

**IMPROVING PROTECTION,
REDUCING CIVILIAN VULNERABILITIES:**

**INTERACTION BETWEEN MINE / EXPLOSIVE
REMNANTS OF WAR ACTION AND SMALL ARMS AND
LIGHT WEAPONS RESPONSES**

A REVIEW OF A DECADE OF CHANGES

Christina Wille

June 2017

Acknowledgement

The present study was commissioned by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). It was researched and written by Christina Wille between September 2016 and May 2017. Thanks to Anna Alvazzi, Eric Berman, Russell Gasser, Peter Herby, Ursign Hofmann, Chris Loughran, Pascal Rapillard and Stefano Toscano, and for guidance and comments. The views presented in this study are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the GICHD or the listed individuals.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	1
List of Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms	6
Executive Summary.....	9
Introduction	14
Chapter 1: The context	17
1.1 The international authoritative guidelines addressing conventional weapon threats.	18
1.2. Standards to address mine action and weapons and ammunition management.....	19
1.3 Communities, organisations and bodies addressing MA/ERW and SALW	21
1.4 Concluding remarks on the context of mine action and SALW measures.....	22
Chapter 2: Interaction and integration between MA /ERW and SALW responses.....	24
2.1 Conceptual developments.....	25
2.1.1 Concepts and framework that address both MA/ERW and SALW	25
2.1.1.1 United Nations Mandates.....	25
2.1.1.2 Individual organisations	26
The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)	26
The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).....	26
The United Nation’s Development Programme (UNDP).....	27
2.2 Operational Interaction between MA / ERW and SALW responses	27
2.2.1 The process by which mine action organisations moved into SALW work	28
2.2.1.1 SALW activities under the UNPoA and regional instruments	28
Research, analysis and interventions by non-governmental organisations	31
2.2.1.2 SALW stockpile management activities by organisations with a mine action background	34
Stockpile Destruction	34
Physical security and Stockpile Management (PSSM), Arms Management and Destruction (AMD) or Weapons and Ammunition Management (WAM) and Ammunition Safety Management (ASM).....	35
2.2.1.3 Armed violence reduction and community safety programmes by organisations with a mine action background	38
Peacebuilding and Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction	38
AVPR approaches by mine action organisations and other actors in this field	40
2.2.2 Changes in the way mine action and SALW organisations interact and projects are designed.....	41
2.2.2.1 Increasing contacts and interaction between mine action and SALW organisations... 41	

2.2.2.2 Beginnings of integration: More frequent attempts to address MA/ERW and SALW through the same programme or project.....	43
SALW and ammunition destruction, safe storage and understanding the risks of unplanned explosions at ammunition sites	44
Mine risk education and SALW awareness	45
Victim Assistance.....	46
2.2.2.3 National implementing structures.....	48
2.3 Concluding remarks	49
Chapter 3: Challenges and opportunities for the future	51
3.1 Challenge 1: Getting the timing and sequencing right and ensuring appropriate coordination	51
3.2 Challenge 2: Understanding the context and actor motivations.....	54
3.3 Challenge 3: Managing tensions within international frameworks driven by conflicting objectives	55
3.4 Opportunities	55
3.4.1 Coordination framework for mine action and SALW control	56
3.4.2 Improved Country level coordination among international actors	56
3.4.3 Better project design guidance and evaluation tools.....	57
3.4.4 Joint data collection and information sharing	57
3.4.5 Opportunities to link to the evolving DDR and SSR agenda.....	57
Conclusion.....	59
Annexes.....	62
Annex 1: Bibliography	63
Annex 2: List of Key Resources	66
Annex 3: People consulted in the preparation of this report.....	68

Textboxes

Box 1: A comprehensive overview of the legal regulations of weapons and their impact	19
Box 2: The International Small Arms and Ammunition Guidance Platform (ISAP).....	20
Box 3: Key aspects of SALW programmes.....	29
Box 4: Second Generation DDR Programming.....	30
Box 5: Mine action and SALW control measures: two different approaches for different problems..	32
Box 6: Mine action organisations and activities in complex systems.....	36
Box 7: Understanding Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction.....	38
Box 8: Synergies in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in Mine Action and SALW Measures	41
Box 9: Database on Unplanned Explosions on Munitions Sites.....	44
Box 10: Case Study: Addressing MA/ERW and SALW risks through mine action programmes in Libya	46
Box 11: National coordination: The example of Mauritania	48
Box 12: Libya Case on PSSM activities	52
Box 13: Small Arms related literature on Libya	54

List of Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms

Ammunition	Charges needed for weapons or weapon systems. The material fired, scattered, dropped or detonated from any weapon as bombs, or rockets, bullets or shells fired by guns.
ASA	Ammunition Storage Areas
ASM	Ammunition Safety Management
ATT	Arms Trade Treaty
AHWG SALW/MA	Ad Hoc Working Group on SALW and Mine Action (NATO)
AMD	Arms Management and Destruction
AU	African Union
AVPR	Armed Violence Reduction
BCPR	Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
BICC	Bonn International Center for Conversion
BPPS	Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (UNDP)
CASA	Coordinating Action on Small Arms (UN with UNODA)
CAVPR	Centre for Armed Violence Reduction
CIFTA	Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms and ammunition, explosives, and other related materials
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CCW	Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons
DCA	Danish Church Aid
DDG	Danish Demining Group
DDR	Disarmament Demobilization and Reintegration
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (NATO)
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EOD	Explosive Ordinance Disposal
ERW	Explosive Remnants of War
EU	European Union
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
GNA	Government of National Accord, Libya
GRIP	Groupe de recherche de d'information sur la paix et al sécurité
HI	Handicap International
HMA	Humanitarian Mine Action
IATG	International Ammunition Technical Guidelines
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDDRS	Integrated DDR Standards
IED	Improvised Explosive Device
IEDD	Improvised Explosive Device Disposal
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
Integration	In this report refers to the process of integrating and coordinating MA and SALW measures as two components within a single programme or project.
Interaction	Mutual or reciprocal action or influence. In this report, refers to contacts and communication between experts with a background in either MA/ERW and SALW that increase understanding of practices and influence how agencies approach MA/ERW or SALW
IPPWN	International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War

IRT	Incident Reporting Template (UEMS)
ITI	International Tracing Instrument (SALW)
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
ISACS	International Small Arms Control Standards
ISAP	International Small Arms and Ammunition Guidance Platform
LCM	Life Cycle Management
LibMAC	Libyan Mine Action Centre
MAG	Mines Advisory Group
MANPADS	Man Portable Air Defence Systems
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
Munition	See ammunition. Munition is used in citations that use the term munition or munitions
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NSA	National Safety Authority (Libya)
NTS	Non-Technical Survey (Mine Action)
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
PRIO	Peace Research Institute Oslo
PSSM	Physical Security and Stockpile Management
PSS	Psycho Social Support
RE	Risk Education
RECSA	Regional Centre on Small Arms (East Africa)
RMSD/G	Regional micro-disarmament Standards and Guidelines
SAA	Small Arms Ammunition
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SALW	Small Arms and Light Weapons
SALW reduction	refers to measures that take weapons out of circulation for destruction
SALW control	refers to measures that define the rules and regulations under which weapons can be accessed, are licenced, and ought to be stored.
SAS	Small Arms Survey
SEESAC	South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures (mine action)
SSMA	Safe and Secure Management of Ammunition
SSR	Security Sector Reform
UEMS	Unplanned Explosions at Munition Sites
UN	United Nations
UNDPKO	United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNILIREC	United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean
UNODA	United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNRCPD	United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
UNOCI	United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire
UNPoA	United Nations Programme of Action (SALW)
UNSMIL	United Nations Support Mission in Libya
WAM	Weapons and Ammunition Management
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

Explosive remnants of war (ERW), mines, small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their ammunition often threaten civilians in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Their simultaneous presence suggests that effective protection for the civilian population requires that mine action, SALW control, and ammunition safety responses should all be considered in the design of an effective response. A narrow focus on only one weapon category or aspect is unlikely to deliver comprehensive safety and security. At the same time, weapon category specific approaches are required as, unlike mines and ERW, all SALW will most often not be removed and implementation has to focus on adequate and effective control practices.

In 2006, a GICHD study found that synergies between the small arms and the mine action sectors had been limited with respect to the development of responses.¹ This report assesses the situation a decade later. It starts from the premise that better integration of mine action and small arms measures would be beneficial for the safety and security of civilians. It finds that there has been increased interaction between the two areas of work at the conceptual and operational levels. In selected cases, there has been integration of activities that address mines or explosive remnants of war and small arms within the same project or programme.

Conceptually, the two agendas of mine action/ERW and small arms converge around the issue of ammunition. From the perspective of mine action, unstable ammunition poses risks to civilians which have to be addressed like any other explosive hazard. From the perspective of small arms control, ammunition is a central element in influencing who and under what conditions is enabled to use firearms or light weapons systems. Both approaches support the goal of protecting the civilian population.

In 2006, it was found that the few operational synergies had generally occurred 'as a result of the daily realities of mine and explosive ordnance clearance and SALW mitigation in a post-conflict environment. These synergies tend to exist where mixed ordnance has been laid, fired, abandoned, stored and hidden, and where large numbers of SALW are present rather than following a strategic decision to tackle both issues together at an operational level.'² This study documents an evolution in practices by many actors since 2006, in particular the expansion of activities of mine action organisations and the deliberate steps they have taken to also offer ammunition and SALW destruction as part of their work.

The 2006 study identified the disposal of SALW and ERW, and SALW awareness and mine risk education as the areas with the greatest potential for synergies, with victim assistance offering further possibilities. This study confirmed that on an operational level these areas have indeed proven to be the entry points for the beginning of projects implemented by mine action organisations that addressed both threats within the same programme or project. However, the process has moved considerably further. Today mine action organisations engage not only in disposal of ammunition and SALW alongside ERW, but have also moved into the provision of safe and secure storage for ammunition and weapons. In a second stream of work, some mine action organisations are today offering community safety programmes aiming to reduce armed violence as part of the broader new agenda on responding to the complex realities of post-conflict societies or unstable and fragile states. This also includes approaches to Psycho Social Services (PSS) that could be regarded as a form of victim assistance. By offering such new services, mine action organisations have entered a SALW/ammunition control activity and have often sought cooperation from bodies with experience in SALW research and or policy.

Most SALW activities have always been implemented by agencies with a mandate wider than just small arms and have constituted one component rather than the main focus of work. Most practical operational projects, which sought to improve control practices, were previously implemented mainly by UN bodies, regional organisations and governments - with NGOs only occasionally running some community-based projects. Most other organisations with expertise in SALW tended to concentrate on research and policy work as one aspect of their wider disarmament, conflict or peace activities and many assumed an advisory role to operational agencies and governments.

By offering services in safe and secure weapons storage and community safety programmes, non-governmental mine action organisations compete for operational contracts primarily with each other and as far regards SALW operational implementing agencies, mainly with UN agencies. Many non-governmental mine action organisations engaged in SALW activities increasingly seek the cooperation of SALW research and policy organisations to strengthen project development and implementation.

The 2006 report noted that no examples were uncovered where large entities actively sought to link mine action with SALW activities under the same umbrella with the exception of the NATO Partnership for Peace Trust Fund. This situation has also changed considerably. Today, there are UN

mandates that place mines ERW, ammunition and SALW responses under the same stabilisation framework. At least two major organisations, UNDP and ICRC, have moved away from organising their interventions around single weapon categories, and have adopted approaches that integrate mine action and SALW into more horizontally defined tasks directly related to their mandates. Some donors, notable the US, also consider mine action and small activities together.

This report documents the increasing interaction between operational mine action organisations and bodies with knowledge of SALW control, and describes examples of programmes or projects that directly address both mine action/ERW and SALW control issues. Mine action organisations have been instrumental in kick-starting the process of interaction between organisations with a background in mine action and small arms expertise on an operational level by offering new services related to small arms and ammunition. Organisations with expertise in SALW, whether in research, project implementation or policy advocacy, by contrast, have not started to engage in mine action if they had not already done so in the past. However, some organisations which have small arms as a focus within their broader portfolio have begun to engage in armed violence prevention and reduction or community safety programmes.

The interviews carried out for this study showed that there is a considerable degree of complementarity in the expertise mine action and organisations with expertise in SALW can contribute. Mine action organisations tend to perform most of the technical and operational tasks, while bodies with expertise in SALW often bring an understanding of the SALW control context and wider policy frameworks. At a project level, there is mainly cooperation and complementarity between non-governmental organisations and little sign of duplication and competition to carry out the same type of work between organisations with a background in mine action or SALW expertise. Competition for resources occurs at the level of core-funding for organisations' activities at headquarter level. However, such competition is much wider than just competition between mine action and SALW control organisations and affects all non-governmental and research organisations across the disarmament spectrum.

However, this study also confirmed the finding from the 2006 report that efforts to address the harmful effects of SALW are more complex than problems encountered in mine action. From a SALW control perspective, destruction and safe storage are one component among many required for a comprehensive SALW control strategy. Small arms measures include a wide range of activities ranging from weapons collection, marking and tracing, to legislation, internal management

procedures, and export control mechanisms, as well as changes in the provision and perception of security and behaviour of individuals. The complexity of many small arms interventions requires highly adaptive intervention skills, which requires on the job learning in a given context rather than reliance on standardised guidance material. It is especially in these areas that mine action organisations have sought advice from and collaboration with organisations with an expertise in small arms and where collaboration has proved most effective.

This report also identified a number of challenges that stem from the complexities of SALW interventions and the difficult working environment of post-conflict societies. Interaction between mine action / ERW and small arms measures has largely been driven through a gradual expansion of activities by mine action organisations, learning from and cooperating with organisations that already have a small arms expertise rather than the development and implementation of a comprehensive new approach. There remain gaps how some of the new activities are linked to broader intervention frameworks, notably DDR and SSR. At present, there are still challenges in managing the sequencing of mine action/ERW clearance, SALW collection and DDR programmes, humanitarian action, peacebuilding and SSR. Mine action/ERW clearance in immediate post conflict contexts is increasingly started soon after fighting ends and at a time when it is often too early to design a comprehensive weapon collection or DDR programme. Most importantly, the understanding of the complexities of small arms projects is not always fully understood across all organizations who moved with a mine action background into small arms activities and some more research focused organisations sometimes fail to see how information has to be adapted to be useful for an operational level.

The study also identified a number of opportunities to address these challenges through better integration of the weapon reduction and control approaches as key elements of Second Generation DDR programmes and SSR. For organisations engaged in projects on the ground there are opportunities to increase integration through more cooperation on practical issues relating to information management, data sharing, the development of common evaluation tools as well as guidance document to facilitate coordination in affected countries.

The report was commissioned by the GICHD in September 2016. The content was informed by 86 interviews with people working on programming, project implementation, research or conceptualization within mainly international or global institutions that engage in implementation or funding of projects related to either mine action or SALW control. Twenty-eight of these individuals

worked in Tunisia covering the Libya response. However, most people interviewed worked for international or global organisations rather than national authorities. The report attempts to bring the numerous individual accounts of activities and reported changes together into a narrative that describes how individual activities fit into the bigger picture of changes that took place over the past years. It is inevitable that elements have been missed and that some broad findings may not apply to individual country cases or even individual organisations. Moreover, the views of national authorities are not well reflected. It is intended that this report will make a first contribution to bringing together diverse experiences and narratives from two professional communities that were separated by differences in backgrounds which resulted from different contexts and were reinforced by working in isolation from each other, but have increasingly collaborated. This report is intended to contribute to a better understanding between the two communities, sharing of good practice, and improved responses to key challenges that have developed separately in different sectors.

Introduction

In 2006, a GICHD study found that synergies between the small arms and the mine action sectors had been limited.³ This report assesses the situation a decade later, and finds that there has been increased interaction between the two areas of work at the conceptual and operational levels. It discusses the implications of the observed changes in policies and programmes for the protection of civilians from conventional weapon threats in post-conflict and protracted conflict contexts.

Explosive remnants of war (ERW), mines, small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their ammunition often threaten civilians in post-conflict and protracted conflict settings. Their simultaneous presence suggests that effective protection of civilian populations requires that mine action, SALW control, and ammunition safety responses should all be considered in the design of an effective response. A narrow focus on only one weapon category or aspect is unlikely to deliver comprehensive protection. At the same time, weapon category specific approaches are clearly needed as, unlike mines and ERW, all SALW will most often not be removed and implementation has to focus on adequate and effective control practices.

The two agendas of mine action (MA)/ERW and SALW converge around the issue of ammunition. From the perspective of MA, unstable ammunition poses risks to civilians which have to be addressed like any other explosive hazard. From the perspective of small arms control, ammunition is a central element in influencing who and under what conditions is enabled to use firearms or light weapons systems. Both approaches support the goal of better ammunition management, protection of civilians and controlling the use of weapons. The advantages of stabilisation frameworks that address the full range of weapon related threats has also been reflected in some of the more recent UN Mission mandates that set the parameters for international interventions in post-conflict countries such as in for Libya and the Côte d'Ivoire.

This study starts from the hypothesis that improved synergies between MA/ERW and SALW measures will be beneficial to the protection of civilians. The report examines to what extent, and in what form, there has been an interaction between organisations and /or individuals with a background in MA/ERW or SALW and to what extent this has led to integration of approaches and practices in programmes or projects at country level. It discusses the process, challenges, limitations and opportunities of this process.

The report brings together available information in relation to four central, and practical questions:

- What is the nature of interaction between organisations and/or individuals with MA/ERW or SALW expertise today? To what extent are there contacts, direct communication and dealings between organisations and / or individuals with a background in MA /ERW or SALW? What were the driving forces behind such interaction and how does it influence MA/ERW and SALW measures today?
- To what extent has this interaction led to integration of MA/ERW and SALW activities within the same programme or project?
- To what extent has this interaction led to duplication and overlap and/or to what extent has there been complementarity, synergy and innovation?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for the future?

Structure of report

The report is structured around three chapters: The first chapter describes the context which includes the architecture of international authoritative guidelines designed to curb civilian harm from conventional weapons. Mines, ERW and SALW cover distinct weapons challenges that cause civilian harm in different ways and that are governed by separate normative frameworks. The chapter also includes a brief review of the development of international standards on mine action (IMAS), International Small Arms Control (ISAC) and the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG) because the technical requirements for addressing different weapon categories are also quite distinctive.

The second and principal chapter of the report describes the increasing interaction between organisations and / or individuals over the past decade. It highlights examples where MA/ERW and SALW control measures were integrated into the same programme or project. The chapter is based on information reported by individuals interviewed for this study (Annex 3). The chapter starts by highlighting the conceptual developments within selected organisations (UN Mandates, NATO, ICRC and UNDP) before discussing changes in operational practice.

The third, and final, chapter discusses challenges and opportunities for the future. It covers mainly the lessons learned from the SALW activities by mine action organisations because this constitutes the most noticeable shift in activities. While the process has generally been highly beneficial in expanding the types of coverage of SALW projects, there are challenges that highlight the need for a better understanding of the full complexity of SALW control measures. Secondly, there is a need to

define the broader frameworks that can integrate MA/ERW and SALW measures in an efficient and effective way.

Research approach

The report was informed by a total of 86 interviews with people working on programming, project implementation, research or conceptualization within international or global institutions that engage in implementation or funding of projects related to either mine action or SALW control (Annex 3).⁴ The study was further informed by two case studies in Mauritania (carried out by Eric Debert in November 2016) and Libya (Christina Wille in January 2017) where 28 of the interviews were carried out. The majority of interlocutors worked for international or global organisations rather than national authorities. Few of the interlocutors interviewed for this report were familiar with both mine action and SALW measures, and they usually approached the issue from one perspective. The key informant interviews also highlighted the ‘cultural’ differences between individuals with a background in mine action or SALW measure with respect to conceptual thinking, terminology and overall approaches. The consultation process thus gathered an array of examples from a wide-range of perspectives in order to supplement the evidence from the case studies.

Chapter Two of this report attempts to bring the numerous individual accounts of activities and reported changes together into a narrative that describes how individual activities fit into the bigger picture of changes that took place over the past years. It is inevitable that some elements have been missed and that some broad findings may not apply to individual country cases or even individual organisations. In particular, as few contacts could be made with representatives from national authorities, their part of the story remains largely absent from this report.

It is intended that this report will make a first contribution to bringing together diverse experiences and narratives from two professional communities that in the past worked in isolation from each other, but have increasingly come together. This report is intended to contribute to a better understanding between the two communities, sharing of good practice and improved responses key challenges that have developed separately in different sectors.

Chapter 1: The context

High levels of civilian harm from conventional weapons are a major concern because they affect human security. Between 2010 and 2015, around 90'000 people died on average per year directly from armed conflict.⁵ This is a considerable rise from around 52'000 people killed per year in conflicts between 2004 and 2009⁶ and some 70'000 killed per year between 2007 and 2012⁷. While there are no disaggregated figures on the number of civilians among the conflict dead, it is likely that civilians make up a considerable proportion of all conflict casualties. In 2015, Action on Armed Violence recorded over 33'000 civilians killed or injured by explosive weapons alone.⁸ Conventional weapons are a threat in both conflict settings and other situations of violence.⁹

The impact of conventional weapons extends far beyond the numbers of individuals directly killed or injured. Misuse of explosive weapons, proliferation of small arms and light weapons (SALW) as well as contamination from mines, cluster munitions and explosive remnants of war (ERW), impact lives and livelihoods significantly, hampering economic development, making access to food and essential medical facilities more difficult, and generally reducing the standard of living and preventing communities from accessing resources.

Effective civilian protection from conventional weapons in post conflict settings requires practical measures that remove the full range of remaining threats. Removal of threats covers a wide range of activities from the removal of weapons to finding appropriate and effective control mechanisms for legally held firearms. In practice, interventions directed at mines/ ERW and SALW have been implemented by different actors under different international instruments and following sector specific guidance. This initially led to a siloed implementation approach. The following section briefly explains the international architecture that evolved around the distinct MA/ERW and SALW approaches before discussing conceptual developments that seek to build clearer connections between different agendas. The framework guiding ammunition work is included in the discussion because there is a general recognition that ammunition is a key link between MA/ERW and SALW control.

1.1 International authoritative guidelines addressing conventional weapon threats

The architecture of international instruments to curb civilian harm from conventional weapons influenced how the MA/ERW sector and SALW measures evolved. The first international instruments designed to curb civilian harm from conventional weapons go back more than 100 years and focused on regulating the conduct of armed conflict to limit its effects by seeking to strike a balance between legitimate military objectives and protection of civilians.¹⁰ In the later part of the 20th century additional treaties outlawed individual categories of weapons on the basis of International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

Some conventional weapons were regulated by the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), which was developed to prohibit or restrict the use of specific types of weapons that are considered to cause unnecessary suffering to combatants or to affect civilians indiscriminately.¹¹ The CCW is structured using a framework convention of general principles with annexed protocols on specific weapons.¹² While there are two CCW protocols dealing with mines¹³ and explosive remnants of war (ERW) under the CCW¹⁴, the more far-reaching regulations on mines, cluster munitions, and SALW were established in separate documents outside of the CCW.

The Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention of 1997 and the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions banned these two weapon categories¹⁵. The 2001 United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UNPoA) by contrast has a much broader scope of action than the MA /ERW agenda. Like Protocol V of the CCW on ERW, it does not set out to ban the weapons but rather to prevent harm¹⁶. The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), which entered into force in 2014, covers eight categories of conventional arms and their ammunition and focuses on their international transfer with a set of regulations and obligations for pre-transfer assessments and recommendations for reporting. Numerous regional instruments address region specific concerns that often go further than the global agreements.¹⁷ The use of firearms outside of armed conflicts is also addressed in the 2005 UN Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms (Firearms Protocol), a legally binding instrument with 114 States Parties, and in the Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.¹⁸

Box 1: A comprehensive overview of the legal regulations of weapons and their impact

The [Weapons Law Encyclopedia](#), a project of the [Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights](#), is an open-access online compilation of information on the legal regulation of weapons in a format that makes it accessible to non-specialists. The site covers the technical characteristics of weapons, their intended or typical uses, the humanitarian impact as documented in practice and their regulations under public international law.

The Encyclopedia covers anti-personnel landmines, cluster munitions and SALW as well as a range of other weapons.

At present, there is no single normative framework that addresses ammunition. Ammunition was not explicitly included in the UNPoA. However, in the interpretation of some, ammunition is included under 'all its aspects.' The Firearms Protocol includes ammunition under record-keeping (Article 7). The ATT covers ammunition in some, but not all of its articles. The export assessment criteria apply to the eight categories of conventional weapons covered by the treaty, as well as their associated ammunitions (Articles 3, 6 and 7), but there are no obligations to keep a record (Article 12) or report on ammunition sales (Article 13), and measures to prevent diversion (Article 11) make no reference to ammunition. The main entry point for work on ammunition is the 2011 International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG) which address effective ammunition stockpile management from a 'whole life management' approach, ranging from categorization and accounting, to physical security, surveillance and the recurrent assessment of the stability and reliability of ammunition.

During the last decade, mine action organisations identified unstable ammunition sites as a humanitarian concern and have engaged in addressing the threat where they encountered it. Small arms research organisations, like the Small Arms Survey, began to document the concerns around unstable ammunition sites.¹⁹

1.2 Standards to address mine action and weapons and ammunition management

Standards and guidance are important tools in influencing practice. The development of International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) preceded the 1997 Ottawa treaty that banned anti-personnel landmines. These standards have been refined over the years and have shaped the nature of operations by providing procedures for management and quality assurance and have helped to

create a distinct MA/ERW sector of organisations which follow these standards.²⁰ The International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) are voluntary international standards that provide guidance to practitioners and policy makers from national governments, UN entities, international and regional organisations, civil society and the private sector.²¹ They are much broader and do not address a single but multiple sectors that come into contact with SALW. The International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG) provide practical, technical advice for national authorities, international organisations and non-governmental organisations involved with the planning and implementation of conventional ammunition stockpile management processes; the guidelines cover the full life-cycle of ammunition management including storage; transportation, processing, maintenance, repair; accounting; demilitarization or destruction of ammunition as well as safety and security of ammunition stockpiles.

There are some important differences in the nature of standards. IMAS provide specific guidance on how to implement three of the five pillars of mine action (with the exception of advocacy and victim assistance). The ISACS, by contrast, are based on best practice guidelines, model regulations and legislation, codes of conduct and standard operating procedures that have been developed at regional and sub-regional levels as examples of effective and achievable practice.²² The IATG are a tool to support a holistic approach to management of conventional ammunition stockpiles. Effective implementation requires that the guidance is integrated into national regulations. These standards continue to influence how MA/ERW, SALW and ammunition related activities are implemented.

Box 2: [The International Small Arms and Ammunition Guidance Platform \(ISAP\)](#)

In 2015, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) initiated a project—known as the International Small Arms and Ammunition Guidance Platform (ISAP)—designed to conduct policy-relevant research, facilitate expert dialogue and create practical tools in order to improve programming and practices on arms and ammunition management. The platform aims to support the practical application of voluntary international guidelines—namely IATG and ISACS—to assist field practitioners in their effort to manage arms and ammunition and to better inform policymakers on potential options and approaches in establishing a sustainable national framework governing arms and ammunition in fragile settings. As part of this project, UNIDIR has developed a practical arms and ammunition management checklist tool for security and basic safety assessments at the field level—based on the ISACS and IATG.

1.3 Communities, organisations and bodies addressing MA/ERW and SALW

Mine action organisations and bodies with an expertise in SALW include very different groups and organisations. While mine action organisations, like for example the Mines Advisory Group (MAG), the HALO Trust, Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), the Danish Demining Group (DDG), Danish Church Aid (DCA), and Handicap International (HI) are diverse in many respects, they still have a common approach to the implementation of mine action based on the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Mine action organisations run mine action projects and carry out research to prepare and evaluate mine action activities.

Organisations with expertise in SALW do not have a common central operational standard and come from a wide variety of different backgrounds and entry points, among them humanitarian concerns, disarmament or conflict research. In comparison to mine action, they do not constitute a clearly defined sector. Most SALW organisations have a strong research focus (like the Small Arms Survey (SAS), Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC), Control Arms, Groupe de recherche de d'information sur la paix et al sécurité (GRIP), and the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO). Some combine research with project implementation (like Saferworld), while others also focus on advocacy (like Control Arms). A number of organisations with SALW expertise are larger research organisations which cover SALW as one of many research areas within the field of disarmament, peace or conflict research and would not consider themselves a small arms organisation (such as International Physicians for the Prevention Nuclear War (IPPNW), Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) or PRIO. Operational SALW projects, by contrasts have often been implemented by large entities such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) or regional organisations (see below) which use research prepared by research organisations to prepare and evaluate their operations. Typically, organisations with SALW expertise cover SALW issues as one of several mandates. Only the Small Arms Survey was established with a specific focus on SALW and their impact.

National structures with responsibilities for mine action or SALW control tend to be separate and not run through the same body. Many countries have Mine Action Centres (MAC) that are in charge of licensing and/or quality control or actual implementation of mine action. SALW control tends to be coordinated through National Focal Points, or National Commissions, that bring together representatives from the relevant ministries or services with some element of SALW control responsibility usually with the objective to coordinate policies. Implementation tends to be

responsibility of the ministry or entity with the existing responsibility of SALW control, such as the police, army, national park rangers or others.

1.4 Concluding remarks on the context of mine action and SALW measures

The work on MA/ERW and SALW is guided by separate normative frameworks that differ in their framing of the problem and in their principle objectives. The MA/ERW instruments helped to clearly define the 'object' of concern, which made it easier to define a clear mandate and develop standards, and to build a community of organisations striving to reach the shared overall objective of eliminating anti-personnel mines and impacts of ERW. With an overall common objective agreed, the mine action community could focus on 'how' to practically work towards this aim allowing the community to focus on technical aspects. This facilitated the development of a linear approach towards achieving a clearly defined objective. Moreover, there is usually a broad consensus in a post conflict environment that mine /ERWs are a hazard and that it is beneficial to remove them.

SALW issues are highly complex because there is no political interest in banning SALW even though in terms of deaths, injuries and economic cost firearms have much bigger impact than mines. SALW control aims at reducing the risk of high rates of civilian casualties both in conflict / post conflict situations as well as in non-conflict settings. SALW risks are multiple and not only technical (poor physical security - unplanned explosions), but also related to diversion and to political, social and economic issues. SALW control international instruments do not deal with a unique 'object of concern' (some cover only the weapons, others may include ammunition, some only cover specific aspects like tracing or trade). Discussions around SALW are often highly political. Addressing SALW is often controversial even in peacebuilding processes. The weapon retains a considerable value for many actors in insecure post-conflict environments. SALW are durable goods, they continue to be sold and resold on secondary markets.²³

These differences influenced the development of practices in addressing MA/ERW and SALW. A clearly defined objective helped the mine action sector to develop the full set of skills to plan, implement, quality control and evaluate project implementation that corresponded to the universally agreed goal of removing and destroying mines and ERW. The 'SALW sector' by contrasts includes a wide range of organisations that usually only do one or two aspect of the required SALW activities (such as research, implementation, evaluation or advocacy) as part of a larger organisational portfolio that addresses other weapons, broader concerns (peace, disarmament) or

activities (development, humanitarian). However, few of the organisations with SALW expertise engage in mine action. Overall there was little interaction between organisations dedicated to MA/ERW and other organisations covering SALW issues as part of disarmament or conflict research. Moreover, most projects on the ground were designed to address either mine action or SALW control.

Chapter 2: Interaction and integration between MA /ERW and SALW responses

More than ten years ago, the 2006 GICHD study found few examples of synergies between the small arms and the mine action sectors.²⁴ In countries like Mozambique²⁵, Angola²⁶ and Cambodia²⁷ mine action and SALW control measures were implemented without much contact or coordination. Over the past decade, interaction between mine action organisations and organisations with expertise in SALW control has increased on a conceptual and an operational level, leading to practical changes in the ways projects are planned and implemented. This chapter describes the main trends based on a range of different examples shared by stakeholders interviewed for this study. The following questions are addressed:

- What is the nature of interaction between organisations and/or individuals with MA/ERW or SALW expertise today? To what extent are there contacts, direct communication and dealings between organisations and / or individuals with a background in MA /ERW or SALW? What were the driving forces behind such interaction and how does it influence MA/ERW and SALW measures today?
- To what extent has this interaction led to integration of MA/ERW and SALW activities within the same programme or project?
- To what extent has this interaction led to duplication and overlap and/or to what extent has there been complementarity, synergy and innovation?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for the future?

This chapter starts by discussing developments on conceptual levels that brought MA/ERW and SALW closer and led to interaction and some integration of programmes and projects. It uses examples from ammunition management and describes the approaches by four entities (UN Security Council, NATO, ICRC and UNDP) that linked their response to mines/ERW and SALW under a single mandate.

The following section then discusses how organisations with a background in MA/ERW and SALW interacted on an operational level and describes to what extent there are examples of projects or programmes that address both MA/ERW and SALW.

2.1 Conceptual developments

2.1.1 Concepts and framework that address both MA/ERW and SALW

For implementers and researchers, ammunition constitutes the clearest conceptual link between MA/ERW and SALW control. Unstable ammunition poses risks to civilians similar to abandoned explosive ordnance. Ammunition control is also a central element of the SALW agenda which seeks to reduce illicit arms flows, in which ammunition is a key factor with a focus on regulations around supply, safe and secure storage, and record keeping. Several actors have also articulated this obvious conceptual connection during negotiations of international instruments. However, for several practical and political reasons this conceptual link is not very explicit in the international instruments and guidance (see 2.1.3).

2.1.1.1 United Nations Mandates

The conceptual link between ERW and SALW ammunition has been more specifically recognized in some recent UN mandates where MA/ERW, SALW and ammunition response are placed within the same general objective. For example, the 2012 the United Nations Security Council mandate for the UN Support Mission for Libya (UNSMIL) set out to streamline international support efforts in the areas of humanitarian mine action, and arms and ammunition management, by calling for coordination, surveys, and capacity development. This link was maintained in all subsequent resolutions with slight changes in wording.²⁸

In 2015, UN Security Council resolution 2219 (2015) that modified the sanctions against Côte d'Ivoire made explicit reference to small arms and light weapons, mines and explosives and tasked the United Nations Operations in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI) to assist the national authorities with work related to SALW and MA/ERW.²⁹ In these cases the response to the two weapons categories was placed under the overall objective of stabilisation. Boxes 9 and 11 give examples of how this influenced operations on the ground in Libya.

The Agenda 2030 of 2015 commits states to a 'significant reduction of illicit arms flows' (Target 16.4), thus representing a new universal mandate referring to arms in general without clearly specifying SALW and or MA/ERW.

However, the new approach that combines reference to mine action and SALW, or uses language related to arms in general is not universally applied. For example, UNSC Resolutions 2117 of 2013³⁰ and 2220 of 2015³¹ specifically address SALW without reference to MA/ERW.

2.1.1.2 Individual organisations

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

In 1999, NATO established the Ad Hoc Working Group on SALW (AHWG SALW) in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), to address the proliferation of SALW in the Balkans area. It was followed in 2000 by the creation of a Trust Fund mechanism to fund destruction of surplus SALW and ammunition. In 2004, the mandates of the AHWG and of the Trust Fund mechanism were expanded to cover the destruction of mines to support allied and partner nations in implementing the provisions of the Ottawa Treaty. Today, the working group, renamed as Ad Hoc Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons/Mine Action (AHWC SALW/MA), is a forum where NATO Allies and partners discuss and coordinate activities that range from mine risk education to demining, as well as arms and ammunition disposal and construction of storage facilities. Since its inception, the Trust Fund mechanism has supported about 30 projects for the destruction of mines (including 1.6 million anti-personnel mines in Albania), SALW (such as 530,000 SALW destroyed in Ukraine), the disposal of ammunition and the construction of safe storage facilities (such as in Mauritania)³².

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) integrated mine action and SALW measures into a single framework for reducing conventional weapons threats to civilians as part of its humanitarian mandate. The framework does not set out different strategies for different weapons types, but instead aims to prioritise ICRC's response in line with an assessment of the impacts and humanitarian consequences of conventional weapons. The ICRC will directly intervene in response to weapons contamination when certain conditions are met and a specific added value is identified, such as when the ICRC has sole access, due to its neutral and impartial humanitarian mandate, to an area where weapon contamination has a humanitarian impact. The ICRC will, for example, remove any type of contamination when its presence hinders the safe conduct of its mandate, or the access to essential infrastructure or services, such as when a water treatment plant, a medical facility, the passage of a food convoy, or when dead bodies require evacuation. The ICRC can also respond when it is best placed to do so, but will withdraw as soon as other specialised organisations can assume the role. For example, following the unplanned explosion of the ammunition depot in Congo

Brazzaville in 2012 in an area which specialised organisations had difficulties accessing, the ICRC engaged in initial clearance operations together with MAG taking into account the urgency of the remaining threat and proximity of densely populated areas, but withdrew when other organisations were fully operational. While the ICRC will not directly engage in long-term projects, it may provide States with technical or other assistance in this field.

The United Nation's Development Programme (UNDP)

In 2015, the United Nation's Development Programme (UNDP) integrated specific development objectives of two former specialised units for mine action and SALW of the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) into broader thematic units in the newly formed Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Within BPPS, SALW issues have been incorporated into Democratic Governance and Peacebuilding Cluster, under Rule of Law, justice, security and human rights as community security and armed violence reduction programme; while mine action and DDR (which usually has a SALW component) are conceived as part of Sustainable Development Cluster and dealt with under Livelihoods and Early Recovery thematic area. This development reflects UNDP's approach that does not address weapons in isolation, but uses multiple entry points to support its broader transitional goals related to conflict prevention, sustaining peace and developing resilient local communities, including the use of weapon focused projects where required. UNDP will support and/or carry out a wide range of projects that may address the management of the weapons, attitudes by users as well as community security programmes in support of its wider development goals. However, this largely furthered the integration of weapon measures into broader development interventions rather than specifically focusing on integrating mine action and small arms control measures within a common framework.

2.2 Operational Interaction between MA / ERW and SALW responses

Over the past 10 years, contacts between mine action organisation and entities with SALW expertise have increased. There are now projects that contain elements of both mine action and SALW control. The interviews carried out for this study revealed that this interaction was mainly the result of mine action organisations extending their focus to cover aspects of SALW and ammunition control as part of a wider response to security threats in the areas they operated in.

To explain this trend, the first part of this section briefly describes how SALW interventions have typically been carried before mine action organisations began to engage in SALW activities as a way

of highlighting the gaps that created opportunities for mine action organisations. The second part explains the activities mine action organisations undertook since entering SALW control activities. The chapter is set up to show the underlying structural origins that enabled mine action organisations to get involved in SALW activities and secondly to highlight the complementarity of approaches and expertise. The final section of the chapter discusses the impact of the process of interaction and discusses issues of cooperation and integrated project design. It also presents a short case study from Mauritania illustrating how a national authority is considering bringing MA/ERW and SALW control under the same government structure.

2.2.1 The process by which mine action organisations moved into SALW work

2.2.1.1 SALW activities under the UNPoA and regional instruments

SALW measures cover a wide range of activities designed to reduce illicit arms flows of small arms and light weapons and address the harmful impacts of these weapons. There are multiple possible entry points and, unlike in mine action, there are no standardised pillars of what constitute SALW measures. Activities on the ground can be described as being either within the context of post-conflict peace consolidation measures where they may include weapons collection, destruction, demobilisation and reintegration -DDR. Other activities are designed to build the capacity of states in areas of marking, tracing, record keeping of weapons and ammunitions, import and export control mechanisms, as well as life cycle management. Another stream of support focuses on counter-terrorism measures (destruction of MANPADS and other weapons types of interest to terrorists). Some interventions are motivated by foreign policy objectives such as weapons embargoes, or transparency in arms trading. Another area of activities focuses on domestic polices related to the regulation of civilian possession, measures to address gun crime and domestic violence.

A regional approach has been a key feature of many SALW projects, with many SALW policies defined and implemented by regional organisations or bodies (e.g. ECOWAS, RECSA, SADC, SEESAC, or UNILIREC). Many UN bodies implementing SALW projects also took regional approaches³³. Often projects focused on awareness raising, capacity building, legislation and policy work, rather than direct implementation of specific control measures, which can usually only be implemented by states. An important activity carried out by some states has been the development of mechanisms for marking, record-keeping and tracing of SALW (but rarely ammunition). On a global level, sanctions and trade restrictions are key instruments.

Box 3: Key aspects of SALW programmes

The regional and national approaches of SALW measures

A major focus of state's SALW programmes has been to combat the illicit transfer of weapons. Consequently, many SALW measures were designed as part of regional programmes rather than individual projects or interventions. Better cross-border coordination between law enforcement and other actors are key in combatting trafficking. Confidence and trust building between states in a region is an important prerequisite to achieving transparency to prevent illicit transfers. This made regional instruments and regional centres an important focus of SALW action.³⁴ Where new regional SALW instrument were developed within regional organisations (e.g. ECOWAS, SADC), or new regional bodies created (e.g. RECSA), regional organisations became the key implementing bodies.

Awareness raising, capacity building, legislation and policy work

As regional organisations generally have no mandate to organise internal security matters of their member states, there are a limited number of viable entry points for SALW work. Regional organisations have usually opted to play a supportive role by focussing on awareness raising, capacity building and support for the development of legal or policy frameworks, and by working with civil society, parliamentarians and government officials. Some regional centres have been instrumental in supporting changes in domestic policies. For example, regional centres in South Eastern Europe (SEESAC), the Latin America and the Caribbean (UNILIREC), as well as RECSA, helped promote the adoption of international standards at national level. The activities of regional organisations also led to the appointment of focal points, and numerous laws and policies were developed.

Transfer controls

Effective regulation and control of legal transfers of SALW are essential components of efforts to prevent, reduce and combat illicit SALW trafficking in all its aspects. Many SALW enter illicit circulation or use through diversion from legal transfers. Large quantities of arms fall into the hands of criminals, terrorist, rebel groups and others through leakage from legally held military, police, civilian or other stocks.³⁵ Arms control issues are implemented through the ATT. States are responsible for designing and implementing regulations on import and exports and for their security forces.

Marking, record-keeping and tracing

Marking, record-keeping and tracing are the practical tools to enable states to implement transfer controls effectively. Some regional organisations have supported these initiatives through practical support and coordination. These efforts were designed to implement the International Tracing Instrument (2005), as well as the UnPoA. The focus was on enabling tracing rather than strengthening physical stockpile security practices. The largest operational SALW programmes in Africa procured marking machines and developed record-keeping software.³⁶ This began in East Africa, where in 2010 the RECSA-led marking project became a trans-regional project managed by RECSA and co-ordinated by the African Union (AU)³⁷. The process of marking encountered several hurdles, from dysfunctional marking machines, to lack of transport facilities, which has limited progress in marking outside capital cities. In Africa, most states are still in need of functioning long-term record-keeping solutions, including adequate infrastructure, hardware and software capable of linking all records nationally.

In post conflict contexts, disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) are key programmes which also have an important SALW component. They are implemented either by the UN or national governments. Unlike other SALW programmes, they are rarely designed as regional programmes, but may have regional components as has been the case in West Africa. The UN alone has a wide range of agencies involved in DDR around the world, chief among them the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the UN Development Programme. DDR has been carried out since the 1980s but it remains challenging to achieve any short-term results because most peace processes are fraught with difficulties. Arms collection processes, in particular, often encountered resistance because those holding guns saw a greater advantage in holding on to them, or selling them on the private market than in handing them over.³⁸ Several different approaches have been used over time. The so-called 'Second Generation' DDR programmes in particular offered opportunities for mine action organisations as will be discussed below.

[Box 4: Second Generation DDR Programming](#)

DDR has been carried out since the 1980s. The 2000 Brahimi report³⁹ underlined the importance of strong mandates and called for the adoption of integrated DDR strategies. In 2006, the Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS) were published offering valuable guidance on how to address the political, military, security, humanitarian and socio-economic dimensions of the post-conflict environment.⁴⁰

The traditional Integrated DDR standards (IDDRS) include a set of preconditions which should be in place before a DDR programme begins. These are the signing of a negotiated peace agreement that provides a legal framework for DDR, trust in the peace process, willingness of the parties to the conflict to engage in DDR, and a minimum guarantee of security.⁴¹ The requirement to have preconditions fulfilled means that in practice mine, ERW and IED clearance can occur much earlier than disarmament in a post-conflict setting.

Second Generation DDR programmes shifted away from military structures towards the larger communities that are affected by armed violence. Second Generation DDR programmes include a number of different types of activities that can be implemented when the preconditions for traditional DDR are not in place. They aim to support the peace process, build trust, contribute to a secure environment and help build the foundation for longer term peacebuilding. Instead of implementing relevant provisions of a peace agreement, Second Generation activities are programmed locally using an evidence-based approach. These efforts, reinforced by regular assessments, enable practitioners to more effectively and quickly adapt to new developments.⁴²

Some of the armed violence reduction activities carried out by mine action organisations can be regarded as supporting building of trust and creating the preconditions for more far reaching interventions. There are also opportunities for better integration of Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM see section 2.2.1.2 below) activities under a Second Generation DDR programme. This may also offer opportunities for improved application of gender and diversity considerations (see Box 8).

Research, analysis and interventions by non-governmental organisations

One of the strengths of SALW activities has been the quality of research and analysis of contexts. Research institutes like the SAS, BICC, and PRIO developed research standards to help understand the underlying factors driving SALW proliferation. Because there are multiple reasons why groups or individuals use small arms and light weapons to threaten civilians, understanding the motives and underlying causes of proliferation in different contexts is central to planning interventions. SALW research also covers detailed information, analysis and assessment and know-how on stockpile procedures and other support operations on the ground. Most non-governmental organisations with an interest in SALW, such as BICC, the Centre for Armed Violence Reduction (CAVPR)⁴³ or Saferworld covered SALW as one of their areas of expertise, developed expertise in research and analysis to support measures by regional bodies, national governments or UN interventions. Many have also used research to support coordination and implementation of capacity building on required policy

measures. However, none of the research- and policy-focused non-government organisations engaged in direct operational tasks such as weapons destruction, construction of safe storage.

[Box 5: Mine action and SALW control measures: two different approaches for different problems](#)

Application of the complexity theory to Mine Action and SALW control measures. Part 1

There are both some overlaps and also important differences between MA/ERW and SALW control measures. Applying "complexity thinking" to mine action, humanitarian, peacebuilding and development interventions provides insight to better understand the different approaches.

From a complexity viewpoint, there are three basic areas of action or domains: firstly, the ordered or linear, secondly the complex, and thirdly the chaotic.⁴⁴ Each requires a different way of understanding and working. Many of the traditional activities of MA/ERW and of SALW require different approaches in identifying and implementing responses.

Most of the activities of MA/ERW are within the realm of the ordered system where cause and effect are closely linked. In the ordered system, repeating the same actions leads to the same results. The end goal and the route to get there can be set out before starting. Ordered systems can be divided into *obvious* systems where the link between cause and effect is obvious to most people, and *complicated* systems where cause and effect are still linked and repeatable, but it takes expertise and analysis to make the connection, for example complicated information management.

In the obvious domain work is defined by procedures, standards and processes, such as the IMAS and the IATG. Mine cause humanitarian harm therefore the intervention focuses on finding and destroying them. No-one is advocating for the retention of landmines, there is agreement on their removal. There is little need to analyse further. For clearance and destruction, the best local solution, from a range of already known and understood options, is identified and applied. The mine action sector has developed considerable expertise in working with a linear cause and effect model for theories of change.

Implementing mine risk education, victim assistance and advocacy often need a different approach. For example, the implementing organisation needs to understand the risk behaviour of the target population to design effective mine risk education. To design interventions, it is important to know who would enter contaminated land and for what reason, but previous experience is still a good guide. The core of mine risk education: not to go, not to touch, and to

alert someone can be adapted for different locations.

Most small arms control measures, by contrast, are part of complex systems. In a complex context repeating the same action does not get the same results each time. Cause and effect may be visible with hindsight but usually cannot be seen in advance. The full name for such a system is a “complex adaptive system” – any intervention changes the situation and affects the response. For example, free and fair elections are not often won by recycling the billboards or arguments from the last round, the context will have changed, and so will some of the people involved. There are no international standard guidelines to follow that provide a method to win elections every time. Linear cause and effect don’t apply overall, and the unique context has to be understood and unique context-specific solutions have to be identified and tested.

Weapons collection is typically part of a complex system which is one reason that DDR and other weapons collection programmes have been notoriously difficult: repeating what worked in one country does not guarantee success in the next post-conflict context. This is in contrast to mine clearance where eliminating the mines works everywhere, and is a one-off solution with no need to repeat the clearance. Many SALW measures require ongoing interventions, in the same way as health or road safety.

There are differences in the way that end-goals can be described. In complex situation, a description of the long-term aim may not be helpful when starting out. It may be too distant and abstract. For example, peacebuilding with the distant goal of ending violent conflict and then trying to somehow implement peace is generally less useful than identifying small moves that can be taken in the short term towards a slightly better situation. This incremental approach has increasingly been taken by the Second Generation DDR programmes. Mine clearance can proceed directly to completely mine-free land.

Many of the well-known centres with expertise in SALW, such as the Small Arms Survey, the Bonn International Centre for Conversion or PRIO have focused on analysis of the problem and intervention measures, rather than the development of any standard guidance - which has limited utility in a complex situation. This is one of the reasons why the two sectors are very different in approach and language.

However, not all small arms control measures are complex. Weapons marking and inventory,

import and export record keeping, the construction of safe storage facilities for arms and ammunition are typical examples where standard practice in the form of the IATGs and the ISACS are important. Interestingly, the current guidelines were not developed by the leading research institutes with small arms expertise. Mine action organisations with experience in the obvious domain used their expertise to develop processes. Many actions have some mixed elements: building an armoury is obvious and there are guidelines. Negotiating a dispute about which government ministry, or which armed faction gets the key to the armoury is complex. Handing the key to the wrong faction can make a conflict worse or destabilise a national government. Thus, theory of change and complexity theory explains a key difference between traditional mine action where linear solutions based on guidance works well, and small arms approaches that are analysis and research focused.

2.2.1.2 SALW stockpile management activities by organisations with a mine action background

The international presence in Afghanistan, Iraq and various peacekeeping missions in Africa required results in response to obvious problems such as surplus stocks that needed destruction or called for the construction of adequate storage facilities. Mine action organisations were well equipped to respond to this very specific and clearly defined SALW challenge in a way that few organisations with expertise in SALW were able as few had developed the technical capacity to directly handle firearms for safe transportation or in storage facilities.

Mine action organisations have a long history of offering services to address threats to civilians from conventional weapons through clearly targeted results-based interventions.⁴⁵ Over time, mine action organisations have increasingly offered their practical services in the field of weapons and ammunition destruction and safe storage. There were both opportunities and needs for mine action organisations to move into these areas to fill a skills gap and to respond to changing priorities within DDR and other interventions with a focus on armed violence reduction.

Stockpile Destruction

The move into SALW activities by mine action organisations was gradual and moved from destruction to safe storage. Banning of anti-personnel mines includes the objectives of the complete destruction of all stockpiles (Article 4). While most destruction is carried out by state militaries within their own countries, mine action organisations have assisted this process in countries where internal capacity was lacking. The international interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq created the

demand for technical experts capable of safely destroy ammunition and brought mine action organisations into the work on ammunition. Over time, some mine action organisations developed key ammunition destruction expertise that SALW project implementing agencies (like UNDP or regional organisations) never provided, because of their mandates or strategic decisions.

SALW experts working in the Western Balkans had also identified ammunition stocks as a concern at around the same time that the first mine action organisations started work on ammunition destruction. However, UNDP, which at the time was the leading organisation implementing most SALW projects in the region, decided to not expand its activities from SALW to ammunition destruction because it was technically more demanding and required different staff skills.⁴⁶ No organisation working on SALW developed the technical capacity to destroy ammunition. The involvement of mine action organisations in ammunition destruction was thus a natural progression into an area where SALW actors never developed comparable capacities due to their mandates.

Physical security and Stockpile Management (PSSM), Arms Management and Destruction (AMD) or Weapons and Ammunition Management (WAM) and Ammunition Safety Management (ASM)

Following the first contracts to destroy weapons and ammunition, mine action organisations moved project by project into safe storage activities for weapons and ammunition. Mine action organisations were chosen for these contracts usually because they offered the best technical solutions for a specific task. Overall, they filled a skill gap rather than competing with organisations from a SALW background, as there were few implementers with a SALW background who could offer such technical services. The development of safe storage facilities brought mine action organisations into a qualitatively new field of work. As anti-personnel mines are banned, storage is not part of mine action, and mine action organisations refer to the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG) to guide their work.

There is no uniform terminology to describe the storage related activities implemented by organisations with a background in mine action. The Mines Advisory Group (MAG) and Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) use the concept of Arms Management and Destruction (AMD) to describe work aimed at reducing the risk and impact of unplanned explosions at ammunition sites and the risks of weapons and ammunition being diverted into illicit trade. Other organisations prefer the term Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM) to describe their weapon and ammunition activities. The concept describes the process of assessing and improving storage sites based on safety guidelines applicable to the identified hazard level of the stored weapons or ammunition and

the expected threat from possible intruders. Operations on the ground focus on improving the physical structures (such as buildings and storage distances) to reduce the risk of uncontrolled explosions, as well as inventory and access procedures designed to protect and prevent leakage of stored weapons or ammunition. Other organisations notably the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) also use the term Weapons and Ammunition Management (WAM) to describe their work related to stockpile storage. Recently, some experts outside UNMAS have started to use the term to refer to life cycle management of weapons and ammunition that covers long-term planning for procurement, import processes, investment in logistical capabilities, the PSSM aspects as well as disposal. However, there is some debate as to whether there are the resources and the capacity to implement a life cycle management (LCM) approach. Some organisations, notably UNMAS, use the term WAM and PSSM more or less interchangeably. Finally, the GICHD performs its thematic work under the umbrella of Ammunition Safety Management (ASM), while also supporting the Swiss government's initiative on the Safe and Secure Management of Ammunition (SSMA).

The development of guidance and implementation of interventions in the field of AWD, PSSM, WAM and ASM are supported by personnel with military training and experience who are part of the staff of mine action organisations. This is an important difference to NGOs with a SALW interest and regional organisations engaged in SALW project implementation, whose staff rarely have a military background. This difference may be related to broader global trends. The emergence of mine action coincided with the downsizing of military presence in Western Europe following the fall of the Berlin Wall, which freed up military trained experts with in particular EOD background to support mine action. These individuals with years of mine action experience have been able to use their EOD background to offer services in weapons and ammunition destruction and storage that SALW sector staff could rarely offer. There are few retiring military personnel with expertise in SALW control that include international transfer regulations. Retiring MoD staff with such skills offered a wider range of career opportunities in the private weapons market sector (manufacturers, legal firms etc.). The private weapons market sectors increasingly has to navigate a more complex regulated environment and can offer considerably more lucrative employment paths compared to the opportunities available with NGOs or UN agencies. Thus, the more technical services offered by mine action organisations filled an important gap and were not a duplication of effort.

[Box 6: Mine action organisations and activities in complex systems](#)

Application of the complexity theory Part 2

Mine action organisations started work in the areas of SALW control where linear solutions and

best practice guidance can be applied for effective results. This was partly driven by donor demands who requested quick and tangible outputs.⁴⁷ Mine action organisations have made important contributions by engaging in destruction, safe transportation of ammunition and upgrades of storage facilities.

However, a number of new activities have also brought mine action organisations into complex systems - and these require a new approach and mine action organisations have learned many new skills over the past years. Armed violence reduction and prevention (AVPRP) or community safety programmes are complex. Just as with state building, they are not able to directly work towards the long-term aim of zero armed violence because it is too distant and abstract. Instead they often achieve the greatest direct results by offering local small-scale nearly-linear solutions that can deliver results in a given context. For example, in Libya, the AVPRP activities did not target weapon bearers in the attempt to persuade them to part with their arms, but instead worked through women and children suggesting practical solutions, such as to persuade their husbands and fathers to lock away the assault rifles to prevent accidents in particular among children. A small part of a complex issue was addressed with clear tangible results of reduced accidents and injuries among children in mind. Work on Psycho Social Service (PSS) is more directly within the complex domain, here the interventions focus on facilitating the identification of required measures as part of a probe, understanding and then developing solutions.

Many PSSM activities are located in the complex domain. Handing control over to the national body intended to manage the facility is never simple, predictable and routine. Strengths and weaknesses in the security sector are unique to each country, or region, and require situation specific solutions that only a complex probe- sense- and response approach can deliver. This requires more analysis and political engagement than has been required for mine action organisations focused on clearance and destruction.

Finally, the increase in mine action activities in urban environments and the debate around the use of IEDs are a further illustration of the extent to which mine action organisations are learning to navigate complex domains to find new solutions. IEDs cannot be dismantled following a single one-size-fits-all method. A probe-sense-respond approach that requires more skill and experience than standard EOD training is needed.

2.2.1.3 Armed violence reduction and community safety programmes by organisations with a mine action background

While some mine action organisations developed units for ammunition and weapons destruction and safe storage, others responded to the changing threat context by developing what was at first called armed violence reduction (AVR) and what is today more often referred to as community safety programmes. Community safety programmes address the impact of weapons proliferation on individuals and focus on activities to promote changes in attitudes and behaviours, either of potential users or potential victims. Community safety programmes are complex and can take many different entry points and foci.

Peacebuilding and Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction

The Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development (2006) was a diplomatic initiative linked to a Ministerial Summit that had brought together representatives from ministries of foreign affairs and development agencies to highlight how armed violence constitutes a major obstacle to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The aim of the Declaration was to integrate armed violence reduction and conflict prevention programmes into national, regional, and multilateral development frameworks and strategies. The Geneva Declaration advocates the inclusion of the issue of armed violence prevention and reduction within the UN system.⁴⁸ In 2008, UNDP placed community security work under the larger umbrella of democratic government and peacebuilding. UNDP projects began to reflect this new focus. The 2009 OECD DAC study on Armed Violence and the adoption of Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been important milestones in the recognition of weapon-focused activities as development measures within a broader peacebuilding agenda. Moreover, the second generation of DDR programmes also included armed violence reduction as a key component. This new framework offered opportunities for mine action organisations to include armed violence reduction components within projects funded as a ‘mine action’ activity. The Geneva Declaration concluded its mandate in 2015 with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals, which finally acknowledged the connection between (armed) violence and development.

Box 7: Understanding Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction

The focus on armed violence responds to the blurring of dividing lines between armed conflict and crime, fragility and stability, and community, national, regional and global security. Armed

violence prevention and reduction (AVPR) is a response to narrowly conceived post-conflict transition programmes of the past that tended to target specific conflict armed actors but failed to pay sufficient attention to other patterns of violence. AVPR programmes seek to reduce the risks and impacts of armed violence through-out affected societies. AVPR is a set of practices and activities that builds on existing frameworks, approaches and lessons learned in areas such as conflict prevention, peacebuilding, crime prevention and public health. Experience also underscored the ineffectiveness of top-down strategies that fail to address the security needs of communities and citizens partly because it made people subjects instead of stakeholders and active participants in the intervention.⁴⁹

The Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence has used the term armed violence prevention and reduction (AVPR) to stress that the aim is not only to remove weapons but also to increase community security to prevent further violence. The outcome of AVPR is behaviour change that can be measured through a reduction in deaths or injuries caused by armed violence.⁵⁰

Mine action organisations, started to engage with what at the time was called armed violence reduction (AVR). At the beginning AVR was often thought of as an activity, like mine risk education.

However, conceptual thinking has moved on within the mine action community. As the Danish Demining Group (DDG) clearly articulated, AVR is best understood as objective rather than an activity. It is comparable to protection of civilians, peacebuilding, rather than as an area of technical intervention. Today, as a project it is often called community security to distinguish it from older AVR concepts.

AVPR or AVR remains an area where the same or similar terminology means different things to the SALW and the mine action communities. The SALW community uses the term AVPR to refer to the concept developed by the OECD and the Geneva Declaration. The OECD distinguishes between direct and indirect AVPR. According to the OECD, direct AVPR covers arms management, collection and destruction, as well as legislative changes to control arms. Indirect AVPR addresses the factors that are the root causes of violence, which could include unemployment, infrastructure development, or addressing conflicts over resources.⁵¹ Thus for the SALW community, all SALW activities carried out by mine action organisations fall under AVPR. The mine action community, by contrast, tends to use the term AVR to refer to activities conceptually close

to mine risk education and most people with a background in mine action would be perplexed if ADM, PSSM or LCM activities would be discussed under a heading of direct AVPR.

AVPR approaches by mine action organisations and other actors in this field

Organisations with experience in mine action began to develop expertise in some aspects of armed violence reduction (AVR) at the time of the Geneva Declaration, which referred to it as Armed Violence Prevention and Reduction (AVPR). For some mine action organisations work on armed violence reduction was triggered through mine risk education. DanChurchAid (DCA) for example, began its work on armed violence reduction because recipients of mine risk education signalled that the training failed to address their broader security concerns. Since then, they have changed the terminology to 'community safety' to describe their projects and activities. Programmes aiming to improve the safety of civilians usually work through community structures and may include a dialogue with state security providers related to the way they interact with civilians. Many organisations, notably DDG and DCA, now implement Community Safety Planning programmes where the organisations function as facilitators to help communities find their own solutions to improve safety and security rather than providing solutions for people in the form of activities that would collect or destroy weapons. Many Community Safety Programmes are closely linked to risk education. Community safety programmes have also become an integrated part of peacebuilding and post-conflict confidence building measures.

The move into AVPR activities by mine action organisations occurred alongside a broader shift in focus within important agencies within the SALW sector, such as UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), as well as units within DFID and the OSCE which began to define SALW concerns as development issues. It also coincided with the emergence of Second Generation DDR projects. Organisations with varying backgrounds responded to the call to bring their expertise to the problem of armed violence reduction. Mine action organisations, like DDG, DCA and Handicap International share this arena with organisations with a background in peacebuilding,⁵² education⁵³, relief organisations,⁵⁴ as well as many community based organisations,⁵⁵ UN and regional organisations⁵⁶ and development organisations⁵⁷.

As AVPR is not an activity where past activities can simply be duplicated in different context but requires a good understanding of the local sensitivities and excellent contacts into the community, AVPR expertise has to be built new for each context. Within each country contexts there are rarely more than one or two international NGOs with the necessary local knowledge. The AVPR services by

mine action organisations, which have been delivered in a handful of country contexts where mine action had good contacts due to long-standing community based mine risk education, constituted important additional new services offered when there was a perceived need rather than duplication of activities already delivered by other organisations. There is also little sign of direct competition between different organisations as most NGOs tend to focus on the country context where they have the best existing contacts and understanding of the underlying issues.

2.2.2 Changes in the way mine action and SALW organisations interact and projects are designed

The increased focus of mine action organisations on some SALW issues has led to increased contact with SALW organisations and changes in the way SALW projects are designed.

2.2.2.1 Increasing contacts and interaction between mine action and SALW organisations

Mine action organisations often sought the support and technical input from organisations with expertise in SALW to develop better projects or to offer a wider range of services. For example, the Small Arms Survey has supported the SALW related survey work of three mine action organisations with training, logistical support and analysis in a wide range of regions or countries including Karamoja, Libya, Mali, Somaliland and South Sudan and has conducted training on SALW awareness raising upon request. The Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC) carried out an evaluation of an arms and ammunition destruction programme in Afghanistan as early as 2006.⁵⁸ In addition, there has been cooperation between the Small Arms Survey and the Mine Advisory Group (MAG) for three publications on conceptual issues around PSSM between 2011 and 2017⁵⁹ and cooperation between MAG and the Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC) on weapons destruction in Nigeria.⁶⁰ The Small Arms Survey has also been subcontracted to work on projects⁶¹ and has contacted organisations for joined project⁶² Cooperation is sometimes formalised through MoUs.⁶³ Some fora, such as the Multinational Small Arms and Ammunition Group (MSAG) provide today for a platform where organisations with a mine action and a small arms background work together.⁶⁴ Thus the increasing interaction is beginning to show signs that key actors see the need for better integration of activities and discussions around common objectives, practices and approaches.

Box 8: Synergies in Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming in Mine Action and SALW Measures

Gender as an entry point for interaction and integration

The analysis of gender consideration can be an entry point to address multiple weapon sectors.

For example, the study on Gender Mainstreaming in Armed Violence reduction (2014) considered gender mainstreaming for a range of different weapon related activities. NATO is also currently developing gender mainstreaming guidelines by providing guidance for arms control, SALW projects and mine action.

Increased interaction between mine action organisations and experts with knowledge of SALW

Since 2015, the Gender and Diversity Hub in the Maison de la paix in Geneva (gdhub.ch) brings together representatives from the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of the Armed Forces (DCAF), the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP) and the Small Arms Survey (SAS) to promote an inclusive peace and security policy, research and practice that no longer distinguishes by weapon's sector.

The international framework and standards

Gender analysis and mainstreaming in MA mine action and SALW small arms can be approached through gender instruments that are not weapon sector specific as well as through the gender dimensions of weapon-specific instruments. The 2000 United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (S/RES/1325) on women, peace and security applies across all weapon sectors but includes a specific reference to mine action by "Emphasizing the need for all parties to ensure that mine clearance and mine awareness programmes take into account the special needs of women and girls,". The most recent follow-up resolution, UNSCR 2242 of 2015, specifically refers to misuse of small arms and light weapons in the context of women, peace and security. Some national action plans developed in response to resolution 1325 focus specifically on SALW.

Weapon specific instruments also make reference to gender considerations. For example, the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) requires the exporting State Party to carry out an assessment that has to take into account the risk of the arms or items "being used to commit or facilitate serious acts of gender- based violence or serious acts of violence against women and children." The 2009 revised International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) include gender into the standards on land release and handover (IMAS 07.11;[19]) Mine Risk Education (IMAS 04.10;[20], IMAS 12.10;[21]) and non-technical surveys (IMAS 08.10;[22]). The International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) will address women, gender and small arms and light weapons in series six, which for the moment exists as a draft.

Gender sensitive SALW activities by mine action organisations

The AVPR projects looked at during this study (see box 10) showed a strong and conscious gender component. Because the security context in Libya made impossible for the AVPR projects to directly address the mainly male weapon bearers themselves, women were a key target group. In Libya the AVPR projects worked with individual women or women's groups to address both SALW awareness and spreading basic safety messages into households and the community. Libyan women also expressed the desire for more AVPR programmes to help de-radicalize their sons and to discourage taking up fighting for money.

This study did not uncover an example of where a PSSM programme made specific efforts to train or otherwise engage women in physical stockpile security. The case studies, however, included an example of a NTS team led by a woman in Libya. Interlocutors also emphasised the potential of better integration of PSSM into DDR which may offer entry points for more professional opportunities for women if women associated with fighting forces could also be offered positions within PSSM and demining activities following demobilisation.

Possible ways forward

The collection and analysis of sex and age disaggregated data is key to inform gender mainstreaming practices at programme and implementation level. It is a prerequisite to targeted and tailored programming and increased benefit. Monitoring of Sustainable Development Goal 16, Indicator 16.1.2 monitoring conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex and, age makes reference to data from small arms violence and MA /ERW. There are probably opportunities for organisations which approach the issue from a mine action or a SALW control perspective to develop better data collection practices that cover both mine/ERW and SALW injuries. This is likely to uncover more links between SALW and MA and to prevent the duplication of work. Guidance on the joint collection, analysis and use of sex and age disaggregated data that covers MA/ERW and SALW could be a good way forward.

2.2.2.2 Beginnings of integration: More frequent attempts to address MA/ERW and SALW through the same programme or project

Explosive remnants of war (ERW), mines, small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their ammunition are threats to civilians in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Their simultaneous presence suggests that effective protection for the civilian population requires that mine action, SALW control, and ammunition safety responses all be considered in the design of an effective

response. A narrow focus on only one weapon category or aspect is unlikely to deliver comprehensive safety and security. At the same time, weapon category specific approaches are required as not all SALW should be removed and implementation has to focus on adequate and effective control practices. The case studies carried out for this report (see below) have identified some typical entry points for joint MA/ERW and SALW interventions. These are: ammunition work, risk education on MA/ERW and SALW awareness, some victim assistance programmes that focus on Psycho Social Service (PSS) to address the experience of violence and support mental rehabilitation.

[SALW and ammunition destruction, safe storage and understanding the risks of unplanned explosions at ammunition sites](#)

Today, a wide range of mine action organisations will collect, transport, destroy MA/ERW including ammunition where encountered and may, where required, build safe and secure storage for ammunition using the International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG) for guidance on appropriate safety and security measures. These activities can be carried out in post-conflict and protracted conflict settings and can be part of a broader DDR process or a stand-alone activity funded by a donor or in support of broader reforms. Examples of recent interventions can be found for example in the Central African Republic⁶⁵, DRC⁶⁶, Ivory Coast⁶⁷, Mali⁶⁸ and Somalia⁶⁹, where mine action organisations are active.

SALW organisations, by contrast have developed new expertise in research, monitoring and analysis of issues connected to ammunition. For example, the Small Arms Survey monitors where unplanned explosions have taken place (see box 9) and works on issues of how to communicate the implications of technical stockpile security challenges to policymakers. They developed the handbook to assist the wider policy community in better understanding and addressing the issue.⁷⁰ Conflict Armament Research has specialised in tracing the sources of ammunition.⁷¹ In the area of ammunition and SALW destruction, transport and storage experts from both communities responded to existing concerns when they began to address ammunition. However, given their different technical expertise due to the qualitative differences between mine action and complex SALW control measures, they provide highly complementary services.

[Box 9: Database on Unplanned Explosions on Munitions Sites](#)

The Small Arms Survey's database on Unplanned Explosions at Munitions Sites (UEMS) is the most comprehensive collection of storage related accidents. The data are widely used in ammunition management forums as information serves as evidence of the dangers associated with poorly

managed stockpiles.

The UEMS database is frequently updated to include new incidents as they occur. In 2014, the Survey produced the UEMS Handbook, which provides a global review covering UEMS incidents between 1979 and 2013 and details activities of key actors.

The UEMS handbook also introduced an [incident reporting template \(IRT\)](#) to help establish systematic reporting criteria for UEMS incidents. The IRT serves to help governments, reporters or anyone investigating UEMS incidents to better document those events.

Mine risk education and SALW awareness

Where civilians are exposed to both MA/ERW and firearms, mine action projects today often include SALW components in their risk education. Risk education, which the SALW community calls SALW awareness, usually covers both mines / ERW and SALW with threat specific messages. Risk education was the first programme area where mines and SALW were addressed simultaneously. While it seemed at first cost effective and time efficient to combining awareness raising on MA / ERW and SALW within the same event or message, this proved counter-productive because it resulted in confusing messaging. The 'don't touch – inform someone' message of MA/ERW risk training designed to minimise deaths and injuries is rarely applicable to SALW risk training, which requires much more nuanced messages that take into account local culture and attitudes to firearm ownership. Moreover, in the context of weapon collection programmes, combined training can lead to dangerous behaviour. For example, in Croatia, people dug up mines to surrender them as part of the weapons collection programme.⁷²

It has now been recognized that risk or awareness messages have to be designed as separate info spots or separate training modules and should never be delivered at the same time.⁷³ They can be played by the same radio station or be delivered by the same trainer but not at the same time as a combined message. Thus mine risk education and SALW awareness are today often both included within the same project but as two specific project activities with distinct messages and dissemination strategies.

Victim Assistance

Some mine action projects now also include victim assistance to populations exposed to violence. As the example of projects from Libya shows (see Box 10), Psycho Social Services (PSS) are at times offered by mine action organisations to assist victims of violence.

Box 10: Case Study: Addressing MA/ERW and SALW risks through mine action programmes in Libya

Under the heading ‘Support to Humanitarian Mine Action and Community Safety in Libya’ the European Commission funded two projects, one by DCA⁷⁴ and one by DDG⁷⁵, that provide an interesting example of how mine action and AVPR activities can be integrated into a single programme or project. In addition, the ‘women and small arms project’ implemented by UNMAS, the Small Arms Survey and UNIDIR provides a further example of how SALW and mine action organisation work together.

The EC funded projects were designed to contribute to safety and security in Libya by reducing the threat from mines and explosive remnants of war and armed violence. The needs assessment had cleared shown that multiple weapon threats affected the safety of civilians. Explosive remnants of war (ERW) contamination is believed to be significant in Libya.⁷⁶ Surveys conducted in 2016 started to define the problem, but the scale of contamination is unknown. The Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor identified 1,004 MA/ERW casualties in 2015.⁷⁷ However, this data is not comprehensive. According to UNMAS, MA/ERW affects public infrastructure such as schools, universities and hospitals, and affects the safe return of internally displaced people (IDPs).⁷⁸ A study in mid-2015 found that over half of its key informants reported the presence of unexploded ordnance in their communities.⁷⁹

Libya is flooded with firearms in the hands of state security forces, militias and private individuals. As a result of the general feeling of insecurity, the majority of households hold weapons. A research study in 2012 found that the use of violence to force change was widely considered acceptable behaviour.⁸⁰ In 2014, a DCA study found that 95% of the interviewed people in Misrata reported SALW proliferation affected the safety of communities.⁸¹ Casualty data from Tripoli hospitals in January and June 2012 confirmed armed violence as a concern.⁸² Assessments carried out in Benghazi, Tripoli and Taraghen (south Libya) in mid-2015 identified a significant problem of armed violence.⁸³ The projects were designed to respond to the full range of security threats to the civilian population in Libya.

The projects addressed elements of MA/ERW and SALW through a project design that focused on capacity building of a range of actor with responsibilities for assisting the civilian population: a) representatives from national authorities, b) a humanitarian demining NGO, c) six other civil society organisations working on armed violence reduction (AVPR) and d) psycho social services (PSS) provided by local NGOs. The design of the projects took account of the current security context in Libya and the need for sustainability of efforts.

The projects include both mine /ERW risk and SALW awareness components. The projects worked with local media to disseminate key safety messages in separate spots that either addressed mines /ERW and SALW. The projects provided training to representatives from national authorities with responsibilities for ERW clearing and a humanitarian demining NGO teaching international standards and practices in clearance, surveying and spot tasks. These components of the projects addressed only mines and ERW. The projects further provided capacity building and small grants to local NGOs to address armed violence and SALW issues, including psycho-social services as a form of victim assistance. This work was carried out in schools, through the scouts and in IDP camps. Thus, the projects took a broad approach to addressing threats from conventional weapons but delivered them in separate and clearly targeted components that took account of the differences in problems and solutions between mine action /ERW and SALW measures. The two projects are examples of a new form of mine action projects that integrate MA/ERW and SALW measures within the same programme and project but not necessarily within the same activity.

The women and small arms project implemented by UNMAS, the Small Arms Survey and UNIDIR focuses on training women on small arms issues to turn them into actors of change for households, communities and with expertise on issues of national stockpile management. It is an example of the very practical and linear SALW risk approaches developed by mine action organisations where clear safety elements are identified and then specifically targeted through project activities. Like other AVPR projects in Libya described above, the project focused on risk education for appropriate management of weapons within the home, such as storing arms and ammunition separately, locking guns away and methods to move them when required. Conscious of the limitations of what can realistically be achieved in an insecure and unstable country like Libya where weapon reduction is not a political viable option, the project focused on making a difference in small day-to-day practices intended to limit accidents and unintended firearm use and thereby contribute to improving the safety of civilians. The project is also an interesting

example of division of labour. In this project UNMAS provided the project management, the logistical support, and the strategic guidance to achieve impact and results. The Small Arms Survey developed the content and the course material while UNIDR provide input into the framing.

2.2.2.3 National implementing structures

While many mine action organisations have moved into providing SALW related services, few national authorities have linked mine action and SALW control at a national level. Most countries where mines continue to pose a threat to civilians have established national mine action authorities and centres. According to IMAS, the national mine action authority is responsible for developing and managing the mine action programme within its national boundaries while the Mine Action Co-ordination Centres (MAC) are normally responsible for the co-ordination of all mine action activities and the provision of technical advice, accreditation, licensing and maintaining of mine action records.

Countries that have created SALW control implementation mechanisms at national level have usually established national commissions that bring together representatives from a range of different ministries such as those responsible for security (Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Interior, other specialised services such as national park rangers) and ministries with responsibilities for the well-being of citizens such as social affairs, youth or women, education, health or others. The aim of these national commissions is to design and later coordinate the implementation a complex policy aimed at changing attitudes and practices. They usually do not have responsibilities for licencing or quality control.

The existence of these two separate structures within most countries means that organisations which implement projects with a mine action and SALW element have to go through the MAC for some aspects of their projects while other components remain outside of MAC coordination.

Box 11: National coordination: The example of Mauritania

Case study by Eric Debert

There are few countries where mine action coordination is linked to SALW coordination. In the Autumn of 2016, the National Humanitarian demining programme for development (Le Programme national de déminage humanitaire pour le développement - PNDHD) in Mauritania asked the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining to carry out an evaluation of

its work and to consider at the same time whether it would make sense to incorporate responsibilities for SALW coordination into the mandate of the PNDHD. This is a very interesting example of a country seeking to better link the mine action and the SALW response.

The evaluation team met with several stakeholders from the government, the United Nations and from the donor community to seek their view about a possible expansion of the mandate of the PNDHD to work on SALW. The evaluation highlighted the relevance of a mixed national commission with responsibilities for MA/ERW and SALW supported by an operational secretariat. Many stakeholders interviewed were in favour of creating the required secretariat through an expansion of mandate for the PNDHD.

The advantages of such an approach are that the new secretariat could build on the developed expertise of the PNDHD such as an efficient existing network developed within the security organs to implement mine action. However, the evaluation also highlighted key challenges that could arrive in case of a lack of inter-ministerial coordination between different state organs with responsibility for SALW (police, army), staff fluctuation and lack of donor support.

No decisions have been taken yet as the Ministry of interior and decentralisation (MIDEC) is currently reviewing the findings of the GICHD's mission before deciding about the next step.

2.3 Concluding remarks

The decision by mine action organisations to address SALW kick-started a process of increasing interaction between mine action and SALW control programmes. This process led on the one hand to increasing interaction between organisations specialised in one or the other weapon type. There are now an increasing number of projects that address both MA / ERW either through destruction, safe and secure storage, risk education, community safety and related services. In parallel, the development of complementary expertise on ammunition took place between small arms experts and mine action organisations.

Thus, the process was generally complementary rather than overlapping. The activities by mine action organisations have added activity options to the already broad spectrum of SALW activities. While there are no signs of direct competition between mine action organisations and organisations with expertise in SALW to carry out the same tasks, competition for scarce funding occurs at the level

of core-funding for the administration of organisations. However, this is not specific to mine action and SALW control but affects all disarmament activities.

Moreover, the expansion of activities by mine action organisations has changed the mine action sector to the extent that they no longer represent a uniform or distinct sector. While few of the mine action organisations have changed their names⁸⁴, reference to mines' no longer accurately describes the scope of their operations. Besides addressing MA/ERW, mine action organisations developed two separate approaches to address SALW. Some mine action organisations have developed units with expertise in 'Armed Violence Reduction (AVPR) or community safety programmes with SALW awareness components, while other units developed expertise in ammunition or SALW destruction and safe storage. Today, there is no uniformity in approach among mine action organisations with respect to their activities outside the traditional five pillars of mine action.

Chapter 3: Challenges and opportunities for the future

The previous chapter documented the increasing interaction between MA /ERW and SALW control measures that have taken place over the past decade. This has led to more practical cooperation on the ground and the inclusion of different weapon responses within the same intervention. These approaches have evolved in response to opportunities identified on the ground mainly by mine action organisations, rather than as an attempt to coordinate different actors in support of a comprehensive post-conflict intervention strategy. The Libya case study and interviews highlight that despite the elements of interaction, there are still gaps in the response to conventional weapons threats relating to the different approaches used by the different communities.

This chapter discusses remaining challenges and opportunities to ensure further improvements in the coherence of mine action and SALW programmes. The Libya case study highlights three main challenges: (1) ensuring appropriate timing and sequencing of Mine Action/SALW interventions, (2) taking account of actor motivation and context in intervention strategies, and (3) managing tensions created by the sometimes conflicting objectives of international frameworks. The chapter also identifies opportunities to address these challenges at two levels: (1) innovations in programme management (e.g. integrated project guidance related to information sharing, data collection and evaluation tools), and (2) coordinating Mine Action and SALW interventions in support of post-conflict intervention frameworks of DDR and SSR.

3.1 Challenge 1: Getting the timing and sequencing right and ensuring appropriate coordination

The timing of MA/ ERW clearance is often not that of SALW collection and wider SALW control measures. MA/ERW clearance typically occurs soon after the end of fighting or in areas away from active combat, and at times this work is carried out when there are still armed actors close by or where the illicit arms flows pose a significant security risk. If all threats to civilian security are to be addressed simultaneous securing of ammunition stockpiles and removal of firearms in circulation would ideally be required. However, this has proven very difficult to achieve in practice. Most ERW are legacy weapons that can be cleared because they have been abandoned and most parties agree that they are a problem that should be addressed. SALW by contrast, are often highly valued in

insecure post-conflict periods because of their utility in personal protection and their resale value. Armed groups and civilians are therefore often unwilling to surrender firearms while they welcome mine and ERW clearance.

Although the beginning of mine action and SALW control often need to be programmed at different times, it is also important to identify opportunities to begin securing of damaged and abandoned ammunition stockpiles and some SALW measures as early as possible. The example from Libya demonstrated the benefits of an early focus on Armed Violence Reduction (AVPR) activities warning civilians of firearms risks. In this case the interventions targeted children and other non-user groups rather than the arms bearers themselves (see Box 10).

Identifying the right time for the construction of safe and secure ammunition and weapons storage facilities to be handed over to local security actors is a difficult decision in fragile states that have experienced conflict. It is often difficult to identify a reliable and legitimate partner for PSSM safe and secure storage activities because many actors remain implicated in complex power relations, and decisions on who to entrust with weapons storage may interfere with local dynamics. In unstable environments without a strong central security provider, there is a real risk that safe and secure weapons or ammunition storage sites may be overrun by armed actors, including terrorist groups. Moreover, when conflict parties remain under weapons embargo, it would be a breach of international sanctions to hand over responsibility for weapons storage to local actors, including the government. Some of these dangers are illustrated by Libya case study. (See box 12)

In addition, coordination of mine action and SALW can be challenging in particular when the programmes follow different time schedules in post conflict context. Moreover, because they are guided by different normative frameworks and utilise different approaches and guidelines, the absence of a common framework leads to ad hoc coordination. Often mine action organisations implementing projects on weapon or ammunition stocks have not read the more academic analytical literature prepared by small arms experts (see box 13).

Box 12: Libya Case on PSSM activities

The international assistance provided to Libya after the overthrow of Colonel Gaddafi in 2011 is an example of new thinking in support of an integrated or comprehensive arms control approach that combines MA / ERW and SALW under a stabilization framework. The language of the mandate of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) changed each year, but

generally recognized that MA/ERW and SALW both needed to be addressed.⁸⁵

In the first years after the fall of the Gaddafi regime, internationally supported actors carried out battle area clearance, identified abandoned ammunition and provided risk education, which included small arms awareness. Some of the dangerous ammunition was destroyed while others were stored in purpose built Ammunition Storage Areas (ASA).

These programmes operated in a challenging context where Libya lacked a fully functioning state. There was no effective army or police. Local actors, usually military councils or revolutionary brigades seized power at local level. Most ASA were handed over to the local actor in control of the area. The ad hoc security patchwork provided temporary stability, but rapidly became a contributing factor fuelling local conflicts. Over time the political and security context deteriorated and international actors left Libya. Some closed their programmes while others continued to operate by managing their programmes remotely from Tunisia.

In December 2015, the Libyan Political Agreement was signed with the intention to bring about a single government. According to the observations by the International Crisis Group⁸⁶, it is now clear that the agreement reconfigured rather than resolved internal strife. Military actors continued to seek to gain more power and control. For example, fighters from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS) seized the town of Sirte in March 2015. During the autumn of 2016, a coalition of western Libyan militias operating with US support retook Sirte. At the same time, the army of General Hafta, opposed to Libya's unity government, took control of key installations in the Libyan oil crescent.⁸⁷

The field visit to Tunisia in January 2017 provided a snapshot of current thinking within the international community. There were discussions about providing IEDD for Sirte; but there was no consensus between the international, Libyan and UN actors whether this should be carried out by international commercial companies, the Libyan army or INGOs. Non-technical surveys and spot tasks were carried out under the supervision of the LibMac in various parts of the country. A tender was put out for the destruction of ammunition found in one of the ASA sites that had been badly looted by unknown actors. Risk education programmes with SALW components were carried out in various locations. The UNDP-run stabilisation facility had integrated non-technical surveys (NTS) into its work schedule around key buildings they were planning to rehabilitate. However, plans for further SALW or ammunition or weapon storage sites are frozen until the

security and political context in Libya will allow them.

The example of Libya shows possible entry points for an approach under a common framework but equally highlights that SALW control projects are difficult if not impossible to implement in the absence of a legitimate government with control over the whole territory. Moreover, the continuation of the weapons embargo places clear restrictions on what activities can be carried out with the government.

3.2 Challenge 2: Understanding the context and actor motivations

Unlike mine action and mine and ERW clearance, which can follow the international mine action standards, the approach for SALW collection must be designed on a case-by-case basis that is carefully adapted to the local context (see boxes 4 and 5 on complexity theory). In order to persuade people to hand over their weapons it is essential to offer the right incentives, and this requires an understanding of peoples' motivations to hold weapons, which reflects a wide variety of cultural, social, economic, political and security considerations. This requires considerable investment in analytical support, and programme preparation and a different type of response that probes rather than follows standards.

Box 13: Small Arms related literature on Libya

At the time when mine action organisations engaged in battle area clearance, identification of left behind ammunitions and construction of purpose built Ammunition Storage Areas, the Small Arms Survey assessed the Small Calibre Ammunition found in Libya in a study⁸⁸, an assessment of armed groups and their roles which concluded that 'understanding the different histories, objectives, and capabilities of existing non-state armed groups has important ramifications for policy-makers. While some groups continue to present a threat to stability, others are playing an active role in securing the country's future. Effective international policy needs to recognize these distinctions.'⁸⁹

However, discussion with stakeholders suggested that this literature, along with other studies that described armed groups⁹⁰ and weapon trafficking patterns⁹¹ was not widely consulted by implementing mine action organisations.

The actual infrastructure upgrade for ammunition and weapon storage facilities includes aspects that are best addressed following good standards on appropriate safety and security regulation. Deciding where to build the storage facility is a complicated decision that requires an assessment by an experienced team. To make the safe storage practices sustainable, most PSSM activities have to involve a training element to build the capacity of the responsible actor to manage and maintain the storage site. This assumes that a legitimate and competent security sector is in place. It has therefore been suggested that PSSM activities should draw on a 'wider SSR framework.'⁹² A recent study that looked at the Integrating SSR and SALW programming⁹³ provided an important insight (that seems equally applicable to the weapons control measures under the PSSM activities) when it warned that 'the failure to recognize the symbiotic relationship [between SSR and SALW] (...) could in turn do harm to the wider goals of the peacebuilding and state-building projects of which they are parts.'⁹⁴ It will therefore be important that all actors who engage in safe and secure storage facility building carry out conflict context analysis and adhere to the principle of not doing harm.

3.3 Challenge 3: Managing tensions within international frameworks driven by conflicting objectives

The discussion in the past chapter showed that while there are today some overarching intervention frameworks, such as the UNSMIL mandate for Libya, that clearly recognize the need to address MA/ERW, SALW and ammunition through a security strategy, there continue to be conflicting interests that make it challenging for implementers of weapon intervention programmes to navigate. Different actors and agencies, both foreign and domestic, often have different agendas on the ground. Some actors are primarily driven by humanitarian objectives, while others are concerned to advance a counter-terrorism agenda or to secure their particular political position. Finding the resources to overcome these political and practical obstacles to a comprehensive approach is very challenging and requires good analysis and flexibility in approach that ensures key actors stay on board.

3.4 Opportunities

These challenges are likely to shape the future collaboration of mine action and SALW control. However, there are numerous opportunities to address existing gaps, which are outlined in the following paragraphs.

3.4.1 Coordination framework for mine action and SALW control

Given the important differences in normative frameworks, international standards, most effective approaches, and specific skills required combined with the fact that most coordination is ad hoc, there are opportunities to improve coordination and implementation. This could occur through the development of a common coordination framework that specifies the differences, synergies and key areas for collaboration and also clearly highlights the areas where joined projects are unlikely to work.

Such a framework would have to take into account all levels of project implementation. There is a need for a standard global and general guidance document that outlines the factors and elements to consider in a coordination framework for MA/ERW and SALW measures. Such guidance would then have to be applied in appropriate forms in country contexts where the day-to-day coordination will take place.

3.4.2 Improved Country level coordination among international actors

There are opportunities to learn from the established practices within the mine action community to improve coordination at country level. In comparison to many other sectors, mine action is often relatively well coordinated. Mine action actors are used to taking part in regular meetings, sharing information and carrying out tasks in support of a national strategy or priorities set by a national mine action centre. However, activities outside of the five pillars of mine action, such as AVR, PSSM/WAM are often not considered to fall under the responsibility of the mine action centre and its coordination function. In the case of Libya, such activities were nonetheless mentioned at the existing mine action coordination meetings. Because of the wider focus of mine action coordination meetings in Libya, they were also attended by representatives of other agencies, such as UNDP. In the case of Libya, UNDP had been mandated to oversee the rehabilitation of civilian infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools, and attended the meetings to coordinate the mine action activities required in relation to their rehabilitation activities. The existing mine action coordination structures provide opportunities for further coordination that could include some of the more obvious SALW control measures where appropriate. In the long-term it might also be worth considering other coordinating mechanisms specifically dedicated to addressing conventional weapon threats that are more adapted to the complex and highly political environment of many SALW control measures.

3.4.3 Better project design guidance and evaluation tools

There are opportunities to develop guidance and share existing information on how to design integrated programmes linking elements of MA/ERW and SALW response. There have been numerous projects over the past ten years providing substantial insight into good practice. However, this experience is not often compiled and shared in order to improve the design on new projects. There are no standard evaluation tools to enable an assessment of the level of integration between MA/ERW and SALW control measures, the benefits or unintended consequences. Moreover, there is no standard guidance on evaluating WAM, AMD or PSSM and armed violence reduction or community safety programmes. There are also opportunities to support better distribution of available analysis of political contexts to mine action organisations where they operate. However, there are beginnings. For example, the annual results-based management workshop at the Maison de la paix is a starting point in this direction.

3.4.4 Joint data collection and information sharing

Mine action has developed detailed guidance on data collection and information management. SALW researchers have also developed various tools for household surveys and other mechanism to assess the extent of weapons proliferation and or attitudes to firearm use and ownership. Non-technical surveys are frequently carried out in post-conflict setting by mine action organisations. If standard guidance on key SALW related questions would be developed and made available through mine action networks, this tool could be extended to help to gather data on broader threats (see also sex and age disaggregated data in box 8).

There may also be opportunities to consider joined information management systems to record key data.

3.4.5 Opportunities to link to the evolving DDR and SSR agenda

Many of the SALW activities developed by mine action organisations appear to be in line with the Second Generation DDR programmes, which attempt to intervene in situations where the preconditions for traditional DDR are not yet in place.⁹⁵ There is a particular role for mine action organisations which moved into the field of community safety and AVPR to conduct early SALW initiatives in order to prepare the ground for weapons collection programmes through AVPR programmes. Moreover, MA/ERW clearance also supports the creation of a favourable environment

for disarmament and blends with obvious activities such as the destruction of abandoned or seized ammunitions and weapons.

Moreover, as the recent study on integrating security sector reform (SSR) and SALW control pointed out, 'advancing SALW can play a vital role in justifying and legitimizing SSR.'⁹⁶ The Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS) also see SALW control measures as an entry point for SSR⁹⁷ Therefore, PSSM SALW control measures can equally be regarded as supporting laying the ground work for SSR, however, they are as yet rarely mentioned in the relevant documents. There is an opportunity to explore how PSSM SALW control measures could be integrated into SSR in a way which takes account of the local context and the risk of doing harm to the peacebuilding process.

Conclusion

This report started with the finding from a 2006 study that observed that synergies between the SALW and the MA/ERW sectors had been limited.⁹⁸ This study has documented an evolution in practices by several actors since 2006, in particular the expansion of activities of mine action organisations and the deliberate steps they have taken to include ammunition and SALW destruction as part of their work.

The 2006 report noted that no examples were uncovered where donors were actively seeking to link mine action with SALW funding with the exception of the NATO Partnership for Peace Trust Fund. This situation has also changed considerably. A few years ago, the United States merged mine action and SALW support under the Conventional Weapons Program. Moreover, there are UN mandates that place mines ERW, ammunition and SALW responses under the same stabilisation umbrella. At least two major organisations, UNDP and ICRC, have moved away from organising their interventions around a focus on the weapon but have moved to more integrated approaches that focus on the harmful impact of weapons and the humanitarian or development objective they want to achieve. Some national authorities are considering integrating mine action and SALW control within their national structures.

The 2006 study identified the disposal of SALW and mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW), and SALW awareness and mine risk education as the areas with the greatest potential for synergies. The review of changes reported by people interviewed for this study confirmed that on an operational level these areas have indeed proven to be the entry points for the beginning of integration of mine action and SALW control into the same programme or project. However, the process has moved considerably further. Mine action organisations now engage not only in disposal of ammunition and SALW alongside MA/ERW, but have also moved into the provision of safe and secure storage. By doing so, they have entered a SALW/ ammunition control rather than destruction activity. In a second stream of work, some mine action organisations are today offering community safety programmes aiming to reduce armed violence as part of the broader new agenda on responding to the complex realities of post-conflict societies. This also includes approaches to Psycho Social Services (PSS) that could be regarded as a form of victim assistance.

The developments over the past years have changed the once clearly defined weapon sectors of mine action to the extent that it no longer seems accurate to describe them as a uniform 'mine

action' sector. Collectively, mine action organisations continue to implement the five pillars of mine action using the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) for three of them. However, outside of the core of mine action, different mine action organisations that have diversified into new areas guide their action by either looking to the International Ammunition Technical Guidance (IATG) and International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) or to the armed violence reduction framework.

Organisations with an expertise in SALW are diverse. Some larger international organisations (e.g. NATO, UNDP, ICRC) and many regional organisations (SEESAC, UNILIREC, RECSA, ECOWAS) implement SALW projects. Many research organisations with an interest in disarmament, conflict or peace research cover SALW issues as one of their mandate areas. Within SALW work, there has always been a degree of division of labour with research institutes carrying out the research, analysis and evaluation which organisations like UNDP and regional organisations have used to inform and underpin their practical activities. The developments of the past years have brought fewer structural changes to the work of organisations with expertise in SALW. Research organisations with expertise in SALW have extended their cooperation and support to mine action organisations engaged in SALW project implementation and some regional organisations engaged in SALW projects have subcontract mine action organisations for specific tasks in the implementation of a SALW project.

Today, there are frequent and regular contacts between organisations with a background in mine action when they implement SALW projects and SALW research organisations. The interviews carried out for this study showed that broadly speaking there is a considerable degree of complementarity in the expertise on SALW control measures between organisations with a background in mine action and SALW rather than duplication or competition. Mine action organisation developed new services in destruction and safe storage of weapons and ammunition that international entities with a track-record in SALW projects never offered. Competition for scarce resources in the area of destruction and safe and secure storage occurs mainly between mine action organisations themselves or between different UN entities. UN or regional organisations which implement SALW projects tend to focus on policy work or may subcontract mine action NGOs to help with specific tasks. In the field of implementation of projects that seek to reduce armed violence reduction, mine action organisations compete more with organisations with a background in peace-building or education, rather than SALW research organisations. SALW research organisations tend to bring specific policy or legal backgrounds to the cooperation with mine action organisations.

However, this report was mainly based on the experiences and activities reported by interlocutors who worked for international or global organisations rather than national authorities. As their part of the story remains largely absent from this report, further work will need to be done to include their diverse perspectives into the larger picture.

Overall, this study finds that the development of interaction have been more beneficial than problematic. Explosive remnants of war (ERW), mines, small arms and light weapons (SALW) and their ammunition are threats to civilians in post-conflict contexts. Their simultaneous presence suggests that mine action, SALW control as well as ammunition safety responses are all required for the protection of civilians. While in 2013, it was still asked whether the increasing engagement in SALW control measures by mine action organisations could be considered ‘mission creep’⁹⁹, most interlocutors spoken to during this study accepted the process as given and few expressed critical concerns.

Today, there are examples of projects and programmes, mainly run by mine action organisations that include mine action /ERW and SALW control components. While the MA/ERW and SALW as sectors are not formally integrated, there is an increasing number of programmes and projects that gather experience and lessons learned of how MA/ERW and SALW activities can be integrated on an operational level. Most of these projects show that MA/ERW and SALW are best treated as complementary components of a wider strategy. Combining MA/ ERW and SALW within the same activity does not usually deliver the desired results as the context of interventions remains different even when both threats are present within the same environment. However, there are few documents that record these valuable lessons learned. A framework document to bring together the existing knowledge and helps to improve coordination could be beneficial.

Despite the increasing number of examples of comprehensive mandates and some well-designed programmes and project, there are still challenges managing the sequencing and approach of mine/ERW clearance, SALW collection and DDR programmes. Mine/ERW clearance and increasingly IED clearance are more and more often carried out soon after fighting ends. This clearance can be carried out at a time when it is too early to design a comprehensive weapon collection or DDR programme. However, by disposing of abandoned ammunition and weapon stocks, mine action is making a first contribution to improving stability that should be more consciously harnessed in the preparation for larger interventions. The design of DDR and SSR programmes are more complex and will require more time.

Secondly, it will be important to provide clearer guidance on when and in which contexts it is appropriate to build safe and secure storage of ammunition and weapons for security actors other than UN peace-keepers. The complexities of instable post-conflict contexts may require that hand-over of facilities should always be linked to SSR and not considered a stand-alone activity. There are opportunities to advance addressing these challenges through better integration of the PSSM/AMD/WAM concepts as key elements of Second Generation DDR programmes and SSR.

However, this study also confirmed the finding from the 2006 report that efforts to address the harmful effects of SALW are highly complex. Application of a theory of change may explain why standardized approaches in SALW control measures may not lead to the desired result. However, the review here also showed that there are areas of SALW control that fall into a more linear model of theory of change where cause and effect are clear and standard guidance can be applied to achieve results. Construction of safe and secure storage facilities as well as weapon marking and inventory and important and export record keeping are also areas where standard practice in the form of standard guidance's like the IATGs and the ISACS can achieve good results. There are particular opportunities in these areas for mine action organisations to contribute to a result-orientated problem approach.

The review of the changes over the past 10 years also showed that the process of integration of specific MA/ERW and SALW components has been gradual and benefited from interaction and mutual learning. There are opportunities to take this further by looking at practical issues relating to data sharing, evaluation tools as well as coordination guidance in affected countries. This is likely to change how projects are designed and implemented and can support a broader framework for coordination and integration of mine action /ERW and SALW control measures.

Annexes

Annex 1: Bibliography

- Alusala, Nelson. 2016. Lessons from Small Arms and Weapons Control Initiatives in Africa. BICC Working Paper. <https://www.bicc.de/uploads/tx_bicctools/wp_1_2016.pdf>
- Ana Leao, 2004. Weapons in Mozambique. Reducing Availability and Demand. Institute for Security Studies. <<https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/118339/94%20FULL.pdf>>
- AOAV. 2015. Unacceptable Harm: AOAV's Explosive Violence Monitor 2015 <<https://aoav.org.uk/2016/unacceptable-harm-aoavs-explosive-violence-monitor-2015/>>
- Aryani, Dwita and Dominika Ziemczonek 2014. Gender Mainstreaming in Armed Violence Reduction: Gaps and Opportunities. The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies Gender and Mine Action Programme. December 2014. <http://www.gmap.ch/fileadmin/ARS_projects/GMAP_ARS_FINAL_REPORT.pdf>
- BBC. 2006. 'Iraq arms 'leaking to insurgents'. 23. May 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/file_on_4/5006196.stm>
- Berman, Eric G. and Mihaela Racovita. 2015 Under Attack and Above Scrutiny? Arms and Ammunition Diversion from Peacekeepers in Sudan and South Sudan, 2002-14. HSBA Working Paper 37, July. Geneva: Small Arms Survey. <<http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/fileadmin/docs/working-papers/HSBA-WP37-Peacekeeper-Diversions.pdf>>
- Berman, Eric G. and Mihaela Racovita. 2013. Diversion of Weapons within Peace Operations: Understanding the Phenomenon. GCSP Policy Paper 2013/8. Geneva: Geneva Centre for Security Policy. 9 December. <<http://www.gcsp.ch/News-Knowledge/Publications/Diversion-of-Weapons-within-Peace-Operations-Understanding-the-Phenomenon>>.
- Berman, Eric G. and Mihaela Racovita. 2015. Diversion of Arms and Ammunition in Peace Operations: Observations based on Missions in Sudan and South Sudan, September 2015. Research Note No. 54, Armed Actors. <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-54.pdf>
- Bevan, James and Benjamin King. 2013. Making a Mark Reporting on Firearms Marking in the RECSA Region. Small Arms Survey Special Report. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/C-Special-reports/SAS-SR19-Making-a-Mark-RECSA.pdf>>
- Keeley, Bob, 2005. Assessing the Compatibility of SALW Awareness and MRE. SEESAC Working Paper. <<https://www.ciaonet.org/catalog/14241>>
- Chives.C.J. 2010. 'Arming Both Sides: The Perils of Ammunition Leakages in the Afghan War.' New York Times. 22 February 2010. <https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/22/arming-both-sides-the-perils-of-ammunition-leakage-in-the-afghan-war/?_r=0>
- Conflict Armament Research. 2012. The Distribution of Iranian Ammunition in Africa or Rebel forces in Northern Mali. <<http://www.conflictarm.com/publications/>>
- Daan Redlinghuys. 2013, Meeting of Experts Protocol V, ERW. <[http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/A1FA966FDCB4043EC1257B560049C764/\\$file/2013_PV_GPMs_MAG.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/A1FA966FDCB4043EC1257B560049C764/$file/2013_PV_GPMs_MAG.pdf)>

Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. <[http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA and SALW_Oct2006.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf)>

GICHD.2012. Mine Action and Armed Violence Reduction.Côte d'Ivoire Case Study. <<https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/157199/AVPR-Cote-d-Ivoire-case-study-Sep2012.pdf>>

Henckaerts, Jean-Marie and Louise Doswald-Beck.2005. Customary International Humanitarian Law. <<https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/customary-international-humanitarian-law-i-icrc-eng.pdf>>

Houliat, Philippe.2014. 'Surplus SA/LW Destruction Project in Mauritania' in The Journal of ERW and Mine Action. Issue 18.2. Sommer 2014. <<https://www.jmu.edu/cisr/journal/18.2/feature/houliat.shtml>>

ICG. 2016. The Libyan Political Agreement: Time for a Reset. Report No 170 Middle East and North Africa, 4 November 2016. <<https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/north-africa/libya/libyan-political-agreement-time-reset>>

Jenzen-Jones, N.R. 2013. The Headstamp Trail: An Assessment of Small-calibre Ammunition Found in LibyaMay 2013. Working Paper No. 16, <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP16-Headstamp-Trail-Ammunition-Libya.pdf>>, followed by updates in December 2013 <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-Dispatch2-Libya-Ammunition.pdf>>

Kartas, Moncef. 2013. On the Edge? Trafficking and Insecurity at the Tunisian–Libyan Border, December 2013. Working Paper No. 17 <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP17-Tunisia-On-the-Edge.pdf>>

Killiot, Phillip. 2007. 'Weaponomics: The Global Market for Assault Rifles' Post Conflict Transitions, Working Paper No 10. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4202. April 2007. <<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/266561468141574815/pdf/wps4202.pdf>>

King, Benjamin, Brian McQuinn, Claudia Navas Caputo, and Alonso Tobon 2013. Ad Hoc Arsenal: PSSM Practices of Selected Non-state Actors, May 2013. Armed Actors Issue Brief No. 2.

King, Benjamin. 2011. Safer Stockpiles: Practitioners' Experiences with Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM) Assistance Programmes. Small Arms Survey Occasional Paper 27, <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/about-us/highlights/highlight-safer-stockpiles.html>>

Lacher, Wolfram. 2014. Libya's Fractious South and Regional Instability, by Wolfram Lacher, February 2014. Security Assessment in North Africa Dispatch No. 3 <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-Dispatch3-Libyas-Fractuious-South.pdf>>

Littlejohn, Gary.2015. Secret Stockpiles Arms Caches and Disarmament Efforts in Mozambique. Small Arms Survey Working Paper. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP21-Secret-Stockpiles.pdf>>

Mag International. 2015. Practical Disarmament Initiative: Stockpile Management & Diversion Prevention Workshop Outcome Summary. <<http://www.maginternational.org/download/55701388af550/>>

McQuinn, Brian 2012. After the Fall: Libya's Evolving Armed Groups, October 2012. Working Paper No. 12 <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP12-After-the-Fall-Libya.pdf>>

McQuinn, Brian. 2012. Armed Groups in Libya: Typology and Roles, June 2012. Research Note No. 18, Armed Actors <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-18.pdf>

Naidoo, Sharmala. 2013. 'Mission creep or responding to wider security needs? The evolving role of mine action organisations in armed violence reduction'. International Journal of Security and Development. <www.stabilityjournal.org/10.53334/sta.av>

OECD. 2009. Conflict and Fragility Armed Violence Reduction. Enabling Development. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/armed%20violence%20reduction.pdf>

Sedra, Mark and Geoff Burt. 2016. Integrating SSR and SALW Programming. SSR Paper 16. <http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Integrating-SSR-and-SALW-Programming>

SEESAC. 2008. Development and implementation of SALW Awareness programmes. RMDS/G 06.10 5th Edition. <<http://www.poa-iss.org/KIT/Development%20and%20implementation%20of%20SALW%20Awareness%20programmes.pdf>>

Small Arms Survey. 2008. 'Arsenals Adrift. Arms and Ammunition Diversion.' <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/A-Yearbook/2008/en/Small-Arms-Survey-2008-Chapter-02-EN.pdf>>

Small Arms Survey. 2016. Monitoring Trends in Violent Deaths. Research Note No. 59. <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-59.pdf>

Spleeters, Damien. 2013. FAL Rifles in Libya: A Guide to Data Gathering, July 2013. Security Assessment in North Africa Dispatch No. 1 <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-dispatch1-FN-FAL.pdf>>

UNDPKO.2010. Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Practices in Peace Operations. A Contribution to the New Horizon Discussion on Challenges and Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping. <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/2GDDR_ENG_WITH_COVER.pdf>

UNIDIR. 2014. Weapons and Ammunition Management in the Federal Republic of Somalia. <<http://www.unidir.org/files/publications/pdfs/weapons-and-ammunition-management-in-the-federal-republic-of-somalia-en-608.pdf>>

UNIDIR. 2015. Weapons and Ammunition Management (WAM) in Somalia: Preliminary findings CCW Protocol V, Meeting of Experts Generic Preventative Measures 8 April 2015. <[http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/C05DBDB38D4DA92CC1257E21005A52E5/\\$file/UNIDIR+CCW+Prt+5+Meeting+of+Experts+-+Somalia+briefing+Final.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/C05DBDB38D4DA92CC1257E21005A52E5/$file/UNIDIR+CCW+Prt+5+Meeting+of+Experts+-+Somalia+briefing+Final.pdf)>

United Nations Disarmament Yearbook.2007. Volume 32 (Part II) <<https://unoda-web.s3-accelerate.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/assets/HomePage/ODAPublications/Yearbook/2007/PDF/DY2007-web3.pdf>>

UNSC (UN Security Council). 2009. Report of the Secretary-General on the African Union– United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur. S/2009/83 of 10 February.

Wille, Christina. 2005. European Union Assistance on curbing small arms and light weapons in the Kingdom of Cambodia: A case study on European action on SALW under the CFSP. In The European Union and Small Arms Action. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Annex 2: List of key resources

Arms Trade Treaty (ATT)

<https://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/att/>

Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/UseOfForceAndFirearms.aspx>

Firearms Protocol

https://treaties.un.org/doc/source/RecentTexts/18-12_c_E.pdf

International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG)

<https://www.un.org/disarmament/un-safeguard/>

Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS)

<http://www.unndr.org/iddrs.aspx>

International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)

<https://www.mineactionstandards.org/>

International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS)

<http://www.smallarmsstandards.org>

International Small Arms and Ammunition Guidance Platform (ISAP)

<http://www.unidir.org/programmes/conventional-weapons/international-small-arms-and-ammunition-guidance-platform-isap-ii-a-platform-to-explore-options-to-strengthen-arms-and-ammunition-management>

International Tracing Instrument (ITI)

http://www.poa-iss.org/InternationalTracing/ITI_English.pdf

Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer or anti-personnel mines and their destruction (Mine Ban Treaty)

<https://unoda-web.s3-accelerate.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/assets/media/8DF9CC31A4CA8B32C12571C7002E3F3E/file/APLC%2BEnglish.pdf>

Mine Action Review

<http://www.mineactionreview.org>

Sustainable Development Goals

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/>

Unplanned Explosions at Munitions Sites (UEMS)

Database Unplanned Explosions at Munitions Sites

<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/weapons-and-markets/stockpiles/unplanned-explosions-at-munitions-sites.html>

Handbook on Unplanned Explosions at Munitions Sites

<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/Q-Handbooks/HB-03-UEMS/SAS-HB03-UEMS-Intro-Part-I.pdf>

UN documents: Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus

General Assembly Resolution. 2008. A/RES/63/61

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/63/61

UN documents: Promoting development through the reduction and prevention of armed violence

General Assembly Resolution. 2008. A/RES/63/23

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/63/23

Report by the Secretary General. 2009. A/64/228

<http://www.genevadeclaration.org/fileadmin/docs/UNSG-Report-Armed-Violence.pdf>

United Nations Programme of Action

<https://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/salw/programme-of-action/>

Annex 3: People consulted in the preparation of this report

Alain Lapon; EESAC, UNDP
Alvazzi, Anna; Director of Programmes, Small Arms Survey
Atwood, David; Consultant
Baud, Jacques; NATO
Beneden, Tom Van; Partnership for Peace Consultant, NATO Support and Procurement Agency
Berman, Eric; Director, Small Arms Survey
Boer, Roos; Policy Advisor Security and Disarmament, PAX
Bold, Mikael; Advisor, National Mine Action Standards, GICHD
Bonnet, Marc; Head, Risk Management, GICHD
Boulter, Richard; Weapons and Ammunition Management Advisor, UNMAS
Bray, Nick; Capabilities Director, HALO Trust
Brehm, Maya; Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
Bromley, Mark; Co-Director, Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Calza Bini, Arianna; Gender and Mine Action Programme
Carapic, Jovana; Gender Focal Point, Small Arms Survey
Carlson, Khristopher; Senior Researcher, Project Coordinator Human Security Baseline Assessment for Sudan and South Sudan, Small Arms Survey
Chayer, Amelie; Government Liaison and Policy Manager, International Campaign to Ban Landmines - Cluster Munition Coalition, ICBL-CMC
De Martino, Luigi; Operations Coordinator, Small Arms Survey
Florquin, Nicolas; Senior Researcher, Research Coordinator, Small Arms Survey
Gasser, Russell; Independent consultant
Giezendanner, Hardy; Researcher, ISAP, UNIDIR
Guilbert, Gerald; Deputy Director Programs, WRA, United States
Hall, Tammy; Head Danish Demining Group, DDG
Jones, Llewelyn; MAG
Juregenson, Olaf; UNDP
Keeley, Robert; Chief Technical Advisor, Danish Demining Group (DDG)
King, Ben; Small Arms Survey
Loughran, Chris; Director of Policy & Evaluation, Mine Advisory Group, MAG
MacCormac, Richard; Head of Mine Action / Safer Communities, DanChurchAid
Masseberg, Asa; Advisor, Strategy, Transition and Development, GICDH
Mathis, Anina; Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland
McCarthy, Patrick; Small Arms Standards, United Nations Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA)
Mukahhal, Sulaiman; Advisor, Information Management, GICHD
Naidoo, Sharmala; DDG
O'Reilly, Clare; Mine Action Development Officer at Handicap International
Parker, Sarah; Senior Researcher, Institutional Partners Coordinator, Small Arms Survey,
Paunila, Samuel; Advisor, Ammunition Operations, GICHD
Perkins, Robert; Control Arms
Peugeot, Frederic; NATO
Prins, Daniel; Chief, Conventional Arms Branch, UN Office for Disarmament
Pritchard, Stephen; Programme Officer – Operations, UN Mine Action Service
Prizeman, Katherine; Political Affairs Office, Conventional Arms Branch, UN Office for Disarmament
Redelinghuys, Daan; MAG
Reeves, Jennifer; Consultant Elveras
Regimbal, Melanie; UNLIREC
Risser, Hans; NPA

Sauvage, Emmanuel; Head of Armed Violence Reduction Technical Unit, Handicap International
Schluchter, Anna-Lena; Gender Officer, GICHD
Sedra, Mark; Director Centre for Security Governance
Sekkenes, Sara; UNDP
Slijper, Frank; Policy Adviser Arms Trade, PAX
Stephenson, James; AVPR, DDG
Sutherland, Flora; Office of Rule of Law and Security Institution, UNMAS
Taslidžan Al-Osta, Alma; Arms Advocacy Manager, HI Belgium
Tollefsen, Erik; ICRC
Wilkinson, Adrian; Explosive Capabilities Limited, UN Expert Panel on Yemen
Wilson, Matthew; Swiss Foundation for Mine Action
Zverzhanovski, Ivan; Coordinator, SEESAC, UNDP

Libya Case Study

Baker, Shukri; Head of Finance and Administration, Free Fields Foundation (3E), Libyan HMANGO
Turšič, Roman; International Trust Fund, (ITF) Head of Implementation Office Libya/Afghanistan
Barr, Lauren; Conflict Advisor/Libya Team Lead, Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, Embassy United States of America to Libya
Barthes, Anne; Handicap International, Programme Manager, Libya
Castro, Craig; Stabilisation Facility, UNDP, Libya
Chang, Dean Chang; Political Military Officer, Special Assistant to Ambassador, Embassy United States of America to Libya
Dakovic, Damir; International Trust Fund, (ITF) Project Officer Libya
Elaeish, Ibrahim; Forensics Police Libya, Misrata (recipient of EOD training)
Elasabi, Monib; Flame of the Capital DCA 'AVPR' Partner, Tripoli.
Graziotti, Piergiorgio; EU Delegation Libya
Grimsley, Paul; UNMAS Libya, Chief of Arms and Ammunition
Gunanayagam, Maxmillan; IMSMA Manager, DDG, Libya
Hamidi, Khaled; PSS Network Libya
Jawshi, Rabieh Jawashi; Director, Free Fields Foundation (3E), Libyan HMANGO
Joseph, Podrasky; Programme/ Operations Manager, DDG, Libya
Khaled, Khaled; UNICEF, Child Protection Manager, Libya
Kosewsky, Lutz; Programme/Operations Manager, DDG, Libya
Malin, Lance; UNMAS, Libya, Programme Manager
Malti, Najat; Nana Maren, DCA 'AVPR' Partner in Libya
Mhamdi, Bisma; Cooperation Officer, Embassy of Federal Republic of Germany
Miftah, Muez; National Safety Authority Libya, Tripoli
Monaque, Xavier; Military Advisor, Security Institutions Division, UNSMIL
Ogilvy, Graeme; Programme Manager, DCA, Tunis
Owen, Helen; Head of Libya Programmes, British Embassy to Libya
Salih Said, Mohammed; UNDP, Libya
Shalghoum, Ahmed; Policy Officer, Libya, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands,
Tasala, Sanna; UNDP, New York
Turjoman, Mohammed; Colonel, Libyan Mine Action Center, Director
Ziyani, Omar Ziyani; International Trust Fund, Libya based Project Officer

Endnotes

- ¹ Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf
- ² Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf, p.3
- ³ Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf
- ⁴ Of the 58 people interviewed outside of the Libya response, 24 can be considered to have had a SALW background, 25 a mine action background and nine had experience in interventions or policy work in both areas.
- ⁵ Small Arms Survey. 2016. Monitoring Trends in Violent Deaths.
- ⁶ <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/index.php?id=296>>
- ⁷ <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/about-us/highlights/2016/highlight-rn59.html>>
- ⁸ AOAV. 2015. Unacceptable Harm: AOAV's Explosive Violence Monitor 2015. <https://aoav.org.uk/2016/unacceptable-harm-aoavs-explosive-violence-monitor-2015/>
- ⁹ According to the Small Arms Survey, an average of 535'000 people were killed violently every year between 2010 and 2015 and around 70 percent of the global burden of violent deaths is attributable to homicides, many of which due to firearms (see Small Arms Survey. 2016. Monitoring Trends in Violent Deaths). This study will not address the issue of homicides.
- ¹⁰ Henckaerts, Jean-Marie and Louise Doswald-Beck. 2005. Customary International Humanitarian Law. <https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/customary-international-humanitarian-law-i-icrc-eng.pdf>
- ¹¹ Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, opened for signature in 1981 and entered into force in 1983. <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/ccwc> and was amended in December 2001 to also apply to situation of non-international conflict and entered into force in 2004.
- ¹² See for example the Weapons Law Encyclopedia. <http://www.weaponslaw.org/instruments/1980-Convention-on-Certain-Conventional-Weapons>
- ¹³ Protocol II and Amended Protocol II on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices. [http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/\(httpPages\)/4F0DEF093B4860B4C1257180004B1B30?OpenDocument](http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/(httpPages)/4F0DEF093B4860B4C1257180004B1B30?OpenDocument)
- ¹⁴ Protocol V. <https://www.un.org/disarmament/geneva/erw/>
- ¹⁵ Cluster Munitions was an important concern in the discussions of ERW from the 1970s until the agreement on Protocol V of the CCW in 2003. However, the 2008 CCM goes beyond the response to the remnants of cluster munitions but also addresses their indiscriminate effects at the time of use. Regulations of use of conventional weapons is an important subject on its own but one that is not the focus of discussion of this report.
- ¹⁶ Key UNPoA objectives, such as marking, tracing and record keeping of stockpiles, were further developed in the 2005 **International Tracing Instrument (ITI)**, which requires States to ensure that weapons are properly marked and weapon and transfer records are kept.
- ¹⁷ The Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing and Trafficking of Firearms, Ammunitions, Explosives and other Related Materials (CIFTA) concluded before the UNPoA is a legally binding treaty agreed by Latin American States. http://www.oas.org/en/sla/dil/inter_american_treaties_A-63_illicit_manufacturing_trafficking_firearms_ammunition_explosives.asp
- The Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on the Control of Firearms, Ammunition and other Related Materials was agreed in 2001 by Southern African states. <http://www.poa-iss.org/RegionalOrganizations/SADC/Instruments/SADC%20Protocol.pdf>
- The Nairobi Protocol for the prevention, control and reduction of small arms and light weapons in the Great Lakes and the Horn of Africa followed in 2004. <http://www.poa-iss.org/RegionalOrganizations/RECSA/Nairobi%20Protocol.pdf>
- The ECOWAS Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition and Related Materials in 2006 and the Central African Convention for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons, their Ammunition, Parts and Components that can be used for their Manufacture, Repair or Assembly of 2010 (Kinshasa Convention) addresses SALW in Central Africa.
- ¹⁸ 1990 Basic Principles on the Use of Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/UseOfForceAndFirearms.aspx>
- ¹⁹ See for example the ASM Toolset developed by the Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining <https://www.gichd.org/mine-action-resources/publications/detail/publication/ammunition-safety-management-asm-toolset/#.WOJxEVt96Ch>
- And the Handbook on Unplanned Explosions at Munition Site developed by the Small Arms Survey <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/Q-Handbooks/HB-03-UEMS/SAS-HB03-UEMS-Intro-Part-I.pdf>

²⁰ The mine action standards were developed following the 1996/7 international conference on Mine clearance technology held in Copenhagen.

²¹ See <<http://www.smallarmsstandards.org>>

²² See introduction to ISACS on <<http://www.smallarmsstandards.org>>

²³ Among small arms, the AK-47 is the single most popular weapon often explained by its ease of operation. It has also been copied freely. Economists have pointed out that the fix costs for ammunition and training of new recruits remains low. A study on AK prices, listed numerous factors that influence the price and therefore the accessibility of AKs and suggested the regulation and supply cost are significant determinants of weapon price. The collapse of the Soviet Union, however, may have been less of a supply shock for the illicit markets as often assumed. See for example, Killiot, Phillip. 2007. 'Weaponomics: The Global Market for Assault Rifles' Post Conflict Transitions, Working Paper No 10. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4202. April 2007.

<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/266561468141574815/pdf/wps4202.pdf>

²⁴ Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf

²⁵ For SALW programmes see for example: Page, Ana Leao, 2004. Weapons in Mozambique. Reducing Availability and Demand. Institute for Security Studies. < <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/118339/94%20FULL.pdf>>

This study has one reference to mines (p. 21) because mines hindered the access to a weapons cache.

For Mine Action Programme see for example: Mine Action Review Mozambique:

<<http://www.mineactionreview.org/country/mozambique>>

²⁶ For SALW programmes see for example: Government of Angola. 2008. Report on Angola's implementation of the Plan of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons. www.poa-iss.org/.../2010@5@PoA-Angola-2010.doc

For Mine Action see for example: Mine Action Review Angola. <http://www.mineactionreview.org/country/angola/anti-personnel-mines>

²⁷ Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf

For SALW programmes see for example: Wille, Christina. 2005. European Union Assistance on curbing small arms and light weapons in the Kingdom of Cambodia: A case study on European action on SALW under the CFSP. In The European Union and Small Arms Action. United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

For Mine Action: Mine Action Review Cambodia. <http://www.mineactionreview.org/assets/downloads/Cambodia.pdf>

²⁸ See UN Security Council resolutions on Libya: SCR 2040 (2012); SCR 2095 (2013); SCR 2144 (2014); SCR 2238 (2015); SCR 2291 (2016);

²⁹ United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire UNOCI mandate. Under 'Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme (DDR) and collection of weapons' it is stated that the UN Mandate is: 'To assist the national authorities, including the National Commission to fight against the Proliferation and Illicit Traffic of Small Arms and Light Weapons, in collecting, registering, securing and disposing of weapons and in clearing explosive remnants of war, as appropriate, in accordance with resolution 2219 (2015); <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unoci/mandate.shtml>

³⁰ Resolution 2117 (2013) Adopted by the Security Council at its 7036th meeting, on 26 September 2013

<http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2117>

³¹ Security Council Urges Heightened Cooperation on Illicit Transfer of Small Arms, Light Weapons, Adopting Resolution 2220 (2015) with Abstentions <https://www.un.org/press/en/2015/sc11901.doc.htm>

³² Houliat, Philippe. 2014. 'Surplus SA/LW Destruction Project in Mauritania' in The Journal of ERW and Mine Action. Issue 18.2. Sommer 2014. <https://www.jmu.edu/cisr/journal/18.2/feature/houliat.shtml>

³³ For example UNDDA and UNODC have taken a regional approach to capacity building. UNDP has also led regional programmes, such as the current project in West Africa.

http://www.ng.undp.org/content/nigeria/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/regional-project-on-small-arms-and-light-weapons.html

³⁴ Particular important are United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-LiREC), the Regional Centre on Small Arms (RECSA) in Nairobi or the South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC).

³⁵ For example, In northern Kenya, 40 per cent of ammunition on the illicit market has leaked from Kenyan armed forces. According to the Small Arms Survey in 2008

Small Arms Survey. 2008. 'Arsenals Adrift. Arms and Ammunition Diversion.'

<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/A-Yearbook/2008/en/Small-Arms-Survey-2008-Chapter-02-EN.pdf>

For leakages during peace operations see:

Berman, Eric. G and Mihaela Racovita. 2015. Diversion of Arms and Ammunition in Peace Operations: Observations based on Missions in Sudan and South Sudan, September 2015. Research Note No. 54, Armed Actors.

http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-54.pdf

Berman, Eric G and Mihaela Racovita. 2015 Under Attack and Above Scrutiny? Arms and Ammunition Diversion from Peacekeepers in Sudan and South Sudan, 2002-14. HSBA Working Paper 37, July. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.

<http://www.smallarmssurveysudan.org/fileadmin/docs/working-papers/HSBA-WP37-Peacekeeper-Diversions.pdf>

Berman, Eric G. and Mihaela Racovita. 2013. Diversion of Weapons within Peace Operations: Understanding the Phenomenon. GCSP Policy Paper 2013/8. Geneva: Geneva Centre for Security Policy. 9 December.

<http://www.gcsp.ch/News-Knowledge/Publications/Diversion-of-Weapons-within-Peace-Operations-Understanding-the-Phenomenon>

UNSC (UN Security Council). 2009. Report of the Secretary-General on the African Union– United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur. S/2009/83 of 10 February.

Leakage by security forces in Afghanistan, Iraq has also been documented:

Chives.C.J. 2010. 'Arming Both Sides: The Perils of Ammunition Leakages in the Afghan War.' New York Times. 22 February 2010. https://atwar.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/02/22/arming-both-sides-the-perils-of-ammunition-leakage-in-the-afghan-war/?_r=0

BBC. 2006. 'Iraq arms 'leaking to insurgents''. 23. May 2006.

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/file_on_4/5006196.stm

³⁶ The project started within the East African region because RECSA member states had committed themselves in the Nairobi Protocol to marking their national stockpiles. In 2005, a system of unique identifying codes for the region was developed that included the ISO country code and the security sector force responsible for the weapon together with a unique number Bevan, James and Benjamin King. 2013. Making a Mark Reporting on Firearms Marking in the RECSA Region. Small Arms Survey Special Report. <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/C-Special-reports/SAS-SR19-Making-a-Mark-RECSA.pdf>

³⁷ The project focuses on select countries in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and the RECSA region (which covers the member states of the East African Community—EAC). Alusala, Nelson. 2016. Lessons from Small Arms and Weapons Control Initiatives in Africa. BICC Working Paper. https://www.bicc.de/uploads/tx_bicctools/wp_1_2016.pdf p.13

³⁸ Littlejohn.Gary.2015. Secret Stockpiles Arms Caches and Disarmament Efforts in Mozambique. Small Arms Survey Working Paper. <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP21-Secret-Stockpiles.pdf>

³⁹ http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/brahimi_report.shtml

⁴⁰ UNDPKO.2010. Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Practices in Peace Operations. A Contribution to the New Horizon Discussion on Challenges and Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping. http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/2GDDR_ENG_WITH_COVER.pdf p.4

⁴¹ UNDPKO.2010. Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Practices in Peace Operations. A Contribution to the New Horizon Discussion on Challenges and Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping. http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/2GDDR_ENG_WITH_COVER.pdf p. 4

⁴² UNDPKO.2010. Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Practices in Peace Operations. A Contribution to the New Horizon Discussion on Challenges and Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping. http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/2GDDR_ENG_WITH_COVER.pdf p. 3

⁴³ <http://www.avrmonitor.org/cavr>

⁴⁴ <http://resultsbased.org/site/cynefin-framework/>

⁴⁵ According to the UN, the five complementary pillars of mine action are a) mine/ERW risk education, b) demining defined as mine /ERW surveying, mapping, marking and clearance), c) victim assistance (including rehabilitation and reintegration), d) stockpile destruction and e) advocacy against the use of anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions. <http://www.mineaction.org/issues>

⁴⁶ Interview with employee at SEESAC at the time. 16 November 2016.

⁴⁷ See for example, <http://www.maginternational.org/media-centre/practical-disarmament-initiative-stockpile-management--diversion-prevention/>

⁴⁸ The 2008 Resolution 'Promoting Development through the Reduction and Prevention of Armed Violence' (A/RES/63/23) as well as the The UN Secretary-General's report on 'Promoting Development through the Reduction and Prevention of Armed Violence' (A/64/228) are the result of effective diplomatic lobbying to that effect.

⁴⁹ OECD. 2009. Conflict and Fragility Armed Violence Reduction. Enabling Development. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/armed%20violence%20reduction.pdf>

⁵⁰ DDG Portfolio 2016.

⁵¹ OECD. 2009. Conflict and Fragility Armed Violence Reduction. Enabling Development. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/armed%20violence%20reduction.pdf>

⁵² Such as the African Peace Forum. <http://www.transconflict.com/gcct/gcct-members/africa/eastern-africa/kenya/africa-peace-forum/>, Centre for Peace, Non-Violence and Human Rights Osijek in Croatia <http://www.centar-za-mir.hr/en>

⁵³ Such as AVSI <http://www.avsi.org/> and many local organisations specialised in youth.

⁵⁴ Among them ADRA <https://adra.org/>

⁵⁵ Among them Inter-religious councils in Africa, traditional leaders, truth and reconciliation commissions and many other grass root organisation (such as PeaceNet, Kenya. <http://www.saferworld.org.uk/expertise/details/36-peacenet-trust-kenya>

⁵⁶ AVR is supported and carried out by several UN agency programmes among them UNDP, WHO, UN-HABITAT, UNODC, UNODA, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD) as well as some regional organisations such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

⁵⁷ DFID for example is engaged in AVR.

- ⁵⁸ <https://www.bicc.de/research-themes/project/project/evaluation-of-the-destruction-of-arms-and-ammunition-in-afghanistan-63/>
- ⁵⁹ King, Benjamin. 2011. Safer Stockpiles: Practitioners' Experiences with Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM) Assistance Programmes. Small Arms Survey Occasional Paper 27, <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/about-us/highlights/highlight-safer-stockpiles.html>
- Mag International. 2015. Practical Disarmament Initiative: Stockpile Management & Diversion Prevention Workshop Outcome Summary. <http://www.maginternational.org/download/55701388af550/>
- 2016-17. Application of the SAS developed PSSM Priorities Matrix in Burkina Faso, and in October 2016 SAS and MAG organized a validation workshop in Ouagadougou with several government stakeholders. This work set the ground for further collaboration under a FCO-supported project aiming at developing a PSSM National Action Plan in Burkina Faso.
- ⁶⁰ <http://www.maginternational.org/mag/en/media-centre/mag-begins-arms-destruction-in-nigeria/>
- ⁶¹ HALO Trust subcontracted the Small Arms Survey on a UNSCAR funded project on weapon control measures in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2017.
- ⁶² The 2015 published SAS UEMS Handbook could not have been completed without the active participation of UNMAS.
- ⁶³ The Small Arms Survey has concluded three MoUs with mine action organisations between 2012 and 2017, including the renewal and update of one MoU after five years.
- ⁶⁴ Beside the government representatives, the MSAG brings together SAS, GICHD, MAG, the Halo Trust and UNIDIR <http://msag.es>
- ⁶⁵ <http://www.mineaction.org/mitigating-explosive-threats-and-weapon-insecurity-central-african-republic-2>
- ⁶⁶ The DRC takes action towards better weapons and ammunition management http://www.mineaction.org/sites/default/files/publications/EN_ONE%20UN%20article_UNIDIR%20CNC%20UNMAS%20workshop.pdf
- ⁶⁷ GICHD. 2012. Mine Action and Armed Violence Reduction. Côte d'Ivoire Case Study. <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/157199/AVR-Cote-d-Ivoire-case-study-Sep2012.pdf>
- ⁶⁸ <http://www.mineaction.org/weapons-and-ammunition-management-mali>
- ⁶⁹ UNIDIR. 2014. Weapons and Ammunition Management in the Federal Republic of Somalia. <http://www.unidir.org/files/publications/pdfs/weapons-and-ammunition-management-in-the-federal-republic-of-somalia-en-608.pdf>
- UNIDIR. 2015. Weapons and Ammunition Management (WAM) in Somalia: Preliminary findings CCW Protocol V, Meeting of Experts Generic Preventative Measures 8 April 2015. [http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/C05DBDB38D4DA92CC1257E21005A52E5/\\$file/UNIDIR+CCW+Prt+5+Meeting+of+Experts++Somalia+briefing+Final.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/C05DBDB38D4DA92CC1257E21005A52E5/$file/UNIDIR+CCW+Prt+5+Meeting+of+Experts++Somalia+briefing+Final.pdf)
- ⁷⁰ Small Arms Survey. UEMS Handbook. <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/Q-Handbooks/HB-03-UEMS/SAS-HB03-UEMS-Intro-Part-I.pdf>
- ⁷¹ Conflict Armament Research. 2012. The Distribution of Iranian Ammunition in Africa or Rebel forces in Northern Mali. <http://www.conflictarm.com/publications/>
- Conflict Armament Research, I-trace project. <http://www.conflictarm.com/itrace/>
- ⁷² SEESAC. 2008. Development and implementation of SALW Awareness programmes. RMDS/G 06.10 5th Edition. Section 6.4.4 De-conflicting SALW Awareness and Mine Risk Education. <http://www.poa-iss.org/KIT/Development%20and%20implementation%20of%20SALW%20Awareness%20programmes.pdf> pp 11-12.
- ⁷³ Bob Keeley, 2005. Assessing the Compatibility of SALW Awareness and MRE. SEESAC Working Paper. <https://www.ciaonet.org/catalog/14241>
- ⁷⁴ ICSP/2015/354-730 "Security, Stabilization and Development programme in Libya", implemented by Dan ChurchAid (DCA) focused on: a) Supporting the Libyan legitimate and competent authorities and organisations to mitigate risks related to armed violence and hazardous remnants of war, and b) Easing psychological trauma and promote behavioural change in conflict-affected /conflict prone communities.
- ⁷⁵ Project II: ICSP/2015/356-074 "Community Safety and Humanitarian Mine Action in Libya", implemented by Danish Refugee Council/Danish Demining Group (DRC/DDG) focused on: a) Increasing the organizational and technical capacities of the Libyan NGO Free Field Foundation (3F) to conduct Humanitarian Mine Action and AVR activities in Tripoli and Sebha or other relevant locations, and b) Creating a safer environment for the civilian population in Sebha and Tripoli and other relevant locations.
- ⁷⁶ See the Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor Libya mine action profile. <http://www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2016/libya/mine-action.aspx>
- ⁷⁷ Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor Libya casualty and victim assistance profile. <http://www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2016/libya/casualties-and-victim-assistance.aspx>
- ⁷⁸ UNMAS Libya profile. <http://www.mineaction.org/programmes/libya>
- ⁷⁹ "Libya Multi-Sector Needs Assessment," REACH, June-July 2015, p. 2. <http://www.reach-initiative.org/libya-reach-multi-sector-needs-assessment-update>
- ⁸⁰ Sixteen percent of respondents were ready to use violence for political ends. First National Survey of Libya® - Executive Summary", Oxford Research International, 2012. <http://openanthropology.org/libya/firstnationalsurveysummary.pdf>
- ⁸¹ DCA amended proposal p. 5.

⁸² According to a study by Handicap International, Tripoli hospitals recorded 1,159 people injured and killed by small arms. About half resulted from criminal activity, and a quarter from accidents, and the remainder from various other causes. Due to lack of resources, the data collection has not been comprehensive or consistent and many responses could not be categorised. According to analysis by UNSMIL covering the period November 2012 to February 2013 the context in which SALW injuries were sustained were 43% criminal, 20 % accidents, 17% disputes, 17%, 18% State security forces and 2% self-directed harm. Source Handicap International, meeting in Tunis, January 2017.

⁸³ AVR Needs Assessments conducted by DCA's CSO partners in mid-2015.

⁸⁴ Landmine Action is a rare example of a mine action organisation that changed its name to Action on Armed Violence to reflect its broader spectrum of work. Other agencies have not changed their name despite the fact that they address today a much wider portfolio of threats than just mine action (e.g. the Mines Advisory Group MAG, the Danish Demining Group, DDG

⁸⁵ SCR 2040 (2012) <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2040>; SCR 2095 (2013) <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2095>; SCR 2144 (2014) <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2144>; SCR 2238 (2015) <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2238>; SCR 2291 (2016) <http://unscr.com/en/resolutions/doc/2291>

⁸⁶ ICG. 2016. The Libyan Political Agreement: Time for a Reset. Report No 170 Middle East and North Africa, 4 November 2016. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/north-africa/libya/libyan-political-agreement-time-reset> p.1

⁸⁷ Aljazeera. 2016. Khalifa Haftar forces seize oil port Brega in Libya. 14 September.

<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/09/khalifa-haftar-forces-seizes-oil-port-brega-libya-160914061306594.html>

⁸⁸ Jenzen-Jones, N.R. 2013 The Headstamp Trail: An Assessment of Small-calibre Ammunition Found in Libya May 2013.

Working Paper No. 16, <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP16-Headstamp-Trail-Ammunition-Libya.pdf>, followed by updates in December 2013 <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-Dispatch2-Libya-Ammunition.pdf>

⁸⁹ McQuinn, Brian. 2012. Armed Groups in Libya: Typology and Roles, June 2012. Research Note No. 18, Armed Actors http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-18.pdf

⁹⁰ McQuinn, Brian 2012. After the Fall: Libya's Evolving Armed Groups, October 2012. Working Paper No. 12

<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP12-After-the-Fall-Libya.pdf>

And : King, Benjamin, Brian McQuinn, Claudia Navas Caputo, and Alonso Tobon 2013. Ad Hoc Arsenals: PSSM Practices of Selected Non-state Actors, May 2013. Armed Actors Issue Brief No. 2.

And: Lacher, Wolfram. 2014. Libya's Fractious South and Regional Instability, by Wolfram Lacher, February 2014. Security Assessment in North Africa Dispatch No. 3 <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-Dispatch3-Libyas-Fractuous-South.pdf>

⁹¹ Spleeters, Damien. 2013. FAL Rifles in Libya: A Guide to Data Gathering, July 2013. Security Assessment in North Africa Dispatch No. 1 <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/R-SANA/SANA-dispatch1-FN-FAL.pdf>

And: Kartas, Moncef. 2013. On the Edge? Trafficking and Insecurity at the Tunisian-Libyan Border, December 2013.

Working Paper No. 17 <http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/F-Working-papers/SAS-WP17-Tunisia-On-the-Edge.pdf>

⁹² Daan Redlinghuys. 2013, Meeting of Experts Protocol V, ERW.

[http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/\(httpAssets\)/A1FA966FDCB4043EC1257B560049C764/\\$file/2013_PV_GPMs_M_AG.pdf](http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/A1FA966FDCB4043EC1257B560049C764/$file/2013_PV_GPMs_M_AG.pdf)

⁹³ Sedra, Mark and Geoff Burt. 2016. Integrating SSR and SALW Programming. SSR Paper 16.

<http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Integrating-SSR-and-SALW-Programming>

⁹⁴ Sedra, Mark and Geoff Burt. 2016. Integrating SSR and SALW Programming. SSR Paper 16.

<http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Integrating-SSR-and-SALW-Programming> p. 77

⁹⁵ UNDPKO. 2010. Second Generation Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) Practices in Peace Operations. A Contribution to the New Horizon Discussion on Challenges and Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping.

http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/2GDDR_ENG_WITH_COVER.pdf p. 3

⁹⁶ Sedra, Mark and Geoff Burt. 2016. Integrating SSR and SALW Programming. SSR Paper 16.

<http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Integrating-SSR-and-SALW-Programming> p.82

⁹⁷ The UN Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS), Level 6.10,

<http://www.unddr.org/uploads/documents/IDDRS%206.10%20DDR%20and%20SSR.pdf> p. 16

⁹⁸ Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining. 2006. Identifying Synergies between Mine Action and Small Arms and Light Weapons. http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD-resources/rec-documents/MA_and_SALW_Oct2006.pdf

⁹⁹ Naidoo, Sharmala. 2013. 'Mission creep or responding to wider security needs? The evolving role of mine action organisations in armed violence reduction'. International Journal of Security and Development.

www.stabilityjournal.org/10.53334/sta.av