

29 April 2011

Original: English

**Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts
on the Implementation of the Programme of
Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the
Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons
in All Its Aspects**

New York, 9-13 May 2011

Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons

**Thematic discussion papers submitted by the Chair of the
Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts**

Introduction

Under the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, adopted in 2001, Member States meet every two years for a biennial meeting of States or a review conference. In 2009, States decided to convene, in addition, an Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts to address key implementation challenges and opportunities in the United Nations small arms process. After broad-based consultations, marking, record-keeping and cooperation in tracing in accordance with the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons (“International Tracing Instrument”) were identified as the core themes for the Meeting of Governmental Experts.

The International Tracing Instrument, adopted by the General Assembly in 2005, was developed on the basis of the 2001 Programme of Action. The Instrument is discussed in the framework of Programme of Action meetings and applies to all Member States.

The discussion papers below are intended to assist Member States in their preparations for and to support deliberations during the meeting. Each of the six following papers relates to one of the key themes outlined in the provisional agenda: (a) marking; (b) record-keeping; (c) cooperation in tracing; (d) national frameworks; (e) regional cooperation; and (f) international assistance and capacity-building. The papers recall States’ commitments under each theme, and suggest relevant



processes, practices and tools for implementation. An additional set of questions highlights areas which could possibly guide discussion.

The paper on international assistance and capacity-building addresses that theme in detail and in a systematic manner. Each paper proposes an illustrative list of those capacity-building areas which may benefit future implementation. One element warrants particular attention, however: marking, record-keeping and tracing are highly interdependent in nature. Successful cooperation in tracing depends on adequate and proper marking and record-keeping as indispensable prerequisites.

In addition, a self-assessment tool is attached (see annex) to assist those States that wish to carry out voluntary self-assessments of their implementation of the International Tracing Instrument in advance of the meeting.

The Meeting of Governmental Experts is the first of its kind in the small arms process, and could be seen as a contribution to the preparatory process for the 2012 Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action. These papers are proposed solely to inspire discussion and to support States' sharing of information, experiences, lessons learned, good practices and challenges and opportunities, with the goal of supporting enhanced national and regional implementation.

The International Tracing Instrument builds on the 2001 Programme of Action and the legally binding Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, of 2001, to which not all Member States are party. The Firearms Protocol outlines a number of requirements and measures regarding the marking, record-keeping and tracing of firearms from a law-enforcement perspective. In the preamble of the International Tracing Instrument, States recognized the complementary nature of these two instruments.

Other meeting documents and background information are available at www.poa-iss.org/MGE.

1. Marking

1.1. Relevant requirements

The International Tracing Instrument prescribes the content of small arm/light weapon markings at the time of manufacture, specifying that they must be unique and allow all States to readily identify the country of manufacture (para. 8 (a)). Commitments relating to post-manufacture marking include the marking of Government armed and security force stockpiles (para. 8 (d)) and the marking of all illicit small arms and light weapons found on national territory (para. 9). The Instrument also emphasizes the importance of import marking, noting that it is a requirement for States parties to the Firearms Protocol (International Tracing Instrument, para. 8 (b); Firearms Protocol, art. 8, para. 1 (b)). While the International Tracing Instrument leaves the choice of marking methods (stamping, engraving, etc.) to national discretion, it prescribes the physical characteristics of weapons markings (para. 7), as well as their placement (para. 10). Complementing these provisions, both the Programme of Action and the Firearms Protocol include measures to prevent the possession of, and trade in, unmarked or inadequately marked small arms and light weapons (Programme of Action), para. II.8; Firearms Protocol, art. 5).

1.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

Marking at the time of manufacture

- National practices
- Industry practices
- Methods, tools, techniques, technology
- Marking in accordance with requirements under the International Tracing Instrument (e.g., marking contents, placement of marking)

Marking at time of import

- National practices
- Practices of private arms dealers, where applicable
- Methods, tools, techniques, technology
- The added value of import marking

Marking of governmental stocks

- National practices
- Methods, tools, techniques, technology

Measures to prevent the removal or alteration of markings

Marking of illicit small arms and light weapons found on national territory

1.3. Questions for consideration on these practices, processes and tools

1. Can you share insights on specific challenges and opportunities or provide examples of good practice in the area of weapons marking, e.g., on:

- Developing, establishing or reviewing relevant legislation?
- Marking at time of manufacture, marking at time of import, marking of governmental stocks?
- Prevention of removal or alteration of markings?
- Marking of illicit small arms and light weapons found on your State territory?
- Any other relevant issue?

2. Marking requirements. What markings are required on small arms and light weapons in your country? Which are most important in practice? Are current marking requirements suitable/adequate?

3. Marking methods. What are the relative merits of the various marking methods available (e.g., engraving, stamping, pin-stamping, laser marking), and what experience have States had in using these? Which techniques are desirable in which situation (e.g., cost-effective)?

4. Marking practices. What benefits can be derived from the sharing of national marking practices, e.g., in national reports? How could the sharing of information on national marking practices be enhanced or facilitated (e.g., establishment of a database on marking practices)?

5. Craft production. Is craft production regulated in your country, and thus considered legal, or is it illegal? Should those weapons be marked in an effort to legalize them or not?

6. Import marking. Are weapons marked at the time of import, and if so, how significant has this been for the effectiveness of systems for tracing small arms? What is the role of national authorities, private arms dealers and, possibly, other stakeholders in marking at time of import? Which technical and technological challenges may be encountered and how could these be overcome (e.g., through capacity-building and training)?

Capacity-building needs (illustrative list)

- Marking equipment, technology and other operational requirements for marking
- Training of officials and technical assistance

2. Record-keeping

2.1. Relevant requirements

The record-keeping provisions of the International Tracing Instrument are framed in broad terms, reflecting the fact that constitutional differences between States may dictate different structures and methods of record-keeping. The objectives are clear, however: the establishment and maintenance of accurate and comprehensive records necessary for tracing (para. 11). More specifically, United Nations Member States have undertaken, to the extent possible, to keep records pertaining to marked small arms and light weapons indefinitely. In any case, they have agreed to maintain manufacturing records for at least 30 years and all other records, including records of import and export, for at least 20 years. The Instrument thus extends the Firearms Protocol's 10-year minimum for the maintenance of firearm records, although the latter, in contrast to the International Tracing Instrument, encourages States to also keep records of firearm parts, components and ammunition (art. 7).

2.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

- National practices
- Industry practices
- Methods, processes, tools, techniques and technology for record-keeping (databases, registers, information/data storage, back-up, retrieval, and other relevant practices)
- Manual and electronic record-keeping
- Managing the transition from manual to electronic record-keeping

2.3. Questions for consideration on these processes, practices and tools

1. Can you share insights on specific challenges and opportunities or provide examples of good practice in the area of record-keeping, including, e.g.:
 - Developing, establishing or reviewing relevant legislation?
 - Technical or technological aspects (e.g., record-keeping software, access to relevant databases)?
 - Manual and/or electronic record-keeping practices and tools?
 - Managing the transition from manual to electronic record-keeping?
2. What practical requirements are there for successful record-keeping (e.g., weapons marking and identification)?
3. Data recording/databases. Are record-keeping data (e.g., serial number, placement, weapons type and model) accurately and consistently recorded? Can relevant data be easily retrieved? Are the databases used by different Government agencies and/or private arms dealers compatible? Are these databases used,

reviewed, updated and checked for accuracy in a satisfactory way? How does information-sharing on data records function?

4. Duration of records. How long are records kept? Has this proved sufficient in practice?

5. Private sector records. What records are manufacturers and private arms dealers required to maintain? How are these records transferred to national authorities upon closure of an arms production business?

Capacity-building needs (illustrative list)

- Hardware, software, technical and technological requirements for electronic record-keeping
- Training of Government officials in record-keeping methods
- Transition from manual to electronic record-keeping

3. Cooperation in tracing

3.1. Relevant requirements

Building upon both the Programme of Action and the Firearms Protocol, the International Tracing Instrument establishes a relatively detailed set of rules governing the issuance of and response to a tracing request. The Instrument underlines the need for sufficient information in any tracing request, including markings, type and calibre, as well as the intended use of the information being sought (para. 17). States receiving a tracing request are to acknowledge receipt within a reasonable time (para. 19). They also undertake to provide all available information sought by the requesting State relevant for the purpose of tracing (para. 20). Any delay or restriction in the content of their response, or refusal to respond, must fall within the scope of the exceptions set out in paragraph 22 and be explained (para. 23). As with record-keeping, Member States retain the choice of tracing system, yet commit themselves to ensuring they are capable of undertaking traces and responding to tracing requests in accordance with Instrument requirements (para. 14).

3.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

Essential elements in tracing cooperation

Institutional aspects of tracing cooperation

- The role of points of contact
- Nominating a national point of contact
- Information-sharing processes and provision of information as part of the tracing request
- Processing a tracing request: effective coordination and cooperation at the technical and political levels, including among law enforcement officials (customs, police, border control, military and others)
- Information-sharing with non-governmental actors: access to information held by industry and private arms dealers and regulations to this effect

Delays faced in receiving responses to tracing requests: causes, solutions

Confidentiality aspects

Processes, tools and resources that facilitate tracing cooperation

- Harnessing the role and operational tools of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL)
- Role of the United Nations in facilitating tracing cooperation

3.3. Questions for consideration on these processes, practices and tools

1. Can you share insights on specific challenges and opportunities or provide examples of good practice in the area of tracing cooperation, including, e.g.:

- Proper identification of weapons
 - Access to relevant operational tools (e.g., the INTERPOL Firearms Reference Table)
 - Establishing tracing procedures
 - Failed or delayed tracing requests (e.g., difficulties in initiating a request, lack of response, delay in response, difficulties encountered in the information-sharing cycle)
2. Has your Government issued any tracing requests recently? If so, what responses were received? Did these requests ultimately produce the information sought by your Government?
3. Has your Government received any tracing requests recently? If so, was your Government able to provide the information requested? What obstacles are commonly encountered in providing timely and accurate responses to such requests and how could these be overcome?
4. How important is accurate weapons identification to successful tracing cooperation? What challenges are encountered in this regard, and how can these be addressed?
5. What procedures must be in place at the national level to facilitate effective tracing cooperation? How can coordination and cooperation among Government officials at the technical and political levels be further strengthened, including through access to relevant databases? How can information-sharing with private entities (industry, private arms dealers) be further enhanced? How can specific requests be effectively managed and tracked?
6. Tracing tools. What tools are available to facilitate tracing (including at the international, regional and bilateral levels)? What use is currently being made of these? Are there specific obstacles to making greater use of these tools (e.g., access, lack of software and training) and how could these be overcome?

Capacity-building requirements (illustrative list)

- Awareness of and access to relevant operational tools
- Technical assistance needs (hardware, software)
- Training for law enforcement officials on access to and use of operational tools
- Training on weapons identification

4. National frameworks

4.1. Legislative and regulatory requirements

Member States have undertaken to put in place, where they do not exist, the laws, regulations and administrative procedures needed to ensure the effective implementation of the International Tracing Instrument (para. 24). Associated commitments include the designation of one or more national points of contact for purposes of tracing and broader aspects of implementation, including the exchange of information on national implementation (para. 25).

4.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

National legislation, policies and administrative rules and regulations

Effective information-sharing processes and coordination at the national level (see also "Cooperation in tracing")

- Nominating a point of contact
- The role of the point of contact in national coordination
- Coordination among Government agencies

Processes, tools and resources that facilitate tracing cooperation at the national level

- National action plans and national coordinating bodies

Exchange of information on national implementation

- National reports
- Exchange of information on national points of contact
- Exchange of information on national marking, record-keeping and tracing practices

4.3. Questions for consideration on these processes, practices and tools

1. Can you share insights on specific challenges and opportunities or provide examples of good practice in national implementation of the International Tracing Instrument, including, e.g.:

- Developing, implementing or reviewing relevant legislation, policies, administrative rules and regulations?
- Establishing and making use of relevant national coordinating bodies and/or a national action plan?
- Effective information-sharing processes and coordination processes at the national level, including among Government agencies and between Government and private entities?
- Nominating and making use of a point of contact?

2. Aspects related to legislative requirements:
 - What relevant tools have been developed by international and regional organizations (e.g., model legislation, legislative guides)? What use has been made of these by your Government or in your region, and with what results?
 - Where applicable, what challenges are involved in implementing the legislative requirements of both the International Tracing Instrument and the Firearms Protocol?
3. Exchange of information on national implementation:
 - What role should national reporting play in monitoring and sharing information on national implementation and indicating priorities for assistance? How could national reports better contribute in this regard?
 - Would electronic reporting make the preparation of national reports easier?¹
 - What roles can designated national points of contact play in international cooperation on these issues? What use is currently being made of them? How could their role be strengthened? What challenges exist (e.g., number of designations, insufficient or inaccurate contact information) and how could these be overcome?

Capacity-building requirements (illustrative list)

- Legislative assistance needs
- Training and technical assistance to enhance information-sharing processes and Government coordination

¹ See www.poa-iss.org/reporting.

5. Regional cooperation

5.1. Relevant requirements

The International Tracing Instrument encourages cooperation at the regional level to support the effective implementation of the Instrument (para. 26). The Programme of Action similarly emphasizes regional cooperation for tracing purposes, including the strengthening of information exchange mechanisms (para. III.11).

5.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

Regional mechanisms and instruments

- Specific requirements of regional instruments, both legally and politically binding (marking, record-keeping, tracing and related aspects, such as cooperation, assistance and capacity-building)
- Regional mechanisms for facilitating implementation of the provisions of the Instrument

Information exchange at the regional level

- Cooperative arrangements, standard operating procedures

Facilitating capacity-building through regional mechanisms: challenges and opportunities

- The role of regional mechanisms in facilitating the articulation of capacity-building needs and coordination of technical assistance

External actors at the regional level

- Presence of international organizations (e.g., INTERPOL, regional United Nations centres/offices)

Capacity-building requirements (illustrative list)

- Legislative assistance needs
- Technical assistance (e.g., provision of marking machines, hardware, software) and training of officials

5.3. Questions for consideration on these processes, practices and tools

1. Can you share insights on specific challenges and opportunities and/or provide examples of good practice on marking, record-keeping and cooperation in tracing at the regional level? Which reflect gaps in implementation?

2. Are there challenges regarding provisions of the International Tracing Instrument and those of relevant regional instruments? How do international and regional commitments complement each other?

3. What roles do regional and subregional organizations have in each region regarding implementation of the Instrument?
4. Specific challenges at the regional level. What challenges are specific to some regions (e.g., craft production) and how can regions share experiences in this regard?
5. What examples of good practices of successful implementation initiatives developed in one region could be shared with other regions (e.g., training, standard operating procedures, assistance packages, strengthening capacity through technical assistance such as record-keeping software or marking machines)?
6. What processes, practices and tools exist at the regional level to facilitate capacity-building and technical assistance? What role and contribution can international organizations make at the regional level?

Relevant regional instruments and mechanisms (illustrative list)

- Andean Community
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations
- Caribbean Community
- Economic Community of Central African States
- Economic Community of West African States, Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials
- Nairobi Protocol, Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Great Lakes Region, the Horn of Africa and Bordering States
- Organization of American States
- Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
- United Nations regional centres for disarmament
- Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and Other Related Materials in the Southern African Development Community Region, Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization
- Central American Integration System
- Pacific Islands Forum

6. International assistance and capacity-building

6.1. Relevant requirements

The International Tracing Instrument underlines the importance of international cooperation and assistance for its effective implementation (paras. 26-29). States are encouraged to provide technical, financial and other assistance in building national capacity for marking, record-keeping and tracing, and to examine — and facilitate the transfer of — technologies for the improved tracing and detection of illicit small arms and light weapons (paras. 27 and 28). Cooperation with the United Nations (information exchange) and INTERPOL (operational aspects) is also emphasized (paras. 30-35).

6.2. Discussing implementation: processes, practices, tools

Among the processes, practices and tools Member States may wish to discuss are the following:

Enhancing effectiveness in assistance and capacity-building

- Identifying capacity-building needs and setting priorities
- Monitoring and evaluating progress and assessing effectiveness of national implementation

Institutional aspects

- National action plans and national coordinating bodies
- National points of contact

Other actors in assistance and capacity-building

- INTERPOL
- United Nations
- Other international organizations
- Regional organizations
- Industry
- Civil society

Matching capacity-building needs with available resources

- Assistance needs elicited from national reports (www.poa-iss.org/MGE/Documents/Index/Assistance-Proposals-BMS4-2010.pdf)
- Reporting template
- Programme of Action Implementation Support System (PoA-ISS): www.poa-iss.org
- Regional mechanisms

6.3. Questions for consideration on these processes, practices and tools

1. (If applicable) How does your Government go about seeking international assistance? What mechanisms (e.g., national reports, PoA-ISS, regional processes, bilateral discussions) are used to communicate needs, and which have proved most useful?
2. (If applicable) Is your Government active in providing capacity-building assistance (e.g. technical assistance, technology transfer, training)? How does it go about setting priorities and identifying international and national partners?
3. How can the effectiveness of international assistance and capacity-building be enhanced? What processes, practices and tools are available to facilitate the identification of needs and the setting of priorities in assistance and capacity-building? How can the effectiveness and impact of capacity-building initiatives be better monitored and assessed?
4. What are the implications of the interdependence of marking, record-keeping and tracing systems for the effective delivery of international assistance and capacity-building?
5. What tools and mechanisms are available at the international and regional levels to facilitate international assistance and capacity-building? What use is currently being made of these tools, and how can access to and the effective utilization of the tools be further enhanced?
 - The added value of needs identification in national reports
 - Enhancing the use of the Programme of Action Implementation Support System as a tool for matching needs and resources
 - INTERPOL tools
 - Self-assessment tools
 - Bilateral and multilateral arrangements
6. What are the main gaps at present in assistance and capacity-building, e.g., technical assistance or training, for effective marking, record-keeping and tracing?

Capacity-building requirements (illustrative list)

- Marking
- Record-keeping
- Weapons identification
- Cooperation in tracing, including technical and technological capacity (e.g., provision of equipment), access to relevant operational tools and/or training for officials
- National frameworks, establishing tracing procedures, national action plans, national coordinating bodies
- Legislation
- Strengthening capacities of law enforcement agencies, e.g., police, customs, border management

Annex

Self-assessment tool based on electronic reporting template

The following questions, based on the reporting template prepared by the Office for Disarmament Affairs, are intended as a tool for States' voluntary self-assessment of the status of national implementation of the International Tracing Instrument. As the reporting template integrates questions on the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the International Tracing Instrument, the questions set out below focus on the essential elements of marking, record-keeping, cooperation in tracing and relevant issues regarding the national framework, regional cooperation and international assistance and capacity-building.

Self-assessment in preparation for the Meeting of Governmental Experts is intended not to duplicate the national reports for 2012, but to serve as an additional tool to facilitate preparation at the national level.

1. Marking

- Does your country require that small arms and light weapons be marked at the time of manufacture? What information is included?
 - Name of the manufacturer
 - Country of manufacture
 - Serial number
 - Year of manufacture
 - Weapon type/brand/model
 - Calibre
 - Other
 - What parts of the small arms and light weapons are marked?
- Are there any exceptions to the requirement to mark small arms and light weapons at the time of manufacture?
- Does your country require that small arms and light weapons be marked at the time of import?
- If so, please specify:
 - Who is required to mark the small arms and light weapons?
 - What information is included in the marking on import?
 - o Country of import
 - o Year of import
 - o Other
 - Are there exceptions to the requirement to mark imported small arms and light weapons?

- Does your country enforce measures to prevent the manufacture, stockpiling, transfer and possession of any unmarked or inadequately marked small arms and light weapons?
- Does your country take measures to ensure that all small arms and light weapons in the possession of Government armed and security forces for their own use are duly marked?
- When Government stocks are transferred to civilians or private companies in your territory, are such stocks marked prior to transfer?
- Does your country encourage manufacturers of small arms and light weapons to develop measures against the removal or alteration of markings?

2. Record-keeping

- Does your country require that manufacturers keep records of weapons manufactured?
- What information must be recorded?
 - Quantity of small arms and light weapons manufactured
 - Type or model of small arms and light weapons manufactured
 - Markings applied to manufactured small arms and light weapons
 - Transactions (e.g., sales of manufactured and marked small arms and light weapons)
 - Identity of buyers
 - Other
- How long must manufacturing records be kept?
 - Indefinitely
 - 30 years
 - Other
- Does your country require that exporters and importers of small arms and light weapons keep records of weapons exported or imported?
- What information must be recorded?
 - Quantity of small arms and light weapons traded
 - Type or model of small arms and light weapons traded
 - Markings appearing on transferred small arms and light weapons
 - Transactions
 - o Identity of buyer/seller
 - o Country the small arms and light weapons are to be delivered to or purchased from
 - o Date of delivery
 - Other

- How long must records be kept?
 - Indefinitely
 - 20 years
 - Other
- Does your country have standards and procedures related to keeping records for all marked small arms and light weapons in its territory?
- If so, what records relating to small arms and light weapons are kept by the State (e.g., manufacturing, brokering, import and export licences granted, sales to other States, small arms and light weapons held by State agencies such as the armed forces, etc.)?
- If so, how long does the State/Government keep such records?
- In the event they go out of business, are companies engaged in small arms and light weapons business (e.g., manufacturing, importing, exporting, etc.) required to submit their records to the Government?

3. Cooperation in tracing

- Does your country have procedures in place to trace small arms and light weapons?
- Has your country ever issued an international tracing request regarding small arms and light weapons?
- Which Government agency is responsible for initiating a tracing request to another country?
- What information does the designated agency include in a tracing request?
 - Circumstances under which the small arms and light weapons were found
 - Reasons why the small arms and light weapons are considered to be illegal or illicit
 - The intended use of the information being sought
 - Any markings on the small arms and light weapons
 - Type/calibre of small arms and light weapons
 - Other
- When receiving information related to small arms and light weapons as a result of your country's tracing request, does your country have procedures in place to ensure that all restrictions placed on its use are respected and the confidentiality of such information guaranteed?
- Which Government agency is responsible for responding to a tracing request from another country?
- Has your country ever received a tracing request? If so, does your country have quantitative data available on tracing activities (e.g., number of tracing requests initiated or responded to in a given period)? If so, have such quantitative data been shared with other States or a regional or international organization?

- Has your country ever delayed, restricted or refused tracing requests? If so, on what grounds?
 - Release of the information would compromise ongoing criminal investigations
 - Release of the information would violate legislation providing for the protection of confidential information
 - Requesting State cannot guarantee the confidentiality of the information
 - Reasons of national security consistent with the Charter of the United Nations
- Has your country ever cooperated with the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) on small arms and light weapons tracing? If so, in which areas?
 - Facilitation of tracing operations conducted within the framework of the International Tracing Instrument
 - Investigations to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons
 - Building national capacity to initiate and respond to tracing requests

4. National frameworks

- Does your country have laws, regulations and/or administrative procedures in place, in line with relevant international instruments, regarding the marking, record-keeping and tracing of small arms and light weapons?
- Has your country established a national coordination agency or other body responsible for policy guidance, research and monitoring of efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects?
- Does your country have a national point of contact designated to act as liaison on matters relating to the implementation of the International Tracing Instrument?

5. Regional frameworks

- Is your country party to a regional instrument that regulates the marking, record-keeping and tracing of small arms and light weapons?
- If so, are your country's regional obligations of a legally or a politically binding nature?
- If so, do your country's regional commitments go beyond the international ones?
- Has your country cooperated with a relevant regional organization on the implementation of relevant instruments, including participation in training seminars, meetings and workshops on the subject?

6. International cooperation and assistance

- Does your country intend to request assistance in building capacity (technical assistance, training) in any of the following areas:
 - Marking
 - Record-keeping
 - Tracing, including weapons identification capacity and technical/technological capacities
 - National frameworks (e.g., national action plan, coordinating body)
 - Legislative assistance
 - Strengthening capacities of relevant law enforcement officials, e.g., police, customs, border management
 - Has your country received technical assistance from a relevant regional organization in the field of marking, record-keeping and/or tracing?
- _____