

# Information Note<sup>1</sup>

<b>Event:</b>	<b>G8 Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG) Meeting</b>
<b>Organizers:</b>	Canada, as 2010 President of the G8
<b>Date and Venue:</b>	19 October 2010, Vancouver, BC, Canada
<b>Participants:</b>	Twenty-three countries comprise the GP. In addition to the G8, representatives from Kazakhstan, Sweden, and Switzerland and invited speakers participated

## 1. Objectives

- Exchanging information on the status of implementation of resolution 1540 and on assistance programs of G8 members
- Increasing engagement with the G8 Global Partnership

## 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 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

A general consensus emerged for the need to extend the Global Partnership (GP) through 2022, but not an agreement on the priorities for its work during that period, which depends on the evaluation of senior experts in light of a preliminary assessment made in May 2010. Some points of contention included whether to expand the number of countries that could obtain assistance under GP auspices, whether this should be done before or after completion of current projects and whether the GPWG should remain within the G8 or move to the G20 or some other format, particularly to include more partners in the planning process.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 responded supportively to the need to integrate implementation of resolution 1540 into their work and having increased cooperation with the 1540 Committee. In reaction to the presentation, questions asked the 1540 Committee expert included:

- A large number of states have taken relatively few measures to implement the resolution. Of those states, which are most vulnerable to threats by non-state actors and should be the focus of efforts by the Global Partnership? For example, which of them have proliferation sensitive facilities, have relevant transit routes, or are targeted by terrorists and criminals?
- Can the 1540 Committee collect more qualitative information, e.g., how well steps taken by States compare with international standards, in order to identify where more assistance may be appropriate? Would the 1540 Committee include such assessments from outside sources in its work, such as through the GP Project Annex?
- Was reporting mandatory?

Participants seemed to agree that the GP might seek more analysis on CTR problems first, projects in which 1540 Committee data could have value. With its matrices, the 1540 Committee has collected much information that could foster analytic efforts of the GP in identifying problems to tackle.

The GPWG reviewed the progress of its efforts in the several States. A presentation was made by a non G8 State on their nuclear nonproliferation projects in the several countries that offered several comments on lessons learned:

- They conduct most of these projects in cooperation with third parties, both States and international organizations. A similar assessment of the problem has an important impact on the development of partnerships.
- Projects move very slowly without specific agreements to cooperate (although they would prefer overarching agreements that would subsume multiple specific agreements), and particularly when a regulatory authority also has to generate income.
- The largest unresolved nuclear issues remain some States, including locations not normally considered nuclear (such as radio-chemical facilities).
- Success in large projects tends to generate many smaller projects as offshoots. Smaller qualitative improvements, such as manuals on procedures, still can have a large impact. At the same time, administering small projects often requires as much effort as large projects, requiring a disproportionate amount of management.

Another State made a presentation on the belief that the GP needed to pay more attention to coordination. They noted that the GP appeared to use its Annex only as an archive and not a tool for coordination. In seeking more coordination, it was suggested that the Global Partnership launch a Global Initiatives Portal, with a prototype developed in early 2011 and full implementation by mid-2011, similar to the Global Biological Initiatives Portal project.

Some plans for the 2011 Presidency of the G8 were discussed, including the pursuit of more “thematic” activities to making the Global Partnership more future oriented. In the final open discussion, another State indicated its interest in the GP, and that a number of GP countries already have projects with them.

#### 4. Additional Comments

For further information, please contact the 1540 Committee experts by e-mail at [1540experts@un.org](mailto:1540experts@un.org)