

United Nations
Register of Conventional Arms

Information Booklet
2007



Department for Disarmament Affairs
United Nations, New York



CONTENTS

PREFACE	2
PART I TECHNICAL PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE REGISTER	3
A. Arms transfers	4
B. Categories of equipment the transfers of which are to be registered.....	5
C. Standardized form for reporting international transfers	6
D. Available background information regarding military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies	7
E. Operation of the Register.....	7
F. Annual consolidated report by the Secretary-General	8
G. Access to the Register.....	8
PART II QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.....	8
Introduction.....	
Basic structure of the Register	9
Categories of equipment	10
Defining an international transfer	16
Utilization of reporting forms	17
Reporting of additional background information.....	19
Administration of the Register.....	20
PART III REPORT OF THE 2006 GROUP OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS	19
Foreword by the Secretary-General.....	21
Letter of transmittal	24
I. Introduction.....	28
II. Review of reports submitted to the Register	30
III. Regional aspects	35
IV. Operation of the Register	39
V. Development of the Register	41
VI. Conclusions and recommendations	47
Annexes.....	52
PART IV REPORTING FORMS FOR THE REGISTER	54
Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (exports)	55
Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (imports).....	58
Simplified form for submitting “nil” returns on exports and imports	58
Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons (exports).....	
62	
Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons (imports).....	
.....63	



Preface

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms has been in operation since 1992. As of 10 January 2007, 170 Member States have participated in the Register by reporting either on a consistent basis or at least once, including nearly all the principal producers, exporters and importers of conventional arms. In recent years, the participation level has been much higher than during the first eight years of operation of the Register. As a result, the Register captures the great bulk of the global trade in major conventional arms.

The Register of Conventional Arms was established by the Secretary-General on 1 January 1992 under General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

In that resolution, the General Assembly declared its determination to prevent the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms in order to promote stability and strengthen international peace and security, taking into account the legitimate security needs of States and the principle of undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments. The Assembly also reaffirmed the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The technical procedures for the Register were developed by a Panel of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General in 1992. Periodic reviews of the operation of the Register and its further development have been conducted by the Secretary-General, thus far, in 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003, and 2006 with the assistance of a Group of Governmental Experts.

This Information Booklet is an updated version of an earlier one published in 2004. It provides information on the technical procedures of the Register, along with questions and answers which are intended to facilitate a better understanding of the operation of the Register. In addition, the booklet contains the definitions of the seven categories of equipment covered by the Register; the Report of the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts on the operation and further development of the Register; and the standardized reporting forms.



Part I TECHNICAL PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE REGISTER



TECHNICAL PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE REGISTER

A. Arms transfers

1. Paragraph 2 (a) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L states that “Member States are requested to provide data for the Register, addressed to the Secretary General, on the number of items in the following categories of equipment imported into or exported from their territory”. The Panel of Governmental Technical Experts in 1992 did not attempt to define arms transfers but, for the purpose of the Register, considered that the terms “imported into or exported from their territory” needed some clarification, as stated in the paragraphs below. To date, no common definition of a transfer has been reached given differing national practices regarding implementation of rules, regulations and procedures for exports and imports. Consequently, the description of a transfer, given in the report of the 1992 Panel and reaffirmed by the 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003 and 2006 Groups of Experts remains the guideline for reporting transfers.

In determining what to report, Member States should take into account the following:

- a) International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment.
- b) Transfers involving only United Nations Member States should be reported to the UN Register.
- c) An international arms transfer may also occur without the movement of equipment across State frontiers if a State, or its agent, is granted title and control over the equipment in the territory of the supplier State. Therefore, a transfer of arms to a State would occur when its forces stationed abroad are granted title and control of equipment by the host country or any third State, or when title and control of such equipment are transferred to the host country or any third State. Additionally, if title and control of equipment temporarily stored or pre-positioned on the territory of another State are granted to the host country by the owner, then an international transfer has occurred.
- d) Since the supply of equipment by a State to units of its armed forces stationed abroad does not involve transfer of national title and control, such supply is not considered an international transfer. Equipment of a State can be temporarily stored or pre-positioned on the territory of another State with no transfer of title and control of this equipment. This is not considered an international arms transfer.

2. Pursuant to resolution 47/52 L, Member States were “requested to provide data on an annual basis by 30 April each year in respect of imports into and exports from their territory in the previous calendar year”, with the first such registration taking place by 30 April 1993 in respect of the calendar year 1992. However, the 1997 Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development concluded that the due date for reporting each year should be changed from 30 April to 31 May in order to assist States in the preparation of accurate reports to the Register. To be reported are those transfers considered by States to have been effected during the relevant reporting year, in conformity with their respective national criteria used to define when a transfer becomes effective. The 1997 Group of Experts also concluded that to facilitate the clarity of submissions, Member States should be encouraged to explain their national criteria for defining a transfer in their annual reports. The General Assembly, by its resolution 52/38 R, endorsed those recommendations.



B. Categories of equipment the transfers of which are to be registered

3. Paragraph 2 (a) of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L identifies the following seven categories of equipment on which Member States are requested to supply data to the Register: battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles or missile systems. Based on the reports of the Groups of Experts¹ convened in 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003 and 2006, the categories and their definitions to be used for reporting to the Register are as follows:

I. Battle tanks

Tracked or wheeled self-propelled armoured fighting vehicles with high cross-country mobility and a high-level of self-protection, weighing at least 16.5 metric tons unladen weight, with a high muzzle velocity direct fire main gun of at least 75 millimetres calibre.

II. Armoured combat vehicles

Tracked, semi-tracked or wheeled self-propelled vehicles, with armoured protection and cross-country capability, either: (a) designed and equipped to transport a squad of four or more infantrymen, or (b) armed with an integral or organic weapon of at least 12.5 millimetres calibre or a missile launcher.

III. Large-calibre artillery systems

Guns, howitzers, artillery pieces, combining the characteristics of a gun or a howitzer, mortars or multiple-launch rocket systems, capable of engaging surface targets by delivering primarily indirect fire, with a calibre of 75 millimetres and above.

IV. Combat aircraft

Fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons or other weapons of destruction, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized electronic warfare, suppression of air defence or reconnaissance missions. The term "combat aircraft" does not include primary trainer aircraft, unless designed, equipped or modified as described above.

V. Attack helicopters

Rotary-wing aircraft designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided or unguided anti-armour, air-to-surface, air-to-subsurface, or air-to-air weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized reconnaissance or electronic warfare missions.

VI. Warships

Vessels or submarines armed and equipped for military use with a standard displacement of 500 metric tons or above, and those with a standard displacement of

¹ See A/49/316, A/52/316, A/55/281, A/58/274 and A/61/261.



less than 500 metric tons, equipped for launching missiles with a range of at least 25 kilometres or torpedoes with similar range.

VII. Missiles and missile launchers

(a) Guided or unguided rockets, ballistic or cruise missiles capable of delivering a warhead or weapon of destruction to a range of at least 25 kilometres, and means designed or modified specifically for launching such missiles or rockets, if not covered by categories I through VI. For the purpose of the Register, this sub-category includes remotely piloted vehicles with the characteristics for missiles as defined above but does not include ground-to-air missiles.

(b) Man-Portable Air-Defence Systems (MANPADS).

C. Standardized form for reporting international transfers

4. All Member States are called upon to provide annually for the Register data on the number of items exported and imported in each of the seven categories of equipment defined in paragraph 3 above and for that purpose, to utilize the standardized reporting form of international arms transfers. The form was developed in 1992 by the Panel of Technical Experts. The 1997 Group of Experts recommended that the existing reporting format and explanatory notes continue to be used but amended to reflect the recommendation to nominate a national point of contact to be sent with the annual report; to note the national definitions of a transfer; and to indicate changes in national policies (see Part IV). In addition to the standardized reporting forms, the 2000 Group of Experts recommended an optional simplified format for submitting “nil” returns on exports and imports, which was further refined by the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts (see Part IV).

5. Column A in the form lists the seven categories as defined above. In column B the exporter State(s) (in the import form) and the importer State(s) (in the export form) are to be entered. Column C in the form includes the number of items of equipment the transfer of which was effected during the relevant reporting year. Transfers, as described in paragraphs 1 (a) and (b) to be reported, are those that have been effected during the relevant reporting year.

6. Columns D and E on the form are included to accommodate data on countries which are neither exporter nor importer countries. In the case of an international transfer involving an export of equipment by a State other than the State of origin, the name of the country of origin should be entered in column D. In the case of an international arms transfer involving transport of equipment to an intermediate location, or involving retention of equipment at an intermediate location for the purpose of the integration of equipment of one category within the Register with equipment of another category, the name of the intermediate location should be entered in column E (e.g., the export of missiles to an intermediate location for integration there with a combat aircraft manufactured at the intermediate location, or vice versa).

7. The right hand column on the form entitled “Remarks”, and divided into two parts, “description of item” and “comments on the transfer”, is designed to offer Member States the opportunity to provide additional information on transfers, thus enhancing its qualitative aspects. As the provision for such information might be affected by security and other relevant concerns of Member States, this column should be filled in at Member States discretion; no specific guidelines are prescribed. To aid the understanding of the international transfers reported, Member States may wish to indicate designation, type or model of equipment, or use various descriptive elements contained in the definitions of categories I to VII, which also serve as guides to describe equipment transferred. Member States may also use this column to clarify, for example, that a transfer is of obsolete equipment, the result of production, or for other such explanatory remarks as Member States see fit. The 2003 and



2006 Groups of Experts reaffirmed the view that use of the “Remarks” column helped in understanding the data submitted and added qualitatively to the information in the Register and thus, encouraged States in a position to do so to provide such information.

D. Available background information regarding military holdings, procurement through national production, transfers of small arms and light weapons and relevant policies

8. Pursuant to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L and its annex (paragraph 3(a)), the Register is to include “information provided by Member States on military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies” and for that purpose, Member States are invited to provide such information. Thus, the reporting of the information is voluntary and Member States may submit it in any form they wish. For reporting of transfers of small arms and light weapons, the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts recommended that member States that are in position to do so can report such information on the basis of the standardized reporting forms on international transfers of small arms and light weapons, or any other method they deem appropriate.

E. Operation of the Register

1. Submission of data on transfers

9. In accordance with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 52/38 R entitled “Transparency in armaments”, Member States are called upon to “to provide by 31 May annually the requested data and information for the Register, including nil reports if appropriate, on the basis of resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L and the recommendations contained in the 1997, 2000, 2003 and 2006 reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operations of the Register and its further development”.

10. Data should be submitted on the standardized form for reporting by 31 May annually to the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

11. Member States that do not have anything to report should file a “nil” report, clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the seven categories during the reporting period. The 2000, 2003 and 2006 Expert Groups concluded that such reporting was important in order to provide as complete a picture as possible of the transactions in equipment covered by the Register and to make use of the Register as a confidence-building instrument.

12. The Department for Disarmament Affairs receives and compiles for the Secretary-General’s annual consolidated report the data sheets submitted by Member States and stores the reported data in its computerized database.

2. Submission of available background information

13. Available background information provided, on a voluntary basis, on military holdings and procurement through national production, together with an index of other additional information, are included in the Secretary-General’s annual report. States providing data on military holdings and procurement through national production may request that the data not be published. As recommended by the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts, Member States that are in a position to do so provide data and information on small arms and light weapons transfers to the Register as part of additional background information on the basis of the standardized reporting form on international transfers of small arms and light



weapons, as adopted by the Group, or any other methods they deem appropriate. The above information should be submitted by 31 May of each year. Late submissions would be issued as addendum to the Secretary-General's annual consolidated report to the General Assembly.

14. The Department for Disarmament Affairs maintains in its computerized database the information provided voluntarily, together with a running index of other interrelated information submitted, by country, date and title.

F. Annual consolidated report by the Secretary-General

15. According to paragraph 5 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "the Secretary-General shall provide annually a consolidated report to the General Assembly of the data registered, together with an index of the other interrelated information".

16. The main part of the annual report consists of (a) the compilation of the reports on international transfers submitted by Member States on the standardized reporting form, as they are received by the Secretary-General, (b) an index of the background information submitted by Member States and (c) the data and information on military holdings, production through national procurement and international transfers on small arms and light weapons voluntarily provided by Member States.

G. Access to the Register

17. According to paragraph 4 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, "the

Part II QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Register shall be open for consultation by representatives of Member States at any time".

18. Member States have access to the computerized data contained in the Register of Conventional Arms.

19. The Secretary-General's consolidated annual report to the United Nations General Assembly and available background information submitted by Member States are open to the public.



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Introduction

1. What is the procedure that is followed annually requesting Member States to report to the Register?

At the beginning of each year, the UN Secretariat issues a note verbale based on the relevant General Assembly resolution, which calls upon Member States to provide data and information on international transfers of conventional arms covered by the Register, while inviting them to also report on additional background information. The note verbale is addressed to all the Permanent Missions of Member States based in New York for onward transmittal to national capitals. The note verbale contains an attachment, consisting of the standardized reporting forms on exports and imports, along with an explanatory notes, the simplified “nil” reporting form, and the definition of the seven categories of equipment covered by the Register. Copies of the note verbale and the attachments can also be obtained directly from the Department for Disarmament Affairs.

Basic structure of the Register

2. What type of activities involving conventional arms are to be reported?

General Assembly resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L call upon Member States to provide data annually on the number of items in seven defined categories of conventional arms imported into or exported from their territory. The resolutions also invite Member States to provide available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies. Furthermore, Member States are encouraged to inform the Secretary-General of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures both on authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers.

3. What type of conventional arms is to be reported in the Register?

The Register covers seven categories of conventional arms, namely, battle tanks, armoured combat vehicles, large calibre artillery systems, combat aircraft, attack helicopters, warships, and missiles and missile launchers. The precise definition of those categories is provided in Part I of this publication.

4. What is the exact meaning of “calendar year”?

Each Member State is requested to provide data on an annual basis regarding exports from and/or imports into their territory during the previous calendar year, that is, from January to December of that year. For example, the data on exports and imports submitted to the Register by a Member State by 31 May 2007 would actually contain information for the previous calendar year, which is 2006.

5. Are States requested to report all types of arms transfers, including orders and deliveries?

The Register is intended to include only data on the number of items in the specified categories of equipment imported into and/or exported from the territory of States in the previous calendar year. States are to report only those transfers which they consider to have



been effected during that reporting year, in conformity with the State's national criteria used to determine when a transfer takes effect.

Categories of equipment

6. Will States have to report the transfer of trainer aircraft?

Yes, in the event these trainer aircraft are “designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons, or other weapons of destruction”. Primary trainers with none of the above characteristics should not be reported.

7. How are States to determine which transfers of missiles and missile launchers are to be reported?

If a missile launcher is an integral component of an item of equipment in Categories I to VI, it need not be reported separately in Category VII under “missiles and missile launchers”. Only stand-alone (fixed or mobile) missile launchers are reported separately in Category VII. Missiles, however, are always reported in Category VII regardless of the category of the equipment which launches them. For example, if State A imports 20 Type NEPTUNE missiles: 10 for use by warships, 5 for use by stand-alone missile launchers, and 5 for use by combat aircraft, then all 20 missiles are still reported in Category VII.

8. Sub-category (b) of Category VII deals with Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS). What should be reported under this sub-category?

For reporting purposes MANPADS are broadly defined as surface-to-air missile systems designed to be man-portable and carried and fired by a single individual and; other surface to air missile systems designed to be operated and fired by more than one individual acting as a crew and portable by several individuals. MANPADS should be reported if the MANPAD system is supplied as a complete unit, i.e. the missile and launcher/Grip Stock form an integral unit. In addition, individual launching mechanisms or grip-stocks should also be reported. Individual missiles, not supplied with a launching mechanism or grip stock need not be reported.

9. Under which category would a State report the transfer of one 210 mm multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) with 30 rockets which have a range of 30 kilometres?

The multiple-launch rocket system (MLRS) falls within the definition of Category III under “large calibre artillery systems”. However, the rockets should be reported in Category VII under “missiles and missile launchers”, if they have a range of at least 25 kilometres (see also explanatory notes (d) on the standardized reporting form).

10. Will States consulting the Register be able to determine the numbers of missiles and missile launchers imported or exported by a specific country?

The number listed in Category VII indicates the total number of missiles and missile launchers combined. Therefore it is not possible, using the data in the Register alone, to determine their separate numbers unless the reporting State clarifies this in the optional “Remarks” column of the standardized reporting forms. In the case of MANPADS, however, and recognising their unique status in the Register, there may be an indication of the number of launching mechanisms or grip stocks if they are supplied and reported as separate items.

Example

State F has exported to State K six missile launchers type FLYER and 500 missiles type CATCH-22. The FLYER is a fixed ground-based launcher. The CATCH-22 is a surface-to-surface missile (SSM), has a range of 180 km, and is armed with a conventional warhead. The



examples that follow illustrate how State F might report on that export, at different levels of transparency.

In Version 1 below, State F has aggregated the missile launchers and missiles, and reports 506 items. This version meets the reporting requirement of the Register.

Version 1

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers

(According to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)

Reporting country: F

Calendar year: 2006

A <i>Category (I-VII)</i>	B <i>Final importer State(s)</i>	C <i>Number of items</i>	D <i>State of origin if not exporter</i>	E <i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	REMARKS	
					<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	a) K b)	506				

In Version 2 below, State F has chosen to offer additional data, indicating in column C that the items are broken down into 6 missile launchers and 500 missiles. State F has used the “Remarks” column to identify the type of both the launcher and missile.

Version 2

EXPORTS

Report of international arms transfers

(According to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)

Reporting country: F

Calendar year: 2006

A <i>Category (I-VII)</i>	B <i>Final importer State(s)</i>	C <i>Number of items</i>	D <i>State of origin if not exporter</i>	E <i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	REMARKS	
					<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
VII. Missiles and missile Launchers	a) 1) K b) 2) K	6 506			1) Launcher, Type FLYER 2) Missile, Type CATCH 22	

11. What about missile launchers on warships? Many ships covered by the Register have the capability to mount missile launchers. Should the transfer of this type of missile launcher be entered as a separate transfer under category VII?

No. All missile launchers mounted on all warships covered by the Register are considered to be an integral component of the warship itself and thus are not to be registered as separate transfers of Category VII equipment. However, in reporting on transfers of warships, States may, if they wish to clarify this point, indicate in the “Remarks” column of the form if and how many missile launchers are mounted on the reported warship(s). If, however, a State exports or imports ship-based missile launchers separately from the ship (as is often the case in order to upgrade or modernize ships that are already in the inventory of a navy), these



launchers would not be considered an integral part of the ship and would, thus, be reported under Category VII of the Register.

12. What about fast attack craft with a standard displacement of less than 500 tonnes equipped with missile launchers with a capability of delivering a missile beyond 25 kilometres? Should the launchers be reported under the missile Category VII?

The attack craft should be reported under Category VI warships; the launchers need not be reported.

Example

State B exported to State J in 2006 the last two of an order for eight Hermes Class fast attack craft of 400 metric tonnes displacement. The ships are equipped with two twin missile launchers capable of delivering a missile to a range of 35 kilometres. The stock of missiles per ship has already been supplied with the previous ship deliveries prior to 2006. The ships are also equipped with a 40 mm gun.

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers

(According to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)

Reporting country: B

Calendar year: 2006

A Category (I-VII)	B Final importer State(s)	C Number of items	D State of origin if not exporter	E Intermediate location (if any)	REMARKS	
					Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VI. Warships	J	2			Hermes Class, 400 tonne fast attack craft. See Note 1.	

Note 1: The ships are equipped with two twin missile launchers.

13. In the definition of Category VII, missiles and missile launchers, “ground-to-air missiles” are excluded and are not required to be reported. Does this mean that surface-to-air missiles mounted on ships are not covered by the Register?

“Ground-to-air” refers only to those surface-to-air missiles which are mounted on fixed land sites or on wheeled or tracked mobile launchers. Therefore, surface-to-air missiles mounted on ships are covered by the Register (see also question 10).

14. Are States asked to report the exports or imports of components used in the assembly, co-production or upgrading of items associated with the seven categories covered by the Register?

No. The Register only records transfers of complete equipment, as defined in the seven categories. If a component is imported by a State which then uses this component to produce and export a complete equipment covered by the Register, the equipment should be reported.

15. Equipment is sometimes exported/imported complete but in disassembled components (known as “kits”). Should these be reported to the Register?

Strictly speaking, the imports and exports of these kits need not be reported as a transfer; although States may do so if they wish, making clear that it is a disassembled kit. Another



option is for the importing State to supply background information on the equipment as procurement from national production once the equipment is assembled on its territory.

16. How shall items exported by a State other than the State of origin be reported?

They should be reported on the export form, indicating the state of origin in column D of the standardized form.

17. How should the transfers of equipment to an intermediate location be reported?

If, for example, State A transfers air-to-air missiles to State B for installation on combat aircraft to be exported to State C, State A should report the export of missiles to State C and declare in column E of the form that State B is the intermediate location.

Example

In 2006, State D exported to State C 72 air-to-air missiles (AAM), type GOAL-104A, and 72 air-to-surface missiles (ASM), type STRIKE-S22, both with a range of 36 km. State C installed these missiles on the F-19B multi-role fighter aircraft, and then exported them to State Y in 2006.

Missiles from D to C

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(According to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: D
Calendar year: 2006

A Category (I-VII)	B Final importer State(s)	C Number of items	D State of origin if not exporter	E Intermediate location (if any)	REMARKS	
					Description of item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	a) 1) Y	72		C for re-export to Y		
	b) 2) Y	72				

Missiles from C to Y as part of combat aircraft export

EXPORTS

Reports of international arms transfers
(According to United Nations General Assembly resolution 46/36 L)
Reporting country: C
Calendar year: 2006

A Category (I-VII)	B Final State(s)	C Number of items	D State of origin if not exporter	E Intermediate location (if any)	REMARKS	
					Description of Item	Comments on the transfer
VII. Missiles and missile Launchers	a) 1) Y	72	D		1) AAM, type GOAL-104A 2) ASM, type STRIKE-S22 See Note 1.	
	b) 2) Y	72	D			

Note 1: In this case State C chooses to supply additional data on the equipment in the remarks column.



18. Should the transfer of second-hand equipment be reported?

Yes. All transfers relating to equipment included in the seven categories should be reported regardless of whether it is new or second-hand equipment.

19. Which State is to report the transfer of an item which was co-produced by three countries?

The transfer should be reported by the final exporting State of the complete equipment. Information concerning the co-production of the item could be given in column D and the “Remarks” section of the standardized form.

Defining an international transfer

20. What is the definition of a transfer?

Agreement on a common definition of a transfer is complicated by differing national practices regarding implementation of rules, regulations and procedures for exports and imports. Therefore, the description of a transfer contained in the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts and reaffirmed by subsequent Groups of Governmental Experts remains the guideline for reporting transfers (see A/ 49/316, para. 42). Accordingly, international arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment.

21. Can a transfer of arms occur without the physical movement of equipment across State borders?

Yes. A transfer of arms could occur when title and control of equipment belonging to State A positioned overseas is transferred to the host State (State B); OR title and control over equipment is transferred to another State (State C) but the equipment remains on the host State’s (State B’s) territory. For example, suppose a battalion equipped with battle tanks (Category I) from State A is stationed in State B. When its mission is complete, the Government of State A agrees to sell the tanks to State B. When State B assumes the title and control of the tanks, both States would report this transaction as a transfer covered by the Register. The same reporting rule could apply if the tanks in question had been stored by State A in State B as opposed to being in the hands of an active military force as described above. In these cases the determining factor is title and control, not geographic location, nor whether or not they are under the control of armed forces.

22. Must all equipment covered by the Register which moves across international borders be reported?

No. In the above example, if State A reinforces its battalion by shipping 20 additional tanks of its own, this is not an export (or import) since the shipment does not involve transfer of title or control of the equipment. Similarly, if these 20 tanks are being shipped to State B for the purpose of pre-positioning and remain under the control of State A, they are not reported as an export or import.

23. How is the date of exports or imports determined?

Each State will determine this date based on its national criteria and determine when a transfer becomes effective. States are invited to indicate such national criteria when



submitting their exports and imports data to the Register. However, the precise date of the transfer does not have to be reported; only that it took place within the calendar year in question.

24. What if items covered by the Register are shipped from State A in 2006 but do not arrive at their destination in State B until 2007? In which year are they to be reported?

If the exporting State A maintains title and control over the equipment until it arrives in State B both States A and B will report the transfer as occurring in the year 2007. However, if title and control are assumed by State B in State A's territory prior to shipment both States will report the transfer as occurring in 2006.

Utilization of reporting forms

25. What is the purpose of the national criteria on transfers in the revised format of the reporting forms?

The 1997 Group of Experts concluded that to facilitate the clarity of submissions, Member States should be encouraged to explain their national criteria for defining a transfer in their annual reports. Explanatory note on the back of the standardized reporting forms on export and import under footnote "f" provide a way of indicating the criteria a State uses in determining when a transfer takes effect. Information on criteria can also be provided at the bottom of the reporting forms on export and import under "National criteria on transfers".

26. What is the national point of contact?

The 2003 Group of Governmental Experts concluded that Member States should designate an official point of contact for Governments on matters directly connected with the Register and that details of the contact point should be sent with the annual report on the understanding that this information will be held by the UN Secretariat and provided on request to Governments only. The Secretariat has also been mandated to maintain an updated list of national points of contact and circulate it to all Member States. In this regard, the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts encouraged Member States to provide full contact details of their national point of contact, including fax numbers and e-mail address as far as possible.

27. How is the information on the national point of contact to be provided?

The standardized reporting forms on exports and imports as well as the simplified "nil" reporting form contain a section that invites such information, including contact details.

28. What if a State, using the standardized reporting form, submits data on equipment that does not fall under the definition for the categories? For example, suppose a State reports that it exported 30 ground-to-air missiles (specifically excluded from Category VII) or missiles with a range less than the reporting criteria of at least 25 kilometres.

Data submitted by a State using the format of the standardized form will be entered in the Register as submitted, even if it includes equipment outside the seven categories. However, in reporting it must be made clear that the equipment falls outside the definitions.

29. What if a State, after evaluating its exports and imports of conventional arms, determines that it has none which fit the criteria for reporting?



States in this situation are invited to submit a report to the Register clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the seven categories during the previous year. Indeed, many States that had neither imported nor exported equipment covered by the Register have submitted “nil” reports. The submission of a blank form without any clarification cannot be assumed to be a “nil” report.

30. How is a “nil” report to be submitted?

Member States can enter the word “nil” in the appropriate columns of the standardized reporting forms on export and import, but they are encouraged to use the simplified “nil” reporting form which was recommended by the 2000 Group of Experts (see Part IV). The importance of “nil” reports, where applicable, has also been emphasized by the 2003 and 2006 Groups of Experts, who concluded that “nil” reporting was important as it would enable the Register to provide as complete a picture as possible of the international transfers of arms covered by the Register. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts observed that, for transparency purposes, a “nil” report was as important as a report on actual transfers.

31. Are States requested to submit details on the designation, model or type of the transferred weapons?

The “Remarks” column was designed by the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts to aid the understanding of international transfers by providing the opportunity, if States so wished, to report the designation, type or model of the equipment being transferred. The 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts also recommended that this column could also be used to provide additional clarification of transfers, such as if the equipment were obsolete or the result of co-production. The number of participating States using the “Remarks” column in the reporting format has increased over the thirteen years of reporting. The 2000, 2003 and 2006 Groups of Governmental Experts reaffirmed that the use of the “Remarks” column helped in understanding the data submitted and added qualitative value to the Register’s confidence-building role. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts encouraged States to provide such information for all types of equipment reported.

Reporting of additional background information

32. Are transfers of small arms and light weapons to be reported to the Register?

The 2003 Group of Governmental Experts agreed that interested Member States, if they wish to do so, could include transfers of small arms and light weapons (SALW) in their annual report to the Register, using definitions and reporting methods they deem appropriate, and as part of additional background information. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts further agreed that data on SALW transfers could be provided in accordance with a standardized reporting format on an optional basis.

33. What is meant by the term “available background information”, which is referred to in paragraph 10 of resolution 46/36 L?

Pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 46/36 L and 47/52 L, Member States are invited, pending the expansion of the Register, to submit available background information on military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies during the reporting year. Respectively, such information relates to the number and type of items of equipment in active and reserve units, in storage, etc; the number and type of items of equipment produced within the State; and any information which makes a State’s policies regarding its production, acquisition and transfers of conventional armaments more transparent.

**34. What format should be used for submitting background information?**

Member States may submit background information in any form they deem appropriate, while assigning titles to their submissions.

35. Does the regular General Assembly resolution on “Transparency in armaments” provide any guidance with regard to reporting on procurement through national production and military holdings?

Yes. For example, General Assembly resolution 60/226 invites Member States in a position to do so, pending further development of the Register, to provide additional information on procurement through national production and military holdings and, in this regard, to make use of the “Remarks” column in the standardized reporting form in order to provide further information on types or models of the equipment reported.

36. Can transfers of small arms and light weapons be reported to the Register as part of additional background information?

Yes. The 2003 and 2006 Groups of Governmental Experts agreed that interested Member States, if they wished to do so, could include transfers of small arms and light weapons (SALW) in their annual report to the Register as part of additional background information, using definitions and reporting methods they deem appropriate or on the basis of an optional standardized reporting format, as adopted by the 2006 Group (see Part IV).

37. The General Assembly resolution on “Transparency in Armaments” invites Member States to provide information on SALW transfers. Should this information be provided under the new reporting format?

Yes, wherever that is possible on the understanding that the categories and sub-categories of small arms and light weapons listed in the optional standardized reporting form do not constitute a definition of “Small Arms” or “Light weapons”. The data can also be submitted by Member States using definitions and reporting methods they deem appropriate. The 2003 and 2006 Groups of Governmental Experts recognized that the reporting of SALW presents unique challenges and States should report as and when they are able to do so. They also observed that the capacity of States to report will grow as a function of their implementation of other national, sub-regional, regional and international measures to address the issue of SALW, e.g. under the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

38. What weapons should be reported?

There is no definitive definition of small arms and light weapons and it is for each State to decide what to report according to their own situation. In order to fulfill the purposes of the Register, however, and bearing in mind its focus on military weapons, man-portable weapons made or modified to military specification for use as lethal instruments of war should be reported. With regard to **Small arms**, this can include those weapons intended (i.e. transferred) for use by individual members of armed forces, such as revolvers and self-loading pistols; rifles and carbines; sub-machine guns; assault rifles; and light machine guns. With regard to **Light Weapons**, this can include those weapons intended for use by several members of armed forces serving as a crew, such as heavy machine guns; hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers; portable anti-tank guns; recoilless rifles; portable launchers of anti-tank missile and rocket systems; and mortars of calibres less than 75mm.



Administration of the Register

39. When should the data and information, including background information, be submitted to the United Nations?

States are asked to submit the requested data and information by 31 May annually. For example, data for calendar year 2006 should be submitted by 31 May 2007. Late submissions will be issued as addendums to the Secretary-General's annual report. The data and information submitted will become an integral part of the Register. The returns should be sent to the Department for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Headquarters, Room 3170, New York, NY 10017.

40. What should a State do if, after submitting information for a certain calendar year, it determines that the information was incomplete or contained a technical error?

Returns from previous years show that among the numerous items of data submitted for the Register, a small number of technical errors or omissions have occurred which States have sought to clarify. In such instances, States should provide written information referring to the item in question. There is no cut-off date for such corrections, although they should be submitted as early as possible in order to enable the Secretariat to process them before publication of the annual report of the Secretary-General. Otherwise, corrections would be issued as corrigendum to the Secretary-General's annual report.

41. What happens to the arms transfer data and the background information once they are submitted?

The Department for Disarmament Affairs keeps a file of the data and information in printed form as submitted by Member States and enters the data in a computerized database. Any State may request the data, by disk or printed copy, at any time. The information is made public in the Secretary-General's annual report to the General Assembly, which indexes and reproduces the reports submitted on procurement through national production and military holdings. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts agreed that, starting from calendar year 2006, data submitted on transfers of small arms and light weapons would be reproduced in the Secretary-General's annual report. Information on national policies is only indexed in the annual report, while States providing data on military holdings and procurement through national production may request that the data not be published in the annual report.

42. Will the general public have access to the submitted information?

The Secretary-General's annual report on the Register will be made available to the general public after it is submitted to the General Assembly. Furthermore, as a means of improving access to the Register through the use of modern means of communication, the annual report of the Secretary-General can be accessed through the Internet by visiting the UN home page (<http://www.un.org>) and clicking on "Conventional Arms, Register of" in the Site Index under alphabet C or by directly accessing the home page of the Conventional Arms Branch of the Department for Disarmament Affairs (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>).

43. If a State has a question on the Register and its implementation, how can it contact the Department for Disarmament Affairs in New York?

Through Mr. Nazir Kamal at fax number (212) 963-3689 or at his e-mail address: kamaln@un.org. Submissions by Member States to the Register can also be copied directly to Mr. Kamal.



Part III REPORT OF THE 2006 GROUP OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPERTS



Contents

Foreword by the Secretary-General	21
Letter of transmittal	24
I. Introduction.....	28
A. <i>Establishment of the Register</i>	28
B. <i>Review of the Register</i>	28
II. Review of reports submitted to the Register.....	30
A. <i>General</i>	30
B. <i>Extent of participation</i>	31
C. <i>Reports on exports and imports</i>	32
D. <i>Reports on additional background information</i>	32
E. <i>Assessment of reporting</i>	33
III. Regional aspects.....	35
A. <i>Developments since the last review</i>	35
B. <i>Assessment of the workshop series</i>	38
C. <i>Enhancing implementation at the regional level</i>	38
IV. Operation of the Register	39
A. <i>Reporting methods</i>	39
B. <i>Contacts among Member States</i>	40
C. <i>Access to data and information reported</i>	40
D. <i>Role of the United Nations Secretariat</i>	41
V. Development of the Register.....	41
A. <i>General</i>	41
B. <i>Relevance of the Register</i>	43
C. <i>Categories covered by the Register</i>	43
D. <i>Expansion of the scope of the Register</i>	45
E. <i>Future review of the Register</i>	47
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
A. <i>Conclusions</i>	47
B. <i>Recommendations</i>	49
ANNEXES.....	52
I. <i>Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons (exports)</i>	52
II. <i>Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons (imports)</i>	53
III. <i>List of documents</i>	
54	



Foreword by the Secretary-General

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms plays a valuable role in the world's efforts to discourage the excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms. By building up our knowledge about international transfers of arms, it can help to reduce the risk of misunderstanding or miscalculation. Such transparency, in turn, can help to build confidence and trust, which are essential ingredients in stemming the flow of deadly weapons.

It is therefore gratifying to note that the Register has made significant progress since the last review in 2003, as reflected in the present consensus report by the Group of Governmental Experts. I welcome the important gains being made towards wider participation and greater transparency in the Register. The Group has also put forward a number of recommendations for strengthening the Register further still. In particular, it has agreed on a standardized form for reporting transfers of small arms and light weapons among States, on an optional basis. This marks a step towards overcoming the lack of transparency in that area, and should also help in combating illicit trafficking of those arms.

While the Group was not able to achieve consensus on some other issues, such as technical adjustments to some categories of equipment covered by the Register, it engaged in serious and in-depth discussions on those matters. Indeed, the spirit of commitment and compromise displayed by the Group has created a sound basis for further consensus-building during the next review.

At a time when the international community faces major challenges in pursuing disarmament and upholding the non-proliferation regime, the positive outcome of the Group's deliberations is especially welcome. I thank the members of the Group for their hard work in preparing the present report, which I commend to the General Assembly for its consideration.



Letter of transmittal

28 July 2006

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. The Group was appointed by you in pursuance of paragraph 4 (*b*) of General Assembly resolution 60/226 of 23 December 2005.

Mr. Kofi A. Annan
Secretary-General of the United Nations
New York

The governmental experts appointed were the following:

Mr. Witjaksono Adji (third session)
First Secretary
Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Mohammad Kamran Akhtar
Director (Disarmament)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan
Islamabad

Mr. Hamid Baeidi-Nejad (second and third sessions)
Director of Disarmament and International Security
Department of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic
Republic of Iran
Tehran

Mr. Alon Bar
Director of the Arms Control Department
Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Jerusalem

Dr. Gerardo Bravo (second and third sessions)
Legal Adviser to the Ministry of Defense of Nicaragua
Managua

Mr. Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos Jr.
Second Secretary
Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Matthias Halter
Deputy Head
Arms Control and Disarmament Policy
Federal Department of Defense of Switzerland
Civil Protection and Sports
Bern

Colonel George Igumba (third session)
Military Adviser
Permanent Mission of Uganda to the United Nations
New York

Ms. Onny Kitty Hiltje Jalink
Security Policy Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
The Hague

Commander Franck Le Biannic
Chargé de mission aux affaires internationales
Ministère de la Défense, France
Paris



Mr. Li Song (second and third sessions)
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of People's Republic of China to the
United Nations
New York

Mr. Mauritz Carel Lindeque
Deputy-Director
Biological, Chemical, Missile and Arms Control
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of South Africa
Pretoria

Mr. William Malzahn
Foreign Affairs Officer
Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation
Office of Multilateral Nuclear and Security Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Hiroshi Matsumoto
Senior Research Fellow and Policy Director
Center for the Promotion of Disarmament and Non-
Proliferation
Japan Institute of International Affairs
Tokyo

His Excellency Mr. Roberto García Moritán
Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Argentina
Buenos Aires

Mr. Oleksandr Moskvitin (second and third sessions)
Deputy Director
Arms Control and Military-Technical Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine
Kiev

Mr. Reza Najafi (first session)
Second Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the
United Nations
New York

Mr. Sergey Y. Petlyakov
Chief Counsellor, Department for Security and Disarmament
Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
Moscow

Rear Admiral Willem Rampangilei (first and second
sessions)
Minister Counsellor/Military Adviser
Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Anatoliy Scherba (first session)
Director-General for Arms Control and Military-Technical
Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ukraine



Mr. Coly Seck
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Senegal to the United Nations
New York

Mr. Naveen Srivastava (second and third sessions)
Director
Disarmament and International Security Affairs
Ministry of External Affairs of India
New Delhi

Mr. Andrew Wood
Head of Export Control Policy
Counter-Proliferation and Arms Control
Ministry of Defence of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
London

Mr. Wu Haitao (first session)
Deputy Director-General
Department of Arms Control and Disarmament
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China
Beijing

The report was prepared between February and July 2006, during which the Group held three sessions in New York: the first from 27 February to 3 March, the second from 8 to 12 May, and the third from 17 to 28 July.

The Group was able to reach agreement on some important issues related to the operation and further development of the Register. Although consensus could not be achieved on other issues, the periodic review of the Register provides opportunity for further consensus-building to ensure the continued progress of the Register as a global arms transparency instrument.

The members of the Group wish to express their appreciation for the assistance they received from members of the Secretariat of the United Nations. In particular, they wish to thank Mr. Nazir Kamal, who served as Secretary of the Group; and Ms. Sarah Meek, who served as consultant to the Group. The Group is also grateful to Mr. Nobuaki Tanaka, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for the support received from him.

I have been requested by the Group of Governmental Experts, as its Chairman, to submit to you, on its behalf, the present report which was approved by consensus.

(Signed) Roberto García **Moritán**
Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts
on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms



I. Introduction

A. Establishment of the Register

1. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was established under General Assembly resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, in which the Assembly called upon all Member States to provide data annually on exports and imports of conventional arms in the seven categories covered by the Register and also invited them, pending the expansion of the Register, to provide available background information on their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant policies.

2. General Assembly resolution 46/36 L was preceded by a “Study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms” (A/46/301, annex), undertaken by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General. The report unanimously advocated the establishment of a United Nations Register to promote the objectives of the study.

3. Pursuant to resolution 46/36 L, the Secretary-General convened a panel of technical experts in 1992 to operationalize the Register. Endorsing the report of the Secretary-General containing the recommendations (A/47/342 and Corr.1) of the Panel, the General Assembly, in its resolution 47/52 L of 15 December 1992, called upon all Member States to provide the requested data and information to the Secretary-General annually, beginning in 1993. In its recommendations, the Panel had also proposed that the annual report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the data and information submitted by Member States should be open to the public.

B. Review of the Register

4. In its resolution 46/36 L, the General Assembly called for an initial review in 1994 of the continuing operation of the Register and its further development. The 1992 report of the panel of technical experts also envisaged future reviews to address those issues. As a result, the Register has been periodically reviewed thus far at three-year intervals.

1994 Group of Governmental Experts

5. By its resolution 49/75 C of 15 December 1994, the General Assembly took note of the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the 1994 Group of Governmental Experts (A/49/316), and decided to keep the scope of and participation in the Register under review, requesting Member States to provide the Secretary-General with their views on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development and on transparency measures related to weapons of mass destruction.

1997 Group of Governmental Experts

6. By its resolution 52/38 R of 9 December 1997, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations of the 1997 Group of Governmental Experts (see A/52/316 and Corr.2), which proposed



extending the reporting deadline from 30 April to 31 May, encouraged information on national points of contact and use of the “Remarks” column in the reporting format. It also recommended the inclusion of data provided voluntarily on procurement through national production and military holdings in the annual report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly.

7. The General Assembly also adopted resolution 52/38 B of the same date, in which it requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on enhancing transparency in the fields of weapons of mass destruction and transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons.

2000 Group of Governmental Experts

8. The 2000 Group of Governmental Experts was established under General Assembly resolutions 54/54 O and 54/54 I of 1 December 1999. By its resolution 54/54 O, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development.

9. By its resolution 54/54 I, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report on the early expansion of the scope of the Register and the elaboration of practical means for the development of the Register in order to increase transparency related to weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons.

10. The Group of Governmental Experts recognized the importance of the principle of transparency and its relevance to weapons of mass destruction. Particularly taking into account that the Register covered conventional arms only, however, the Group agreed that the question of transparency in weapons of mass destruction was an issue that should be addressed by the General Assembly.

11. The recommendations of the Group notably included a simplified form for the filing of “nil” returns; updating the United Nations information on the Register; and, with the assistance of interested States, the holding of regional or subregional workshops, seminars and other activities to encourage greater participation in the Register. A feasibility study on the electronic filing of national submissions to the Register was also recommended. By its resolution 55/33 U of 20 November 2000, the General Assembly endorsed the report of the 2000 Group of Governmental Experts (see A/55/281).

2003 Group of Governmental Experts

12. The 2003 Group of Governmental Experts was established by the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 57/75 of 22 November 2002.

13. The Group was able to reach agreement on technical adjustments to two of the seven existing categories of the Register, namely, the inclusion on an exceptional basis of, Man-Portable Air-Defence Systems (MANPADS) in category VII under “missiles and missile-launchers”; and the lowering of the



reporting threshold of large-calibre artillery systems from 100 mm to 75 mm in category III of the Register.

14. The Group also made some progress on international transfers of small arms and light weapons within the Register's framework. It noted that interested Member States in a position to do so, could provide additional information on transfers of small arms and light weapons made or modified to military specification and intended for military use, and recommended that, where national, subregional and regional mechanisms exist, interested Member States could make use of those reporting methods, including definitions of small arms and light weapons, as they deem appropriate.

15. In addition, the Group recommended that the Department for Disarmament Affairs should continue to play a central role in promoting the progress of the Register and the workshop series, initiated after the 2000 review, should be sustained, focusing on regions and subregions that had not yet hosted a workshop, as well as returning to regions and subregions periodically, in order to strengthen the progress of the Register and receive feedback for its further development.

16. The Group concluded that the Register had made significant progress since its inception and that it had entered a period of increased participation. Renewed efforts were now required to ensure reporting on a regular basis and progress towards universal participation, as well as continued attention to its further development and increased relevance.

17. By its resolution 58/54 of 8 December 2003, the General Assembly endorsed the report of the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts (see A/58/274).

2006 Group of Governmental Experts

18. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts was established under General Assembly resolution 60/226 of 23 December 2005, which requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the subject.

II. Review of reports submitted to the Register

A. General

19. For the purpose of analysis, the Group of Governmental Experts had at its disposal the data and information submitted by Governments for the Register for the calendar years 1992-2004 inclusive² as well as tables and graphs compiled by the Department for Disarmament Affairs.³ The Group also had before it the views of Member States on the operation of the Register and its further development, submitted to the Secretary-General. On

² Submissions in 2006 for the calendar year 2005 are still ongoing. The latest completed calendar year is 2004 for which submissions were received in 2005.

³ The tables and graphs can be accessed at <http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>.



the basis of that data and information, the Group reviewed the functioning of the Register with a view to making recommendations for enhancing its operation and further development.

B. Extent of participation

20. Since the inception of the Register, over 90 Governments have submitted reports each year on arms transfers, with the exception of calendar year 1998. The number of submissions for calendar years 2000-2004 increased significantly over all previous years. In 2000 a total of 118 Governments submitted reports on arms transfers, the number increasing to 126 in 2001 and 123 in 2002. In calendar year 2003 and calendar year 2004, 115 and 116 reports were received, respectively. Although the highest number so far was recorded for calendar year 2001, the level of participation continues to remain relatively high. The Group viewed positively the increase in reporting during calendar years 1999-2004.

21. As at 28 July 2006, a total of 170 States have participated in the Register at least once by reporting on international arms transfers and/or by providing additional background information.⁴ During the 13 years of operation of the Register, 142 States have participated three or more times, 101 have participated at least seven times, 50 have participated in all the years, while 25 have never participated.

22. The Group observed that the Register covers the great bulk of the global arms trade in the seven categories of conventional arms, as almost all significant suppliers and recipients of those weapons submit reports regularly. In addition, the Register is able to capture a number of transfers involving non-participating States.

23. Even though some States may not participate in a given year or may have never participated, the Register captures transfers involving many of them. For the latest completed calendar year 2004, 22 countries which had not participated in that year were reported upon by other countries declaring their exports and imports. For calendar year 2003, the number was 23. Previously, for calendar years 2001 and 2002, the additional number of countries captured by the Register was 27 for each year.

24. In other words, although 116 States participated for calendar year 2004 and 115 States participated for calendar year 2003, the Register covered transfers involving a total of 138 States for each year. Of these additional 23 States, more than 10 have never participated in the Register. For calendar year 2001, although 126 States participated, the Register captured transfers involving 153 States. Of the 27 additional States, 15 have never participated in the Register. Similarly, for calendar year 2002, 123 States submitted reports, while the Register captured additional 27 States, including 13 States that have never participated.

25. In noting the increase in “nil” returns in recent years, the Group recognized the continuing importance of reporting “nil” transfers in order to confirm that no transfer had taken place. The

⁴ Includes Cook Islands, the Holy See and Niue (non-Member States).



Group also noted that a substantial percentage of participating States had submitted “nil” reports for each of the 13 years. For calendar year 2004, for example, 64 States submitted “nil” returns out of a total of 116 participating Governments, representing close to 60 per cent of the total.

26. Despite the increase in the submission of “nil” returns, there are still a number of potentially “nil” reporting States that have not yet participated in the Register. Their participation would help to move the Register closer to the goal of universal participation, thereby contributing to the continued progress of the Register.

27. The Group also observed that some “nil” reporting States were not consistent in their participation. For example, 13 States that had participated in calendar year 2003 by submitting a “nil” report but did not participate in calendar year 2004 would most likely have submitted a “nil” return.

28. The level of participation varied from region to region, remaining low in some subregions. The pattern remained broadly consistent in some regions, while it fluctuated in other regions or subregions. Participation by region, based on a United Nations list of regional groups, as well as additional data showing ratios within some geographical regions, can be accessed on the Register website maintained by the Department for Disarmament Affairs (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>).

C. Reports on exports and imports

29. The Group observed that the number of States reporting exports or imports remained relatively stable throughout the period under review, on average recording some 25 and 40 Member States each year, respectively. For calendar year 2004, 28 Member States reported on exports and 41 on imports, compared to 25 and 40 and 26 and 37 for calendar years 2003 and 2002, respectively. The number of States reporting both exports and imports also remained relatively stable, averaging at around 16 each year.

D. Reports on additional background information

30. The number of States reporting procurement through national production and military holdings has varied. So far, the highest number of reports was achieved for calendar year 2000, when 29 and 34 States, respectively, reported on procurement and holdings. For the latest calendar year 2004, a total of 15 and 28 States submitted reports on procurement and holdings, respectively. The number of States submitting “nil” reports on procurement has fluctuated during 2000-2004, with 10 States submitting “nil” reports in 2000 and 2001, 9 in 2002, 7 in 2003 and only 2 in 2004. The number of States providing information in their reports has remained fairly consistent during 2000-2004. A significant majority of those States provided information on the model and type of equipment reported. The Group recognized the importance of “nil” reporting on procurement through national production, as well as the value of providing information on model and type.

31. Many States had reported national policies relevant to the Register only once and thereafter reported only changes or



additions as they occurred. A total of 37 Member States had provided such information, starting with 27 for calendar year 1992 and 5 for calendar year 2004.

32. In terms of voluntary reporting on transfers of small arms and light weapons, a limited number of States have reported such information since the recommendation was made by the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts. For calendar year 2003, five States reported transfers and in calendar year 2004, six States reported such information.

E. Assessment of reporting

33. While appreciating the increase in participation in recent years, the Group noted the importance of continued progress towards the goal of universal participation. Universality of participation would greatly increase the value of the Register as a global confidence-building measure. Furthermore, failure to report by the exporter and importer created uncertainty regarding the accuracy of the reported data.

34. Reporting on a consistent basis was important to consolidate the progress achieved so far in raising the level of participation in recent years and also to provide a basis for analysis of trends over time. In a number of cases, however, participation lacked consistency, which wider participation would help to alleviate.

35. The Group believed that non-participation or inconsistent participation could be attributed to various factors, including political considerations and inadequate institutional capacity. In some cases, States did not possess equipment covered by the Register or engage in transfers of such equipment. In addition, some States may not consider the Register to be sufficiently relevant to their security concerns. The existing scope and parameters of the Register could also be reason for inconsistent or non-participation by some States. In some cases, armed conflicts, severe political crises, or other negative developments in the international and regional security situation could contribute to non-reporting on transfers, as well as non-reporting of additional background information.

36. The Group noted with satisfaction the high incidence of use of the simplified “nil” reporting form, which was recommended by the 2000 Group of Governmental Experts to simplify the procedure for reporting a “nil” return and to encourage participation by “nil” reporting States.

37. Reporting by the 31 May deadline⁵ has varied during the period under review. After achieving a high of 86 submissions for calendar year 2001, the number declined to 43 and 47 for calendar years 2003 and 2004, respectively, but increased significantly to 62 for calendar year 2005. While States may report at any time, prompt reporting enables the consolidated report of the Secretary-General to contain as much data as possible for consideration by the General Assembly at its regular annual session and to make such data publicly available at the earliest opportunity.

38. The Group noted significant variations in participation levels among regions. Changes in regional or subregional security and/or

⁵ The deadline for submission was changed from 30 April to 31 May by the 1997 Group (see para. 6 of the present report).



political situations could play a role in the pattern of reporting from regions in a given year. The long-term trend, however, has been towards higher reporting from all regions, except at some subregional levels.

39. The Group observed that the number of participating States using the “Remarks” column in the reporting form to provide details of equipment transferred, had remained relatively high over the 13 years of reporting. Almost all the 51 States reporting transfers for calendar year 2004 had used the “Remarks” column to provide a description of types and models, though not necessarily for all the categories reported.

40. The use of the “Remarks” column helped in understanding the data provided and in identifying or reducing discrepancies, thereby adding considerable value to the Register. The Group noted that such information on models and types added clarity and quality to reporting.

41. Mismatches continued to occur on transfers reported by exporters and importers, such as the number of items transferred, the date of transfer and the type of equipment transferred.

42. In the absence of a common definition of transfer, different national practices continued to contribute to mismatches in the Register. In this regard, the Group noted that provision of information in the reporting form of national criteria on transfers and consultations among the suppliers and recipients prior to submitting reports would assist in preventing mismatches.

43. With regard to reporting on additional background information, the Group noted that most reports on procurement through national production and military holdings had provided data on the seven categories of the Register and a number of States had reported regularly on background information. The Group noted the variation in reporting on procurement and observed that a decline in “nil” reports mainly accounted for the variation. Only a small number of States had provided additional background information on small arms and light weapons. The Group also noted that the continued dissemination of additional background information, where possible, strengthened the Register’s confidence-building objectives.

44. The Group discussed the impact of adjustments made to categories III and VII, as agreed by the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts, but found that sufficient time had not elapsed to provide a basis for assessment, as data was only available for two calendar years subsequent to those changes. The Group noted that enhancing specific recommendations of the 2003 Group could better assist States in providing information to the Register.

45. On national points of contact, the number of States providing that information as requested in the reporting forms had increased since the last review from 85 to 122, though in some cases the information was incomplete.

46. The Group noted the increased visibility enjoyed by the Register since the last review, as reflected in the following documents: report of the Secretary-General on small arms (S/2005/69); report of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change,



entitled “A more secure world: our shared responsibilities” (A/59/565 and Corr.1); letter from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban to the President of the Security Council (S/2005/83); and report of the Secretary-General entitled “Uniting against terrorism: recommendations for a global counter-terrorism strategy” (A/60/825).

III. Regional aspects

A. Developments since the last review

47. The Group reviewed reporting to the Register across regions and assessed the factors that could contribute to participation levels. While noting variations in reporting at the regional level, it observed that the overall trend indicated a high level of acceptance of and support for the Register.

48. In examining regional variations, the Group noted that the Register’s relevance and its existing scope remained an important consideration for some States, while other factors also affected participation. For example, regional situations in some cases could create limitations. The Group noted that, in view of different security conditions, complementary confidence- and security-building measures and other efforts to enhance security should take account of specific concerns and security perceptions, thereby facilitating greater participation by the regions.

49. With regard to additional background information, the Group noted the factors that may affect reporting on procurement through national production, military holdings and small arms and light weapons, notably security considerations, capacity and, in some cases, the willingness of other States to report additional information.

Africa

50. Overall participation in the Register by African countries has historically been the lowest among the regions. Participation levels have fluctuated, with the highest level of 17 out of 53 States achieved for calendar years 2001 and 2002, and 16 for 2004. While the figure for calendar year 2003 was lower, overall participation since 1999 has risen. The Group also noted reporting by some countries emerging from conflict. Consistency in reporting has also fluctuated. In 2004 a number of States that had reported in prior years, but had not reported in 2003, submitted reports.

51. Participants at the two regional workshops on transparency held in sub-Saharan Africa affirmed the value of the Register, while noting that reasons for non-participation include: their transparency concerns which are primarily related to small arms and light weapons that are not currently included in the seven categories of the Register; national capacity to prepare annual submissions; awareness of the Register, its purpose and reporting requirements; tensions within subregions; and concerns over national security related to transparency measures.

52. The Group noted the relevant achievements that have been made in the subregion since the last review with regard to



enhanced efforts to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. These include: the entry into force of the Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and Other Related Materials, in the Southern African Development Community in 2004; the signing of the Nairobi Protocol for the Prevention, Control and Reduction of Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa in April 2004 and its entry into force in May 2006; and the signing of the Economic Community of West African States Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition, and Other Related Materials on 14 June 2006.

The Americas

53. Overall participation from the Americas has increased since 1998. Generally, participation has increased each year, from a low of 13 States in 1998 to the highest number, 26 States, reporting in calendar year 2001. Consistency in reporting has generally been high, although there are subregional variations.

54. The Group reviewed possible reasons for lower reporting within some subregions and noted that concerns similar to those for the African region, such as national capacity, were applicable.

55. As at 1 June 2006, 11 Organization of American States member States had ratified the Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions, which was adopted in June 1999 and came into force in November 2002.⁶ On 30 November 2006, a meeting of States Parties will be held to begin preparations for the first Conference of States Parties in 2009. In the field of small arms and light weapons, as at 1 June 2006, 26 member States had ratified the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials, which came into force in 1998.

56. In Central America, significant progress has also been achieved since the last review of the Register. In September 2003, the Presidents of Central America adopted a Programme for Arms Limitation and Control for Reaching a Reasonable Balance of Forces and Promoting Stability, Mutual Confidence, and Transparency in Central America. Their Joint Declaration called upon all Central American States to urgently implement the Regional Balance of Forces programme and instructed the Central American Security Commission to prepare an implementation and follow-up schedule. The Central American Integration System has also adopted a Code of Conduct of the Central American States on the Transfer of Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials.

Asia and the Pacific

57. In the region of Asia and the Pacific, reporting increased significantly between 1999 and 2000. Since then, an average level of 31 reporting States has been maintained each year. The highest level of participation was for calendar year 2003, when 33 States

⁶ For more details, see A/58/274, para. 55; see also <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/fs/2002/9259.htm>.



reported. Among those States reporting to the Register, consistency remains high.

58. As with other regions, levels of participation varied by subregion. Participation has remained low in Western Asia. The Group noted that participation was affected by security concerns and threat perceptions, as well as national capacity that impacted on transparency and confidence-building efforts.

59. Since the last review of the Register, the United States of America, Japan, China and others have engaged in consultations to achieve regional progress on arms transparency, particularly in relation to the United Nations Register. Such efforts to facilitate the continued progress of the Register are ongoing.

Europe

60. Participation by the European States remains the highest among regions of the world. In calendar year 2004, 21 of 22 States in Eastern Europe reported, while in 2002, universal participation occurred in the East European subregion. Consistency in reporting among States in Europe also remains notably high, with only five States not reporting annually since 2001.

61. In September 2003, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) organized a workshop to promote awareness of practical questions concerning confidence- and security-building measures, the information exchange regime and its principles regarding transparency on military-related issues. In February 2005, OSCE held a conference on the Treaty on Open Skies to review all aspects of treaty implementation and to discuss the Treaty's continued relevance for promoting security and stability through openness and transparency. In May 2004, OSCE decided to adopt the principles developed under the Wassenaar Arrangement to tighten controls over the export of MANPADS with a view to reducing the risk of terrorism involving such weapons. The 55-member body agreed to incorporate those principles into their national practices and regulations. In February 2006, OSCE held a high-level seminar to promote greater transparency and openness by moving forward its dialogue on military doctrines.

B. Assessment of the workshop series

62. The Group reviewed the three regional workshops held since 2003. These included two held in Nairobi in 2004 and 2005, respectively, and one in Fiji in 2004. The latter was held in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme. The Group noted that in the view of all of the workshop participants, the Register remained a valuable instrument for confidence-building and that, in this regard, the Register would benefit from increased participation by States. The Group also noted the concerns raised by some States related to reasons for not reporting, as well as the observation that small arms and light weapons were of special relevance for Africa but such weapons had not been duly taken into account in the Register.

63. The Group endorsed the view of workshop participants that the workshop forum provided a valuable opportunity for Member States to raise awareness about the Register, which could enhance



participation in the Register, and that such a forum also provided an important platform for informal consultations among the delegates, the Secretariat and the sponsoring Governments.

C. Enhancing implementation at the regional level

64. The Group expressed the view that measures to enhance regional and subregional reporting must be sustained, complementing broader efforts towards greater openness, confidence-building and transparency in the regions, including through the adoption of legally binding instruments, as appropriate. The Group recognized the security concerns of States in some regions and welcomed efforts within regions to exchange views on transparency issues, expressing the hope that these would enhance the development of the Register and increase regional reporting. The Group noted that in cooperation with the United Nations, regional and subregional organizations, where appropriate, could play an important role in such efforts.

65. The Group reaffirmed the importance of regional and subregional workshops, as well as discussions and presentations on the Register at other meetings, as important measures to promote participation and receive feedback for the Register's further development.

66. The Group believed that efforts at raising awareness should be focused, in particular, in those regions where consistency in reporting was less and where the scope to enhance participation could be greater. The Group noted that technical assistance with the preparation of annual returns, at the request of States, could benefit some States in certain regions. Such technical assistance could form part of the workshop or be undertaken on an ad hoc basis upon request. The Group also noted with gratitude the efforts of some States through multilateral, regional, subregional or bilateral efforts to promote the Register, for example, through sponsoring and hosting workshops and supporting the production of publications by the Secretariat on the Register.

67. The Group reinforced the need to use opportunities that existed for greater partnership within the United Nations system to promote the Register. The Group also observed the value of strengthening relationships with relevant regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations and, in that regard, noted the Secretariat's cooperation with some of them.

68. In addition, the Group encouraged Member States to include the United Nations Register in relevant workshops or other meetings organized by them on disarmament-related matters.

IV. Operation of the Register

A. Reporting methods

69. The Group of Governmental Experts noted that the simplified reporting form was used widely by States submitting a "nil" return. The Group also expressed satisfaction with the use of the "Remarks" column in the standardized reporting form, which increased the value of information provided on arms transfers,



thereby further strengthening the confidence-building role of the Register.

70. The Group observed that the reporting method for declaring export and/or imports by participating States lacked uniformity. Of the 51 States that reported transfers for the calendar year 2004, 29 did not use the amended standardized forms. The standardized reporting forms were amended in 2003 to include MANPADS as a subcategory (b) under category VII.⁷ A broadly similar pattern can be discerned for the calendar year 2005, for which submissions have not been completed.

71. The Group noted that a number of States continued to provide additional background information on a voluntary basis, in addition to their submissions on arms transfers. States provided information on procurement through national production and military holdings using different reporting formats. A limited number of States also provided information on transfers of small arms and light weapons, using their own reporting methods.

72. With regard to reporting on procurement and/or holdings, the Group noted that only 5 of 29 States used the relevant columns of the “standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms” when providing such information, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 58/54. Of these five, three replaced “subcategory (b)” of category VII with “MANPADS”, when reporting transfers of MANPADS.

73. The precise definition of “international arms transfer” varies among States. In this regard, the Group observed that of the 51 States that reported transfers for the calendar year 2004, 29 did not use the standardized forms which include an endnote for “National criteria on transfer”. A broadly similar pattern seems to be emerging for the calendar year 2005, for which submissions have not been completed. For the purposes of information, clarification and confirmation, the Group noted the value of providing information on national criteria on transfer, as requested in the standardized reporting form.

B. Contacts among Member States

74. Particularly in view of variations in the national definition of transfer, the Group reaffirmed the importance of direct bilateral contact between States as an important means to avoid and/or resolve possible discrepancies in the data submitted by exporters and importers, as well as other issues relevant to the Register. In that regard, the Group acknowledged the value of appointing a national point of contact, as requested in the standardized reporting forms of the Register. Such points of contact also serve as an efficient channel of communication between national capitals and the Secretariat to facilitate and expedite the submission of reports for the Register and address related matters.

75. The Group observed that good progress had been made by States since the last review in providing information on national points of contact. So far, 122 States have provided information,

⁷ The forms are also accessible in the official languages of the United Nations on the website of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, <http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>.



although a number of them have yet to provide fax numbers and/or e-mail addresses, while some have not provided any information on contact details. The Group recognized the importance for Member States to provide up-to-date information on national points of contact to the Secretariat.

C. Access to data and information reported

76. The Group emphasized that easy and reliable access to data and information submitted by States to the United Nations Register played an important factor in enhancing the value of the Register as a confidence-building tool. The Group discussed ways of further strengthening the utility of the website as a means of accessing information on the Register, including electronic filing of returns and enhancing the role of its database.

77. The Group noted with satisfaction the role of the Secretariat in increasing awareness and familiarity among States about the Register. The Secretariat maintains on its website a wide range of documents directly related to the Register and the subject of arms transparency, including the annual consolidated reports of the Secretary-General, the reports of the groups of governmental experts and the standardized reporting forms. The Secretariat has prepared and actively disseminated documents on the Register, including the updated *Information Booklet* on the Register in English, French and Spanish as well as a publication highlighting the recommendations of the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts. The Secretariat also maintains a document on its website entitled "Questions and Answers", which is designed to provide easy access to States on guidelines in preparing their annual submissions to the Register. In addition, the Secretariat circulates information papers, containing tables and graphs, on the progress of the Register to the delegations during the annual session of the First Committee and, as appropriate, provides information to relevant United Nations Security Council sanctions committees.

78. The Group noted the increased number of States providing an electronic version of their hard-copy annual reports to the Register and encouraged this trend, as it expedited the compilation of data and information submitted to the Secretariat.

79. The Group examined a report prepared by the Department for Disarmament Affairs in response to a request by the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts for a feasibility study on electronic filing of reports to the Register by Member States, and noted that an electronic data submission system can be developed, utilizing the existing resources and expertise within the Department.

D. Role of the United Nations Secretariat

80. The Group commended the active role played by the Secretariat in promoting the Register and facilitating its progress, including efforts to raise extrabudgetary support and assistance to organize regional and subregional workshops as well as its efforts to brief regional organizations on the progress of the Register. In that regard it noted the cooperation between the United Nations



and regional and subregional organizations and the potential for cooperation with relevant research institutes, as appropriate.

81. The Group appreciated the work of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in enhancing awareness of the operation and procedures of the Register as well as encouraging timely submission of reports. The Group also noted with appreciation the Department's efforts to produce and disseminate useful and educative information material related to the Register and for regularly upgrading and updating the Register website, assisting States with technical queries, and in highlighting the Register both within and outside the United Nations system.

82. The Group reaffirmed the central role of the Secretariat in facilitating the continued progress of the Register, which should be one of the primary missions of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. In this regard, the Group reiterated that the mandated tasks related to the Register require strong and sustained support by the United Nations system, including adequate financial and personnel resources.

V. Development of the Register

A. General

83. The General Assembly, by paragraph 8 of its resolution 46/36 L, *inter alia*, initiated the process, through a panel of experts, to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production. The 1992 Panel proposed an indicative list of equipment for future consideration, which subsequent groups of governmental experts in 1994, 1997 and 2000 discussed without any agreement being reached.

84. The 2003 Group of Governmental Experts, however, reached agreement on technical adjustments to category III of the Register by lowering the reporting threshold for large-calibre artillery systems from 100 mm to 75 mm and by including MANPADS as a subcategory in category VII. The Group also agreed to allow for additional voluntary background information on the transfer of small arms and light weapons. Those recommendations were adopted by the General Assembly at its fifty-eighth session (see resolution 58/54).

85. The 2006 Group of Governmental Experts examined in detail the question of additional technical adjustments to the seven categories of equipment covered by the Register and the expansion of its scope. The Group took into account recent observations of the Secretary-General on the Register, as well as other references made to it in various United Nations documents. The Group also took note of the views expressed by some Member States on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, as well as on transparency measures related to weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 58/54 and paragraph 4 (a) of resolution 60/226.

86. The Group noted the original purpose of the Register, which was to avoid excessive and destabilizing arms build-ups that would pose a threat to national, regional and international peace



and security, particularly by aggravating tensions and conflict situations, and also that increased transparency in the international arms trade would enhance confidence, promote stability, help States to exercise restraint, ease tensions and strengthen regional and international peace and security. In this regard, the Group also noted that there was a need for a balanced approach in enhancing the relevance of the Register while pursuing the goal of universal participation.

87. The Group engaged in a substantive discussion of the Register's further development. In this regard, the Group observed that a flexible approach, which would take into account the different priorities, regional contexts, capacities of Member States and the effect this could have on participation, would be the best way forward.

88. The Group examined the concepts of force projection and force multiplier capabilities owing to technological and doctrinal developments affecting the conduct of modern warfare during the years of operation of the Register. The Group recognized the different levels of development in the field of military technologies and doctrines of various States and the conceptual differences among them with regard to whether such systems should fall within the scope of the Register's seven categories. The issues were discussed without prejudice to the differing views of States with regard to the offensive-defensive nature of the weapon systems. The Group also examined the question of whether adjustments of this type would affect the focus of the Register and participation.

B. Relevance of the Register

89. The Group undertook wide-ranging and in-depth discussions on the relevance of the Register at the global, regional and subregional levels. The Group observed that relatively high reporting levels indicated that the Register is viewed at the global level as an important transparency and confidence-building instrument.

90. The Group noted, however, that the Register's existing scope was perceived to be more relevant to the security concerns of States in some regions than in other regions. The Group also noted that the Register's traditional focus on conventional weapons to conduct large-scale offensive operations failed to adequately address the small arms and light weapons of particular concern in some regions and subregions, which rendered the Register less relevant to those particular regions.

91. The Group believed that in considering adjustments to the Register's categories and its existing scope, it was important to take into account security and capacity concerns, as well as the effect these could have on the level of participation in the Register.

C. Categories covered by the Register

92. On the question of adjustments and expansion of the Register's scope, the discussions of the Group benefited from contributions by all its members, including discussion papers on a



broad range of issues and proposals for possible options, as well as background documentation for consideration by the Group. With regard to technical adjustments to the existing seven categories of conventional arms covered by the Register, the Group discussed comprehensively technological developments and other related issues pertaining to each category.

Category I

Battle tanks

93. The Group noted the trend towards lighter, more mobile and deployable tanks, potentially with a smaller gun to offset the lighter weight. With regard to the existing definition of battle tanks, the Group concluded that it provided adequate coverage and, since all tanks were covered either by category I or II, no further specification was necessary.

Category II

Armoured combat vehicles

94. The Group discussed technological advances in this category since the Register's establishment, the implications for transparency and the problems of distinguishing specific military capabilities from those which have civilian applications. The Group also discussed trends towards smaller armoured combat vehicles carrying fewer than four troops and weaponry less than 12.5 mm for reconnaissance. During the discussion, the Group considered proposals for possible inclusion, in particular armoured vehicles designed for bridge-laying as well as vehicles designed for reconnaissance and electronic warfare. The Group also discussed clarifying elements in the existing definition of this category for reporting purposes.

Category III

Large-calibre artillery systems

95. The Group recalled the reduction of the reporting threshold in this category from 100 mm to 75 mm, as agreed by the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts, and discussed the question of further reduction, in particular lowering the reporting threshold to 50 mm, including how definitions of artillery systems and light weapons might be affected as a result of such a change, as well as whether such a reduction could be achieved within the existing title and definition of this category, or if it was appropriate to change the existing title and definition. In addition, the Group discussed small arms and light weapons in the context of this category, as well as gun tractors specifically designed for towing artillery.

Category IV

Combat aircraft

96. The Group considered adjustments to this category, including force projection capabilities, such as aircraft designed to perform military transport and airdrop missions, as well as air-to-air refuelling. The Group also examined whether the reference to "versions of combat aircraft" in the existing definition covered all military aircraft that performed reconnaissance missions. In

⁷ Discussion on this issue also took place in the context of category VII.



addition, the Group discussed intensively developments in unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the observation that category IV already covered those unmanned platforms that were versions of combat aircraft or that otherwise fell within the existing definition but not specially designed UAVs. The Group also discussed whether other types of UAVs, for example those designed for reconnaissance, should be covered by the Register as well as their relevance to the Register.⁷

Category V

Attack helicopters

97. In parallel with discussions on UAVs under category IV, the Group also discussed these issues in the context of category V. The Group also discussed the possible inclusion of helicopters that performed airdrop missions and troop transport roles. The Group also examined the question of including systems that performed combat support functions, such as mine-laying missions and communication and command of troops.

Category VI

Warships

98. The discussion on technical adjustments to warships focused on lowering the tonnage of surface vessels and submarines to 500 metric tons. The Group also discussed other reporting thresholds such as 150 metric tons for surface vessels and 50 metric tons for submarines or the option of removing the range limits for missiles and torpedoes. The question was raised whether vessels that would be covered by the proposed reduction in tonnage should be regarded as being offensive or defensive in nature. During the discussion, the Group noted that the geographical and maritime context varied among States, and for a number of States with certain types of coastal boundaries, surface vessels of smaller tonnage were more relevant than larger warships, such as blue-water vessels.

Category VII

Missiles and missile launchers

99. The Group discussed technological developments regarding missiles and missile launchers, including the issue of whether some types of UAVs could be included within the existing definition of category VII. The Group noted the inclusion of MANPADS as an exception, as recommended by the 2003 Group. The Group also discussed a proposal for the inclusion of surface-to-air missiles in the context of this category.

D. Expansion of the scope of the Register

100. The Group discussed the question of treating procurement through national production on the same basis as reporting on the export and/or import of arms. The Group noted that information on procurement through national production could make transparency in arms acquisition more comprehensive and balanced. The Group also noted in this regard that a limited number of States were producers of the major conventional weapons covered by the Register and a number of those producers reported procurement through national production annually. The



Group welcomed such voluntary reporting, while recognizing that security concerns, among others, could make it difficult for some States to provide such information.

101. The Group also discussed retaining the current status of reporting on procurement through national production, as part of additional background information, while enabling interested States that wished to do so to provide such information on the basis of the seven categories for reporting arms transfers. It also noted the importance, in the context of reporting transfers and providing additional background information, of including information on the model and type of equipment reported.

102. The Group considered the significance of reporting on military holdings, while recognizing the sensitivities related to reporting such information. The Group welcomed such voluntary reporting, noting that the same concerns applicable to reporting on procurement through national production, such as security concerns, could affect decisions of whether to report such information.

103. With regard to reporting transfers of small arms and light weapons (SALW), the Group took note of the agreement of the 2003 Group on adjustments to category III to incorporate specific types of light weapons by lowering the reporting threshold for artillery systems to 75 mm calibre. The Group also noted that there was no transparency instrument covering international transfers of SALW between States, although those transfers were believed to comprise a significant portion of the global trade in conventional weapons.

104. The Group discussed introducing an eighth category in the Register for reporting SALW transfers on an optional basis, recognizing that some States might not be in a position to report for various reasons. The Group also discussed retaining the current status of reporting on SALW transfers, as part of additional background information, while providing, for interested States that were in a position to do so, the option of reporting on the basis of a standardized form. In this regard, the Group noted that, so far, the limited number of States providing such data to the Register had used different methods for reporting SALW transfers.

105. The Group also discussed a number of additional conventional military capabilities that contribute to the operational effectiveness of conventional arms under the existing scope of the Register, particularly related to categories II, IV, V and VI. In particular, the Group discussed troop transportation roles under categories IV and V and the inclusion of such capabilities within the scope of the Register or as additional background information in national reports.

106. In the discussions on modifications to the existing categories, the Group noted that States wishing to go beyond the existing definitions and report on military equipment with additional capabilities, were not prohibited from doing so. It was a State's sovereign decision as to what to report to the Register. States going beyond the existing definitions, however, were encouraged to utilize the "Remarks" column to provide model/type information on the item being transferred so as to avoid diluting the effectiveness and the relevance of the information being reported.

107. With regard to weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, the Group recalled the position stated in paragraph 90 of the report of the 2000 Group of Governmental Experts on this matter (A/55/281), as follows:

The Group recognized the importance of the principle of transparency and its relevance to weapons of mass destruction. In its consideration of proposals to add a new category to include such weapons, the Group reviewed the nature of the Register, regional security concerns and existing international legal instruments concerning the subject matter, as well as General Assembly resolution 46/36 L. In view of all these factors, particularly taking into account that the Register covered conventional arms only, the Group agreed that the question of transparency in weapons of mass destruction was an issue that should be addressed by the General Assembly.

E. Review of the Register

108. The Group emphasized the importance of conducting periodic reviews of the Register in order to ensure the continued progress in its operation and further development. Such a process would help to achieve universal participation and enhance the Register's relevance and effectiveness as a confidence-building instrument in a changing technological environment. In that context, it recognized the value of holding regional workshops and seminars, organized to promote the Register, as a means of receiving feedback on the Register, as well as receiving input from meetings at relevant regional and international organizations.

VI. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Conclusions

109. The Group concluded that significant progress had been made towards achieving a relatively high level of participation annually in the United Nations Register. It was important, however, to make continued progress towards the goal of universal participation in order to enhance the effectiveness of the Register as a global confidence-building instrument.

110. The Group also concluded that transfers involving only States Members of the United Nations should be reported to the Register.

111. The Group believed that efforts should continue to be made to achieve more consistent participation by States and to encourage non-participating States to join the Register. Such efforts should include workshops, increased cooperation between the United Nations Secretariat and relevant regional/subregional organizations, as well as outreach activities by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, including its regional centres.

112. The Group noted that regional and subregional efforts to achieve greater openness, confidence and transparency, including through legally binding instruments as appropriate, would facilitate the progress of the Register towards universal

participation, as well as strengthen the prospects for its further development. The Group also noted the value of including sessions on the Register in the agenda of relevant meetings of regional and subregional organizations, other groups of Member States as well as organs/agencies of the United Nations system.

113. The Group also recognized the need to provide the Department for Disarmament Affairs with adequate assistance and support to organize workshops and to carry out other outreach activities to promote the Register. It welcomed the provision of direct support to the Secretariat through in kind contributions or financial contributions to the appropriate trust fund. It also recognized that Member States could provide bilateral assistance to other Member States to support initiatives related to the Register.

114. In addition to increasing participation in the Register, efforts should continue to be made to strengthen the scope of the Register. In this regard, the Group noted that a flexible approach, as discussed in chapter V, would help to optimize progress towards achieving those mutually reinforcing objectives.

115. The Group encouraged Member States that were in a position to do so to provide additional background information, pending further development of the Register.

116. The Group expressed satisfaction with the progress made by States in the use of the optional “Remarks” column in the standardized reporting form, as its use enhanced the quality of information provided on international arms transfers. The Group encouraged the use of the “Remarks” column, including information on model and type, for all equipment reported to the Register.

117. The Group reaffirmed the importance of encouraging all States to report regularly and in a timely manner to the Register, including using the simplified “nil” reporting form, where appropriate, to confirm that no international transfer had taken place in a given calendar year. In terms of transparency, a “nil” report is as important as a report on actual transfers.

118. The Group encouraged States to report by the 31 May deadline as far as possible in order to facilitate the early compilation of data and information. The Secretariat should continue its practice of circulating, under cover of a note verbale, the reporting forms to Member States at the beginning of each year, as well as subsequent reminders, to help facilitate timely submissions. The Secretariat should also send the note verbale and attachments by electronic means to national points of contact.

119. The Group expressed satisfaction with the progress made in providing details of national points of contact for the use of the Secretariat and for onward dissemination to Member States. Such information facilitated accurate and efficient reporting by allowing for corroboration of the data submitted as well as providing a means for clarification between suppliers and recipient States. The Group encouraged greater progress as in some cases contact details provided were incomplete, while no contact information was provided in other cases. The Group identified electronic mail as a particularly useful means of communication and encouraged States to provide that contact information in particular.



120. The Group also noted with satisfaction the improvements made in the Register website of the Department for Disarmament Affairs with a view to providing easy access to the data and information provided by Member States as well as other documents related to the Register and transparency in armaments. The Group noted its technical and operational limitations and emphasized the need for a technological updating to make it more useful and user-friendly.

121. The Group concluded that the Department for Disarmament Affairs should continue to actively support and promote the United Nations Register as one of its primary missions. In that connection, the Group recognized the need to strengthen the Department for Disarmament Affairs to enable it to fulfil its mandated responsibilities in the area of arms transparency.

122. In order to facilitate universal participation and further development of the Register, the Group concluded that the review process, initiated at the time of the establishment of the Register, should be continued. Such a review process is essential to furthering consensus-building and ensuring the continued progress of the Register.

B. Recommendations

123. After extensive and in-depth discussions on the question of technical adjustments to the seven categories of the Register, as well as other possible changes to its existing scope, the Group arrived at the following decisions.

124. The Group recommends that the definition of category VI, “Warships” be amended to reflect the lowering of the tonnage of vessels from 750 metric tons to 500 metric tons. The definition should read as follows:

VI. Warships

Vessels or submarines armed and equipped for military use with a standard displacement of 500 metric tons or above, and those with a standard displacement of less than 500 metric tons, equipped for launching missiles with a range of at least 25 kilometres or torpedoes with similar range.

125. The Group recommends that Member States that are in a position to do so provide data and information on small arms and light weapons transfers to the Register as part of additional background information on the basis of the standardized reporting form on international transfers of small arms and light weapons (see annexes I and II to the present report), as adopted by the Group, or any other methods they deem appropriate.

126. In addition, and also taking into account the recommendations contained in the report of the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts (A/58/274), the Group recommends the following:

(a) Transfers involving only States Members of the United Nations should be reported to the United Nations Register;



(b) Member States should participate in the United Nations Register in order to achieve the shared goals of this global transparency mechanism, including universal participation;

(c) Member States should enhance awareness of the Register and the importance of participating on a regular basis;

(d) Member States should submit “nil” reports to confirm that they do not have any international transfer to declare. Member States in a position to do so are encouraged to make use of the “Remarks” column in the standardized reporting form to furnish additional data on models or types. They are also encouraged to provide data on additional background information;

(e) Member States should report promptly in order to help to ensure the early dissemination of data and information submitted to the Register and in that connection should use the standardized reporting form provided annually in the note verbale;

(f) Member States should continue to provide details of their national point of contact in the standardized reporting forms when submitting their annual report to the Register and ensure that this information is up-to-date when submitting annual reports to the Register;

(g) The Secretariat should maintain an updated list of national points of contact and request such information, where required, in order to keep its record up-to-date and circulate it to all Member States;

(h) The Secretariat should continue to make all possible efforts to promote the Register as a confidence-building measure;

(i) The Secretariat should continue to strengthen the role of the regional centres of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in facilitating the progress of the Register at the regional level;

(j) The workshop series should be sustained with a view to encouraging greater participation as well as obtaining feedback from regions/subregions on the operation and further development of the Register;

(k) The Secretariat, with the support and assistance of interested Member States, should continue to strengthen cooperation within the United Nations and with relevant international, regional and subregional organizations with a view to promoting the Register and its role as a confidence-building measure;

(l) The Department for Disarmament Affairs should overhaul the Register database on its website with a view to making it more user-friendly and up-to-date technologically;

(m) Since the resources of the Secretariat devoted to operating and managing the United Nations Register are also utilized for implementing other departmental responsibilities, including operating and maintaining the standardized United Nations instrument for reporting military expenditures, it should consider providing adequate resources, including a full-time General Service staff for data inputting and other support services on a regular basis;



(n) The Department should conduct a pilot project with the support of interested Member States to test the feasibility of electronic filing of reports to the Register in order to determine the practical requirements for making such a facility available to Member States;

(o) Member States should consider providing support and assistance to the Secretariat in carrying out the recommendations addressed to it, including the holding of workshops and seminars to advance the objectives of the Register;

(p) Member States should consider providing direct bilateral support to those States undertaking Register-related activities;

(q) Member States should also consider including the subject of the United Nations Register in workshops and other relevant meetings organized by them in the disarmament field.

127. The Secretariat should continue to undertake the following activities:

(a) Update the *Information Booklet* on the United Nations Register and distribute it to all Member States as well as relevant regional organizations, and make the *Information Booklet* available on the Register website, both as a hypertext linked series of pages and as a downloadable document;

(b) Send a note verbale, with the reporting forms and the categories of equipment covered by the Register, to Member States by the beginning of each year as well as follow-up reminders, including electronic reminders to national points of contact, where appropriate;

(c) Ensure that all information relating to the Register is electronically available as soon as possible;

(d) Provide the General Assembly with the annual consolidated report of data and information on international arms transfers submitted by Member States, as well as the voluntary submission of data and information on procurement through national production and military holdings, as well as small arms and light weapons transfers, together with an index of other additional background information;

(e) Ensure that all basic data and information relevant to the Register are available electronically in all official languages of the United Nations;

(f) Develop and expand the Register website, including establishing links with other relevant organizations/institutions;

(g) Facilitate informal meetings, such as briefings by the Secretariat, on the progress of the Register on the sidelines of the meetings of the First Committee and other relevant occasions;

(h) Encourage and facilitate the inclusion of sessions on the Register in the agenda of relevant meetings of regional and subregional organizations, other groupings of Member States as well as organs/agencies of the United Nations system.

**Annex I****Information on international transfers of
small arms and light weapons^{a,b} (exports)****Exports**

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact _____
(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)
(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A		B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
		<i>Final importer State(s)</i>	<i>Number of items</i>	<i>State of origin (if not exporter)</i>	<i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
SMALL ARMS							
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols						
2.	Rifles and carbines						
3.	Sub-machine guns						
4.	Assault rifles						
5.	Light machine guns						
6.	Others						
LIGHT WEAPONS							
1.	Heavy machine guns						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns						
4.	Recoilless rifles						
5.	Portable anti-tank missile launchers and rocket systems						
6.	Mortars of calibres less than 75 mm						
7.	Others						

National criteria on transfers:

^a The standardized forms provide options for reporting only aggregate quantities under the generic categories of "Small arms" and "Light weapons" and/or under their respective subcategories. See the United Nations Information Booklet 2006 (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>) for questions and answers regarding the reporting of small arms and light weapons.

^b The categories provided in the reporting form do not constitute a definition of "Small arms" and "Light weapons".

**Annex II****Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons^{a,b} (imports)****Imports**

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact: _____

(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)

(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A		B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
		<i>Exporter State(s)</i>	<i>Number of items</i>	<i>State of origin (if not exporter)</i>	<i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
SMALL ARMS							
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols						
2.	Rifles and carbines						
3.	Sub-machine guns						
4.	Assault rifles						
5.	Light machine guns						
6.	Others						
LIGHT WEAPONS							
1.	Heavy machine guns						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns						
4.	Recoilless rifles						
5.	Portable anti-tank missile launchers and rocket systems						
6.	Mortars of calibres less than 75 mm						
7.	Others						

National criteria on transfers:

^a The standardized forms provide options for reporting only aggregate quantities under the generic categories of “Small arms” and “Light weapons” and/or under their respective subcategories. See the United Nations Information Booklet 2006 (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>) for questions and answers regarding the reporting of small arms and light weapons.

^b The categories provided in the reporting form do not constitute a definition of “Small arms” and “Light weapons”.

Annex III

List of documents

Tables and graphs

- Global participation table/graph
- Regional participation tables/graph
- Subregional participation table/graph
- Regional reporting ratios table
- Reporting of transfer/"nil"
- Reporting of exports/imports
- Reporting on additional background information
- Submission by 31 May deadline
- Procurement through national production, 2000-2004
- Military holdings, 2000-2004
- Use of the "Remarks" column
- Frequency of reporting
- Non-participating States captured in the reports by participating States, 2002-2004
- Register data on transfers category I-VII, 2002-2004
- Regional breakdown of United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database (Comtrade) on small arms and light weapons (SALW)
- United Nations Comtrade: top 20 exporters and importers of SALW in 2004
- Exports and imports reported to United Nations Comtrade on SALW
- Regional participation in the Register, 1992-2004

Reports of the Group of Governmental Experts on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

- Report of the Secretary-General of 13 August 2003 transmitting the report of the 2003 Group (A/58/274)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 9 August 2000 transmitting the report of the 2000 Group (A/55/281)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 29 August 1997 transmitting the report of the 1997 Group (A/52/316 and Corr.2)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 22 September 1994 transmitting the report of the 1994 Group (A/49/316)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 14 August 1992 transmitting the report of the 1992 Panel of Governmental Technical Experts (A/47/342 and Corr.1)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 9 September 1991 transmitting the study on ways and means of promoting transparency in international transfers of conventional arms (A/46/301)



Relevant resolutions of the General Assembly

- Resolution 60/226 of 23 December 2005
- Resolution 58/54 of 8 December 2003
- Resolution 57/75 of 22 November 2002
- Resolutions 54/54 I and O of 1 December 1999
- Resolutions 52/38 B and R of 9 December 1997
- Resolution 49/75 C of 15 December 1994
- Resolution 46/36 L of 6 December 1991

Other relevant documents

- Note verbale and attachments (DDA/39-2006/TIA)
- *2004 Information Booklet* on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms
- Report of the Secretary-General on small arms of 7 February 2005 (S/2005/69)
- Note by the Secretary-General of 2 December 2004 transmitting the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, entitled “A more secure world: our shared responsibilities” (A/59/565 and Corr.1)
- Report of the Secretary-General of 27 April 2006 entitled “Uniting against terrorism: recommendations for a global counter-terrorism strategy” (A/60/825)
- Letter dated 15 February 2005 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2005/83)

Regional agreements

- Southern African Development Community Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and Other Related Materials, 2004
- Nairobi Protocol for the Prevention, Control and Reduction of Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region and the Horn of Africa, April 2004
- Economic Community of West African States Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition, and Other Related Materials, 14 June 2006
- Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions, adopted June 1999
- Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials, came into force 1998
- Programme for Arms Limitation and Control for Reaching a Reasonable Balance of Forces and Promoting Stability, Mutual Confidence, and Transparency in Central America, adopted September 2003
- Central American Integration System Code of Conduct of the Central American States on the Transfer of Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials, 2005



- Treaty on Open Skies, entered in force 2002
- Wassenaar Arrangement: Elements for Export Controls of Man-Portable Air-Defence Systems (MANPADS)
- Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE): Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons, 2000
- OSCE, Vienna Document, 1999
- Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (adapted), 1999
- OSCE, Principles governing conventional arms transfers, 1993

Others

- Transparency in armaments (2006 edition) (non-paper by expert from the United Kingdom)
 - Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) data on MANPADS
 - SIPRI data on warships
 - SIPRI data on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) International transfers/licensed production
-



Part IV REPORTING FORMS FOR THE REGISTER



Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (exports)^a

EXPORTS

Report of international conventional arms transfers
(according to United Nations General Assembly resolutions 46/36 L and 58/54)

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact: _____

(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)

(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A	B	C	D ^b	E ^b	REMARKS ^c	
<i>Category (I-VII)</i>	<i>Final importer State(s)</i>	<i>Number of items</i>	<i>State of origin (if not exporter)</i>	<i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
I. Battle tanks						
II. Armoured combat vehicles						
III. Large-calibre artillery systems						
IV. Combat aircraft						
V. Attack helicopters						
VI. Warships						
VII. Missiles and a) missile launchers^d b)						

National criteria on transfers:

^{a b c d} See explanatory notes.

The nature of information provided should be indicated in accordance with explanatory notes e and f.



Standardized form for reporting international transfers of conventional arms (imports)^a

IMPORTS

Report of international conventional arms transfers

(according to United Nations General Assembly resolutions 46/36 L and 58/54)

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact: _____

(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)

(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A	B	C	D ^b	E ^b	REMARKS ^c	
Category (I-VII)	Exporter State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle tanks						
II. Armoured combat vehicles						
III. Large-calibre artillery systems						
IV. Combat aircraft						
V. Attack helicopters						
VI. Warships						
VII. Missiles and a) missile launchers ^d b)						

National criteria on transfers:

^{a b c d} See explanatory notes.

The nature of information provided should be indicated in accordance with explanatory notes e and f.

Explanatory Notes

(a) Member States that do not have anything to report should file a "nil report" clearly stating that no exports or imports have taken place in any of the categories during the reporting period.

(b) International arms transfers involve, in addition to the physical movement of equipment into or from national territory, the transfer of title to and control over the equipment. Member States are invited to provide with their return a concise explanation of national criteria used to determine when an arms transfer becomes effective. (See paragraph 42 of the annex to document A/49/316.)

(c) In the "Remarks" column Member States may wish to describe the item transferred by entering the designation, type, model or any other information considered relevant. Member States may also wish to use the "Remarks" column to explain or clarify aspects relevant to the transfer.

(d) Multiple-launch rocket systems are covered by the definition of category III. Rockets qualifying for registration are covered under category VII. MANPADS should be reported if the MANPAD system is supplied as a complete unit, i.e. the missile and launcher/Grip Stock form an integral unit. In addition, individual launching mechanisms or grip-stocks should also be reported. Individual missiles, not supplied with a launching mechanism or grip stock need not be reported.

(e) Check any of the following provided as part of your submission:

Check

- | | |
|---|---|
| (i) Annual report on exports of arms | — |
| (ii) Annual report on imports of arms | — |
| (iii) Available background information on military holdings | — |
| (iv) Available background information on procurement through national production | — |
| (v) Available background information on relevant policies and/or national legislation | — |
| (vi) Other (please describe) | — |

(f) When reporting transfers, which of the following criteria, drawn from paragraph 42 of the annex to document A/49/316, were used:

- | | |
|--|---|
| (i) Departure of equipment from the exporter's territory | — |
| (ii) Arrival of equipment in the importer's territory | — |
| (iii) Transfer of title | — |
| (iv) Transfer of control | — |
| (v) Others (please provide brief description below) | — |



UNITED NATIONS
REGISTER OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS

**SIMPLIFIED FORM FOR SUBMITTING “NIL” RETURNS
ON EXPORTS AND IMPORTS ⁸**

The Government of , in reference to General Assembly resolution of , confirms that it has neither exported nor imported any equipment in the seven categories of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms for the calendar year , and therefore submits a “nil” return.

National point of contact
(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY):

(Organization, Divison/Section,

Telephone, Fax, E-mail)

⁸The simplified form for reporting “nil” returns was recommended by the 2000 Group of Governmental Experts and endorsed by General Assembly resolution 55/33 U of 20 November 2000. Inclusion of information on national points of contact was recommended by the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts and endorsed by General Assembly resolution 58/54 of 8 December 2003.



Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons^{a,b} (exports)

Exports

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact _____
(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)
(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A		B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
		<i>Final importer State(s)</i>	<i>Number of items</i>	<i>State of origin (if not exporter)</i>	<i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
SMALL ARMS							
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols						
2.	Rifles and carbines						
3.	Sub-machine guns						
4.	Assault rifles						
5.	Light machine guns						
6.	Others						
LIGHT WEAPONS							
1.	Heavy machine guns						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns						
4.	Recoilless rifles						
5.	Portable anti-tank missile launchers and rocket systems						
6.	Mortars of calibres less than 75 mm						
7.	Others						

National criteria on transfers:

^a The standardized forms provide options for reporting only aggregate quantities under the generic categories of "Small arms" and "Light weapons" and/or under their respective subcategories. See the United Nations Information Booklet 2007 (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>) for questions and answers regarding the reporting of small arms and light weapons.

^b The categories provided in the reporting form do not constitute a definition of "Small arms" and "Light weapons".





Information on international transfers of small arms and light weapons^{a,b} (imports)

Imports

Reporting country: _____

National point of contact: _____

(Organization, Division/Section, telephone, fax, e-mail)
(FOR GOVERNMENTAL USE ONLY)

Calendar year: _____

A		B	C	D	E	REMARKS	
		<i>Exporter State(s)</i>	<i>Number of items</i>	<i>State of origin (if not exporter)</i>	<i>Intermediate location (if any)</i>	<i>Description of item</i>	<i>Comments on the transfer</i>
SMALL ARMS							
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols						
2.	Rifles and carbines						
3.	Sub-machine guns						
4.	Assault rifles						
5.	Light machine guns						
6.	Others						
LIGHT WEAPONS							
1.	Heavy machine guns						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns						
4.	Recoilless rifles						
5.	Portable anti-tank missile launchers and rocket systems						
6.	Mortars of calibres less than 75 mm						
7.	Others						

National criteria on transfers:

^a The standardized forms provide options for reporting only aggregate quantities under the generic categories of “Small arms” and “Light weapons” and/or under their respective subcategories. See the United Nations Information Booklet 2007 (<http://disarmament.un.org/cab/register.html>) for questions and answers regarding the reporting of small arms and light weapons.

^b The categories provided in the reporting form do not constitute a definition of “Small arms” and “Light weapons”.



United Nations
Register of Conventional Arms

*Information Booklet
2007*



Produced for the United Nations
Department for Disarmament Affairs
With the assistance of the Government of the United Kingdom