

Information Note¹

Event(s):	G8 1540 Experts Meeting
Organizers:	Canada, as 2010 President of the G8
Date and Venue:	20 October 2010, Vancouver, BC, Canada
Participants:	Delegations of senior experts from the G8 members and observers plus invited speakers participated

1. Objectives

- Increasing engagement with the G8 Global Partnership and the G8 Nonproliferation Directors' Group (and their 1540 Experts)
- Exchanging information on the status, scope and direction of implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) and on assistance programs of G8 members

2. Background

Since 2004, the G8 annually has organized demarches to non-reporting states calling on them to submit a report to the 1540 Committee. It also has promoted implementation of resolution 1540 (2004) in its documents, declarations and communiqués. Resolution 1810 (2008), however, called on the 1540 Committee to engage international bodies more actively, which prompted a marked increase in such efforts, including cooperation with the G8.

Building on earlier exchanges, Canada, in its role of G8 President, proposed a meeting with the 1540 Committee experts that took place on 4 May 2010. Canada and the experts discussed engagement with the G8 and a possible meeting between the 2010 NPDG Chairman and the Chairman of the 1540 Committee, which took place on 10 May 2010. Informally, the 1540 Committee experts provided representatives of the NPDG Chairman with the formal requests for assistance received by the 1540 Committee through June 2010.

In June 2010, the G8 Muskoka Communiqué specifically identified implementing resolution 1540 (2004) as one of the four pillars of G8 nonproliferation efforts. Subsequently, Canada invited the 1540 Committee Chairman to address the NPDG and a 1540 Committee expert to make presentations at the GPGW and the 1540 Experts meetings.

3. Highlights

At the request of the organizers, the 1540 Committee expert delivered a presentation at the 1540 Experts Meeting that included more analysis of the assistance efforts of the 1540 Committee. The participants, some of whom attended the Global Partnership meeting the prior day, expanded on some key topics from the day before, i.e., which countries should be priorities based on vulnerabilities, and how could the 1540 Committee gather and offer more information to compare national measures with current international standards.

¹ For information – not an official report. The views expressed here do not necessarily represent those of the 1540 Committee or of the organizers or participants in the event.

Participants offered several lessons learned:

Make implementing resolution 1540 (2004) part of the agenda of entities within a regional organization, such that the existence of the resolution raises the profile of the issue in organizations and working together on an issue once can lead to cooperation in more projects;

Regionally some States can inspire others to take more steps to implement the resolution, especially those smaller States that might not otherwise act in the absence of regional encouragement and movement;

Nationally, in smaller States, opposition from even one stakeholder can mean failure;

Link the resolution to other national objectives, such as managing illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons or drugs (in one instance, a 1540-related commodity identification training sparked more interest in assistance as it's wider implications became clearer) and have a concurrent capacity-building track;

Speakers noted a wide gap between declarations and implementation in several regions. Working without priorities among all these gaps makes implementation of objectives long and difficult;

The work of NGOs has been significant. Without the work of several NGOs, some sub-regional organizations would not have resolution 1540 (2004) on its agenda; and,

African regional institutions have proven less amenable to putting the resolution on their agenda, such that the G8 might consider adding such institutions to their annual demarche.

During the general discussion, the idea emerged that the length of the mandate of an international body, such as the 1540 Committee, has a political impact. Specifically, a body with a short mandate makes it easier to ignore by States or other international institutions.

4. **Additional Comments**

For further information, please contact the 1540 Committee experts by e-mail at 1540experts@un.org