medical students
$6,000 = 10 years of daily spoil meal for an average Kenyan family of six

Slide 16: ...250,000 deaths per year as a result of small arms.
- Over 9 million small arms
- 1st most often weapon of choice
- Of 49 major conflicts in the 1990s 7 were characterised by small arms as the weapon of choice
- Annual global trade in SALW is estimated at 34 billion dollars.

Slide 17: Small Arms - A man-made disease!

Slide 18: Small Arms Violence is a Public Health Crisis.

Solutions include a public health approach:
- Collect data
- Identify Risk Factors
- Design interventions
- Prevent injuries.