



## TACKLING POVERTY BY REDUCING ARMED VIOLENCE

Recommendations from a Wilton Park Workshop  
14–16 April 2003

Photo credit: A ten year old child soldier chases a woman out of a house at gunpoint during fighting between rival ethnic militias in Bunia, Democratic Republic of Congo. May 2003.  
*(AP photo/Karel Prinsloo).*

## CONTENTS

---

<b>Foreword by Valerie Amos, Secretary of State for International Development</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Report Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Is small arms availability and misuse a development issue?</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>Why aren't development agencies more engaged?</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>What needs to be done to engage development agencies more effectively?</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>How can arms issues best be integrated into development programmes?</b>	<b>22</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>What are the challenges of integrating SALW measures into national development policy frameworks?</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>What are the challenges of integrating armed violence issues into specific areas of development assistance?</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	

---

<b>What are the risks of integrating SALW controls into development programmes?</b>	<b>31</b>
<i>Recommendations</i>	
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Annex I – Moving the Agenda Forward – Actions for DFID</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Annex II – Wilton Park workshop agenda</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Annex III – Wilton Park workshop participants list</b>	<b>40</b>

## FOREWORD

---

Every year, hundreds of thousands of people die and millions more are left injured from gunshot wounds. The easy availability of small arms and light weapons undermines people's livelihoods and economic security. The threat and use of guns blight the lives of people all over the world, whether they are in a situation of violent conflict or 'at peace'.

The widespread availability and use of small arms hampers efforts to reduce poverty. In many countries, violence and insecurity are key concerns for the poor. Without personal and community security, economic growth and planning for the future are impossible. Gun violence prevents teachers and children from going to school, and the costs of gun violence place a heavy burden on scarce health care resources. Women are at increased risk of domestic violence when guns are in the home. Robberies, car jacking, drug trafficking and organised crime are all closely connected to the widespread availability of guns.

Over the last decade, considerable progress has been made to focus greater attention on arms issues, and important regional and international agreements have been signed that commit states and their partners to action to address these problems.

However, states cannot implement controls on small arms and light weapons in a vacuum. Controlling the supply and reducing the numbers of weapons in circulation is not enough – we need to do more to address the root causes of armed violence. Social and economic exclusion, weak state institutions, and political grievances all motivate gun violence. To successfully meet the Millennium Development

Goals we need to integrate work on armed violence into our efforts to improve the lives of the world's poor.

In April 2003, the UK's Department for International Development sponsored a workshop to discuss the links between arms availability and poverty in more depth. The workshop identified both a number of entry points and a range of challenges to addressing armed violence as part of strategies to reduce poverty. These are presented in this report. There is considerable experience and expertise amongst small arms control groups and development agencies – the key now is to learn from past experiences and use our collective expertise to reduce armed violence and promote poverty reduction.

Development agencies have established networks, good relations with a wide range of stakeholders, and substantial resources to help governments and communities around the world reduce the armed violence that so often inhibits economic opportunity and growth. Development agencies are uniquely placed to both articulate the problems associated with armed violence, and to address these problems in partnership with other governments. We hope that the recommendations contained here will be a catalyst to develop this work in the future, and we look forward to working with others to do so.



**Valerie Amos, Secretary of State for International Development**

## REPORT SUMMARY

---

Although armed violence poses a significant obstacle to poverty reduction, few development agencies have addressed small arms issues in their policies or programmes. In April 2003, small arms experts and development agency representatives came together to discuss ways and means of integrating arms controls into development policy and programmes. This report highlights key findings and recommendations that emerged from that workshop, including:

**Small arms availability and use is a development issue but more needs to be done to document its impact on poverty.** Although many development programmes are affected by armed violence, the links between weapons availability and poverty are not well documented. It was *recommended* that research should be commissioned that makes explicit the links between armed violence reduction and

poverty eradication, including achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

**Development agencies could be more engaged on small arms.** Currently many agencies are wary of addressing small arms, because of mandate and resource constraints, and because of insufficient knowledge of both the problem and possible solutions. It was *recommended* that those engaged on small arms issues should develop examples and best practice guidelines for armed violence reduction programmes that are accessible to development practitioners, and help develop the capacity of development agencies to engage on armed violence initiatives.

**More needs to be done to engage development agencies more effectively.** Efforts to engage development agencies on arms issues have been limited and often the messages that have been conveyed have seemed irrelevant to poverty reduction. It was *recommended* that 'small arms

and light weapons' language needs to be radically altered so that it is less technical and more accessible to development agencies, for example by referring to armed violence reduction, rather than small arms proliferation. Tools, guidelines and training for development professionals should be developed to offer practical assistance for addressing small arms issues.

**Small arms reduction measures need to be integrated into national development policy frameworks.** Engaging policy makers on armed violence is key, particularly those responsible for developing Poverty Reduction Strategies, as these provide the overarching framework for many donors' bilateral assistance. Participants *recommended* that more needs to be done to engage the international financial institutions, particularly the World Bank, to ensure that armed violence issues are included in development policy dialogues.

**Governments and civil society in developing countries need to be engaged on armed violence issues.** The buy-in and support of states and communities affected by armed violence is crucial for demonstrating the relevance of arms issues to poverty reduction. It was *recommended* that co-operation with different parts of government and with civil society should be improved, to ensure that, where armed violence is a significant obstacle to development, this is articulated in poverty reduction strategies.

**Armed violence is particularly relevant to specific areas of development assistance.** The workshop offered several examples of programmes that have addressed armed violence in wider development contexts. It was *recommended* that armed violence should be included in conflict assessments and more should be done to document examples of urban and rural development programmes that have successfully addressed armed violence.

Arms management issues should be integrated into security sector reform processes.

**There are risks in integrating small arms controls into development assistance.** Although there is a clear need and many opportunities for integrating armed violence reduction into development assistance, there are also risks. Participants *recommended* that ‘stand-alone’ small arms programmes should be maintained and their success and contribution to poverty reduction evaluated.

**Co-operation among development agencies on armed violence issues needs to be strengthened.** To date, there has been limited information exchange or co-ordination among development agencies on armed violence issues. It was *recommended* that increased co-operation among development agencies is a high priority,

and that the OECD Development Assistance Committee could play a role in improving co-ordination of donor policies on arms issues.

The report explores these conclusions and recommendations in more detail.

## Conclusions

---

The report concludes that although there is a fair degree of awareness amongst development agencies of the problems caused by armed violence and easy availability of small arms, more needs to be done to encourage development agencies to address this issue. The onus lies with the small arms community to develop evidence and tools for development agencies, to demonstrate that in countries affected by the wide availability and use of arms, poverty reduction can be best achieved through a reduction in armed violence and improved human security.

## INTRODUCTION

---

The threat and use of small arms and light weapons (SALW) has wrought devastation and insecurity across the world. These weapons cause untold human suffering. Millions have been injured, lives have been lost and countless more livelihoods undermined. However, although weapons proliferation poses a significant obstacle to sustainable development and poverty reduction, few development agencies have directly addressed SALW issues in either their policies or their programmes.

The UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) has been developing arms policy and supporting related programmes since 1998<sup>1</sup>. DFID recognises that

arms control programmes cannot be implemented in a vacuum and the integration of arms control and reduction measures into poverty reduction programmes is a priority. However, integration remains a challenge that development agencies, faced with competing calls on their limited resources, have tended to resist. DFID is not the only agency faced with this challenge – a number of governments, multilateral and non-governmental development agencies are grappling with similar issues.

In April 2003, DFID hosted a workshop at Wilton Park<sup>2</sup>, which brought together small arms experts and development agencies, to discuss ways and means of integrating arms controls into development policy and programmes.<sup>3</sup> These fruitful discussions highlighted a number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Since 2001, violence reduction work has been funded through the £20 million Small Arms and Light Weapons Strategy under the auspices of the UK's Global Conflict Prevention Pool. This is a joint initiative of DFID, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Defence. This strategy is jointly agreed by the three departments and managed by DFID.

<sup>2</sup> This workshop was organised by DFID, in conjunction with Bradford University and Saferworld, and in consultation with GTZ, Oxfam, QUNO, Small Arms Survey, UNDP and UNIDIR. The workshop and this report were funded by the Small Arms and Light Weapons Strategy of the Global Conflict Prevention Pool.

<sup>3</sup> The full agenda and participants list for the Wilton Park workshop can be found in Annexes II and III.

areas where small arms experts need to work if development agencies are to be encouraged to effectively integrate measures to reduce armed violence as part of efforts to reduce poverty and improve the lives of the world's poor. A list of

actions that DFID intends to take forward, is attached as Annex I. DFID invites other development agencies to work with us in taking this agenda forward.

## IS SMALL ARMS AVAILABILITY AND MISUSE A DEVELOPMENT ISSUE?<sup>4</sup>

---

Although SALW are rarely the root cause of conflict, crime or insecurity, their wide availability acts as a ‘multiplier of violence’<sup>5</sup>, making conflict more lethal, crime more violent and people’s lives, assets and livelihoods more insecure. Over 500,000 people are killed each year and millions more injured by SALW, as combatants or civilians in wars or as victims of crime, oppression, suicide or communal violence.<sup>6</sup> In the last decade some 2 million children have been killed and 6 million others disabled, seriously injured or traumatised in

conflicts. SALW are the main source of such injuries.<sup>7</sup>

In most developing countries, the indirect social, political and economic impacts of injury and insecurity arising from the threat and use of SALW are as significant as the direct impacts. For example, in Latin America, the Inter-American Development Bank calculated the regional economic costs of armed violence to be between \$140 – 170 billion per year during the late 1990’s – approximately 12 percent of regional GDP.<sup>8</sup> Indirect costs can include:

- a rise in criminality, banditry and criminal violence;

---

<sup>4</sup> This section draws upon the paper “How is SALW control a development issue?” written by Owen Greene, University of Bradford, UK, April 2003. This paper was commissioned by DFID for the April 2003 Wilton Park workshop, and is available at [www.brad.ac.uk/adac/cics/](http://www.brad.ac.uk/adac/cics/). For further reading on the impact of arms on development see references in that paper and Chapter 4 of the *Small Arms Survey 2003* “Development Denied”.

<sup>5</sup> Oxfam, *The Human Cost of Small Arms*, Oxfam 2001.

<sup>6</sup> *Small Arms Survey 2001*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001, chapter 6.

<sup>7</sup> R. Stohl et al, *Putting Children First*, Biting the Bullet Project briefing, London, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> M. Buvinic and A. Morrison, *Violence as an Obstacle to Development*, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC, 1999, quoted in E. Krug, L. Dahlberg, J. Mercy, A. Zwi and R. Lozano (eds), *World Report on Violence and Health*, World Health Organization, Geneva 2002.

- the dislocation of social cohesion and trust in and between communities;
- challenges to state and traditional authorities by armed groups, with impacts on governance;
- an erosion or collapse of social services;
- an overall decline in economic production and trade;
- undermined livelihoods; and
- a distortion of savings, investment, trade, and revenue collection.

By increasing the risk of armed violence, SALW availability can obstruct and raise the costs of development and humanitarian aid in areas where these are desperately needed. Virtually all sectors of society can be badly affected, but the impact on the poor and the marginalised tends to be most traumatic.

In the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, widespread small arms availability and use is

catalysing and perpetuating armed conflict, criminality and arbitrary violence, and is leading to the fragmentation of governance structures. The cumulative impacts of small arms-related violence and insecurity since 1998 have directly contributed to the displacement of approximately 1,790,000 people; a precipitous decline in access to health care; the collapse of economic productivity; a drastic reduction of humanitarian and development access; the disintegration of traditional social bonds and communities; and the militarisation of society as individuals increasingly turn to weapons to regulate social and economic interaction.

Arms availability and misuse threatens the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)<sup>9</sup>, which have become central international objectives for development efforts. The impacts of armed violence are undermining progress towards the primary goal of halving the proportion of people suffering from extreme

---

<sup>9</sup> The MDGs were agreed at the UN Millenium Summit in 2000. More details at [www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html)

poverty and hunger by 2015. A high proportion of the poorest countries in the world, where large parts of the population suffer extreme poverty and hunger, are also those that are in or emerging from prolonged armed conflicts.<sup>10</sup> In many countries that have not suffered large-scale armed conflict, high levels of gun violence obstruct poverty alleviation, deter investment, restrict food production and distribution, and undermine livelihoods in both rural and urban areas.

The MDGs also include goals to extend education, improve health and environmental sustainability and promote gender equality. Eighty-two percent of the 113 million children out of school live in crisis or post-crisis countries. Across the world, gun availability directly contributes to violence and insecurity in or obstructs access to schools, limiting progress on the education MDGs. Similarly, armed

violence places enormous strains on health services, diverting scarce resources from programmes to achieve the MDGs to reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, and combat HIV/AIDS and other diseases. The impacts of SALW availability and misuse tend to differ between men and women, with severe implications for the MDGs to promote gender equality and empower women. Sexual violence at gunpoint and domestic gun violence are particular risks for women, and in many societies women bear the brunt of the impacts of gun deaths and injuries on their families and communities.

While the realities of armed conflict and violence are stark, particularly for those working in the field, a number of workshop participants concluded that there is insufficient compelling data that systematically and unequivocally link small arms availability to poverty. Much of the

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, over 20 of the 34 lowest ranking countries on the UNDP's Human Development Index, are severely affected by recent or current conflict. UNDP: Human Development Report 2002, UNDP, New York, 2002, Chapter 1.

available data relate to conflict or violence in general, rather than small arms specifically. This greatly hinders advocacy efforts with development agencies.

## Recommendations

- There is a clear need for more evidence based research and analysis to back up the assertion that availability and use of SALW undermines development, and that programmes to control SALW can significantly contribute to the achievement of development targets such as the MDGs.
- New research is needed to provide a more nuanced understanding of the circumstances in which SALW proliferation has a negative impact on development.

## WHY AREN'T DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES MORE ENGAGED ON SALW?

---

Many development agencies are yet to be persuaded of the need to single out the issue of small arms as an area of particular concern. During the workshop, representatives of donor agencies identified the following obstacles to closer engagement on arms issues:

**Guns are only the tools of conflict, not the root causes:** Development professionals often argue that, although the impacts of armed violence are terrible and poor people often cite insecurity as one of their major concerns,<sup>11</sup> this does not necessarily imply that controls on weapons availability and use should be a priority for development assistance. Some argue that arms control and reduction measures only address the tools of violence, and can therefore distract attention from the more fundamental issues of

the root causes of conflict or violence.

**SALW is perceived as a disarmament issue, dominated by Foreign Ministries.** In policy terms, the small arms issue grew out of negotiations at the UN and regional organisations and has been dominated by Ministries of Justice and Foreign Affairs. In addition, in many countries the main source of funding for SALW programme assistance continues to be from Foreign Ministries. Ministries of Foreign Affairs often argue that their development agencies are reluctant to engage, whilst development agencies sometimes argue the reverse. This lack of communication and co-operation between ministries has been an obstacle for engaging development agencies.

**Development agencies often face mandate constraints.** Invariably, institutional mandates determine whether agencies engage on security issues. Many donors face significant obstacles

---

<sup>11</sup> World Bank, *Voices of the Poor*, Washington DC, 2000.

when using development resources to address anything that is remotely connected to military issues. One participant argued that “development agencies draw an invisible line when they get to SALW issues, and then stop”. In part this is due to mandate concerns, but it is also due to institutional fears that such issues may be the ‘thin end of the wedge’ leading to pressure to use development resources to address wider security or military-related concerns. This suggests that there is clearly a need for continued funding and engagement by Ministries of Foreign Affairs and others. One participant argued that these mandate restrictions are less insurmountable when working in countries facing major security issues and suggested that country level approaches to SALW rather than headquarters engagement could prove productive.

**Development agencies lack capacity.** Even when donors are not constrained by mandates, and are persuaded that integrating SALW

controls could contribute to development goals, they can be reluctant to implement arms related programmes because they lack relevant experience and capacity to design and manage programmes in this area.

**Development agencies are not receiving relevant information on the impact of small arms on poverty.** A lack of relevant information was identified as a key reason for lack of engagement by development agencies. Some concluded that the small arms community is spending too much time talking to itself and failing to make its messages explicitly relevant to development agencies. It was, however, also acknowledged that development agencies were not proactively asking for information on arms issues and their impact on poverty.

**Competing priorities, limited resources.** Donors face considerable financial and human resource constraints. Many donors working on conflict and security issues are already regarded

as slightly removed from ‘mainstream’ development issues. They have limited resources to address a wide portfolio of issues and find it challenging to operationalise too many issues at once. Some argued that as long as SALW programmes continue to be funded from separate budget lines, development professionals will always have to sacrifice something else in order to monitor or manage them. Integrating SALW control and reduction measures into wider conflict, violence reduction and peace building activities would make it easier for donors to engage.

**Risks and institutional culture.** Development officers and institutions are often wary of new initiatives that may have unexpected or negative consequences, particularly in areas where they have little institutional experience. The risk of failure associated with innovation may appear high, and impact on career prospects or cause institutional embarrassment. As a result, risks and mandate constraints may be overstated, and

agencies may appear unresponsive to concerns about SALW availability and armed violence.

**The risk of compromising neutrality.** Relations between an affected population, the government and NGOs can raise sensitive political issues, and working on weapons control or peacebuilding activities may put other aspects of development co-operation at risk.

**Demand from developing country governments.** Several development agency participants noted that their interlocutors in ministries in developing countries do not tend themselves to emphasise the importance of conflict reduction or SALW controls for achieving their development goals. As a result, development strategies drawn up in partnership with them may not reflect the realities of armed violence. This can happen even where the government concerned has expressed strong concerns about SALW and their impact on development in other fora, such as the UN or regional organisations.

It is important that developing country governments ensure that their concerns about SALW and development are raised by economic and finance ministries, as well as by ministries of justice or foreign affairs.

## Recommendations

- **Make explicit links between SALW control and poverty reduction:** There is a clear need to link SALW control and reduction measures more explicitly to poverty reduction and other established development goals.
- **Greater inter-departmental coordination:** Donor governments should consider ways to promote the development of joint or co-ordinated strategies and programmes addressing issues of arms and armed violence, including mechanisms to facilitate pooling of resources between ministries and agencies.

- **Build the capacity of development professionals:** In an effort to build knowledge and capacity in development agencies, it was recommended that guidelines on SALW control and reduction measures are produced to assist development officers.
- **Donor networks:** It was recommended that the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) increases its involvement in SALW issues, to promote greater co-operation and information exchange between development agencies, and the identification and dissemination of best practices. Other networks such as the Conflict Peace and Development Cooperation Network of the DAC, and the Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network could also be useful arenas for convincing development agencies to work on SALW.

### ■ Revisit the UN Programme of Action:

In order to move away from the perception that SALW is a purely disarmament issue, some participants suggested that the UN Programme of Action on Small Arms<sup>12</sup> may not be the most appropriate starting point for engaging with development agencies. Nevertheless, it was also recognised that the Programme of Action has played a vital role in engaging developing countries on this issue. Several participants recommended that more should be done to highlight the development elements of the UN agreement, starting with discussions at the UN Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms in July 2003.

---

<sup>12</sup> *The UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects*, UN Document A/Conf/192/15, 21 July 2001 available at <http://disarmament.un.org/cab/poa.html>

---

## WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO ENGAGE DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES MORE EFFECTIVELY?

---

In view of the obstacles of integrating SALW controls into development policy and programmes, and the limited progress so far, it is clear that those most concerned with wide availability and use of SALW need to do more to engage development agencies. This must include further development of evidence, arguments, and best practices that the development community will find useful and compelling. Outlined below are the recommendations made by workshop participants.

### Recommendations

---

- **Develop data linked to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).** Participants emphasised the need for more evidence

based research and analysis on why and how the availability and use of SALW impedes the poverty reduction strategies and other development goals. Such research and analysis should be balanced and detailed. Recent emphasis in development agencies on promoting ‘pro-poor’ policies make it critical to show that security issues are a priority for the poor, and that SALW controls can valuably contribute to poverty alleviation and achieving the MDGs. Participants saw this as a high priority.

- **Evaluate and document the impact of existing SALW programmes.** Many participants asked for examples of successful SALW initiatives that were having an impact on poverty and other development goals. It was recognised that, to date, these have not been fully evaluated or documented but that many

of the programmes developed in recent years could provide useful lessons and examples of best practice.

- **Develop indicators of success for SALW interventions.** The workshop identified a clear need to develop indicators of successful SALW interventions. Several SALW programmes were discussed that have delivered substantial development benefits. For example, the EU ASAC<sup>13</sup> SALW programme in Cambodia has developed a wide variety of linkages between small arms controls and poverty reduction, including linking weapons collection and destruction with community development programmes. Success was not only measured in numbers of weapons collected and destroyed, but by qualitative assessments such as improved community security, changes in attitudes towards gun

possession and empowerment of marginalized groups such as women. In some areas, programmes were deemed successful even if many weapons remained hidden or buried rather than carried. Participants noted that anecdotal evidence such as this is a good starting point for developing indicators of successful SALW interventions.

- **Evaluate ‘implicit’ and ‘explicit’ small arms programmes:** Often SALW issues may be highly relevant, but ‘invisible’ in programme planning and evaluation processes. On the one hand, a reduction in armed violence can be an indicator of success in a programme that implicitly focuses on small arms. For example, programmes offering teenagers access to education and training which at the same time deter or prevent their involvement in

---

<sup>13</sup> European Union Assistance on Small Arms and Light Weapons in Cambodia.

gun violence. On the other, programmes may usefully integrate an explicit SALW dimension into a wider development objective, such as education programmes that target gun violence in or around schools. In both approaches, the key is to ensure that SALW concerns are integrated into planning and evaluation processes as indicators that can be monitored.

- **Provide technical expertise:** The technical ‘harder end’ of small arms programmes, such as secure weapons and ammunition destruction, can be an obstacle for development agency engagement, particularly at the community level. The key is to provide community organisations, development officers and other stakeholders with information on where to find the expertise, for example UNDP’s SALW expert roster. However, many SALW control and reduction measures do not require technical

expertise. Some participants suggested that published guidance on the range of activities that can help reduce small arms availability and use without involving ‘hardware’ or technical expertise would be very useful to development agencies.

- **Develop practical ‘toolkits’ for integrating arms issues into development programmes:** Development agency representatives consistently highlighted the need to keep the message simple. SALW proliferation is perceived as a technical and complex subject, distant from poverty reduction programmes. A number of participants drew upon conflict assessment frameworks as an example from which the SALW community can learn. Participants noted that development agencies are now beginning to use policy frameworks for conflict assessment as a matter of course. However, it has taken significant time and advocacy to convince development

agencies to integrate conflict assessments into their planning and programming. Documenting the hard evidence of the impacts of development programmes on conflict was an essential part of this process and its ultimate success. Participants with previous experience of integrating conflict assessment into development programmes emphasised that the challenges of mainstreaming armed violence issues should not be underestimated. They identified the following elements as key to getting conflict issues on the development agenda.

- **Strong, contextual analysis;**
- **Simple, accessible presentation** of information, using the language of development officers;
- **Start small** rather than attempting large cross-cutting programmes; and

– **The development of ‘toolkits’**, which fit with existing development programmes and frameworks. This may mean designing SALW projects that do not look like SALW projects. As one participant noted from experience in their agency “if it smells like a SALW programme and looks like a small arms programme, it won’t get funded”.

- **Change the language of the SALW community:** A recurring recommendation throughout the workshop was the need to revolutionise the language of the SALW community to make it more relevant to poverty reduction and sustainable development. A number of participants argued that the language of “small arms and light weapons” is often too technical and relatively meaningless to development agencies. Although one participant argued that, “when you are in

a situation of violence, language doesn't matter", others maintained that, if you work in a development agency, terminology does matter. Participants also argued that the language of SALW did not adequately reflect and do justice to the work that is being undertaken. There was a degree of consensus among workshop participants that:

- “Preventing and reducing armed violence” is more relevant to development agencies than “combating SALW proliferation and misuse”.
- In order to effectively engage development agencies we need to:
  - i) Talk about people rather than weapons;
  - ii) Talk about guns rather than SALW; and
  - iii) Start talking about reducing armed violence, conflict, crime and

insecurity rather than reducing the number of weapons.

## HOW CAN ARMS ISSUES BEST BE INTEGRATED INTO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES?

---

It is one thing to change the language, and to develop evidence to demonstrate the relevance of SALW controls for poverty reduction. It is another to actually integrate armed violence reduction measures into development planning and programmes effectively. A fundamental shift in the approaches to planning and programming will be required if armed violence issues are to be successfully integrated into development programmes.

Participants recognised that in many contexts neither ‘security-only’ nor ‘development-only’ approaches work. The example of Uganda was cited by one participant who argued that the failure of the Karamajong Development Agency to address SALW issues undermined the success of its programme; conversely, attempts to disarm

the Karamajong without recognising the development issues failed to remove SALW from society.

A careful balance needs to be struck between continuing to support initiatives that aim to directly prevent and reduce arms availability and misuse (*stand-alone SALW programmes*), and creating programmes where SALW concerns are integrated into wider agendas (*SALW sensitive development programmes*). It was recognised that this proposed shift in approach would be difficult and take time. It would require strong co-operation between SALW experts and ‘mainstream’ development professionals. SALW actors may need to learn more about the perspectives, priorities and methodologies of development agencies.

Participants also recognised the need for increased information exchange and co-operation amongst donors on arms issues. To date, there has been inadequate donor

co-ordination, either formal or informal, on SALW policies or assistance, and few joint co-operation initiatives. Participants agreed that improved co-ordination is a high priority. It was suggested that donors revisit the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) guidelines on *Conflict, Peace and Development on the Threshold of the 21st Century* (1997) and on *Helping to Prevent Violent Conflict* (2001) as a starting point,<sup>14</sup> and consider encouraging the DAC to play more of a role in co-ordinating donor policy on arms issues.

## Recommendations

- Build the capacity of development professionals to address arms issues within wider development frameworks by including arms and security issues within their training and job descriptions;

- **Offer training and assistance to SALW experts**, on development programming and poverty reduction frameworks and methodologies.
- **SALW experts should examine how other issues have been mainstreamed**, such as HIV/AIDS, the environment, gender and conflict.
- **Increase information exchange and consultation among donors and development agencies**, to avoid duplication of funding and enhance the prospects for co-operation; and
- **Encourage the OECD DAC to play a role in improving co-ordination of donor policies on arms issues.**

<sup>14</sup> The Development Assistance Committee, *DAC Guidelines on Helping Prevent Violent Conflict*, OECD, Paris, 2001; and *Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation on the Threshold of the 21st Century* (OECD, Paris, 1997) encouraged 'conflict sensitive' development programming to contribute to: conflict prevention and reduction; peace-building; regional co-operation, and to engage with relevant security sector issues including security sector reform, DD&R, landmines, and SALW control.

## WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES OF INTEGRATING SALW MEASURES INTO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY FRAMEWORKS?

---

A number of the development agency representatives at the workshop argued that the only way to get development agencies to engage on arms control and reduction measures is to ensure that it is identified as an issue within key aid instruments. The following issues were discussed:

### **Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)<sup>15</sup>:**

The most important aid instrument is the Poverty Reduction Strategy process. This is normally written by Governments as a paper representing poverty reducing policy initiatives. The process

has been heavily supported by the World Bank, agreed with other International Financial Institutions and bilateral donor agencies. In several notable examples, bilateral and multilateral development support has been “harmonised” to assist delivery of the PRSP. For example, DFID’s bilateral assistance aims to support PRS processes and details of that support are set out in three year Country Assistance Plans (CAPs). The UN uses a similar process to draw up Development Assistance Frameworks (UN DAF), which coordinate in-country engagement by all UN agencies. Both of these aid instruments should, in theory, rely heavily on inclusive consultation. The best examples of PRS documents represent the views and “voices” of poor people and their own experiences of poverty. But in practice, quality and process varies.

---

<sup>15</sup> Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) describe a country’s macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programmes to promote growth and reduce poverty over a three year period. In theory, PRSPs should be country-driven, comprehensive in scope, partnership-oriented, and participatory. PRSPs are often used by other donors as the basis for their bilateral engagement with a country. On completion of a PRSP, a country is eligible for debt relief under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative, and concessional loans from the IMF’s Poverty Reduction and Growth Fund (PRGF).

Effectively integrating armed violence reduction programmes into these development frameworks, especially the PRSP, represents a challenge that should not be underestimated. Workshop participants cited two challenges in particular. Firstly, PRSPs and the international finance institutions that develop them use a discourse of economics and politics. To date economic analysis has been missing from SALW research and analysis. Secondly, the PRSP process is heavily supported by the World Bank, which, to date, has not engaged on the issue of arms, citing mandate restrictions<sup>16</sup>. Some participants argued that the World Bank's reluctance to engage on arms issues either hampered or deterred other agencies from tackling small arms problems. However, where PRS processes are consultative, it should be possible to find ways to capture poor people's concerns about security.

## **Budgetary support and sector wide approaches.**

Efforts to integrate arms issues are further challenged by development agencies increasingly offering multilateral and bilateral assistance via budgetary or sectoral support. Budgetary support, where money is given for use against an agreed development plan, depends on the developing country government articulating its development needs, and developing appropriate policies and programmes. Such a fundamental change in the provision of bilateral development assistance poses additional challenges for integrating armed violence issues into development programming. Participants identified the need for collective thinking on how issues such as violence, insecurity and arms proliferation can be considered within these frameworks. For the SALW community, familiar with providing stand-alone programmes and projects, or isolated policies, this will be a challenge.

---

<sup>16</sup> The Bank does not address disarmament primarily because its operational mandate states: 'In view of its mandate, the Bank does not engage in peacekeeping or peacemaking, which are the functions of the United Nations and certain regional organizations.' It also does not provide direct support to disarming combatants (World Bank 2001a), p152, Chapter 4 of the *Small Arms Survey 2003* "Development Denied".

### **Engaging governments and civil society in developing countries on armed violence issues.**

Although much discussion focused on practical ways of engaging the donor community, the buy-in and support of those states and individuals affected by armed violence is crucial. Participants emphasised that engagement with developing countries often needs to happen at a very local level. It is challenging but essential to secure the buy-in and ownership of all relevant actors, not just those within central/national government. Very often, the people affected by armed violence, or those parts of government and civil society that are working on arms issues, have difficulty being heard. Police or local and regional authorities tend to engage less with the donor community or may not be taking part in the PRSP process. Processes are often dominated by Ministries of Finance – who may not be aware of arms related security issues. Workshop participants raised questions about the representativeness of civil society organisations participating in PRSP processes and emphasised

the importance of ensuring that governmental and non-governmental actors working on violence and security issues are included in defining national policy framework processes.

### **Securing political buy-in in affected countries:**

Another recurring finding of the workshop was that securing political and policy buy-in from governments in affected countries is critical. For example, senior level government officials in Cambodia were clear that SALW controls needed to be an integral part of peace-building and development efforts. This was critical to the success of the EU ASAC programme. However, questions remain about how to identify those with the motivation, interest and capacity to work on SALW issues. It is not clear how the SALW community should work on arms issues in countries where governments are disinterested or lack the capacity to tackle these issues. Some participants advocated engaging at sub-national levels in countries where central government was either disinterested or hostile.

## Recommendations

In order to address these challenges the SALW community needs to:

- Conduct further analysis of the economic implications of armed violence for achieving poverty reduction;
- Engage with the World Bank and other IFIs to encourage them to consider armed violence issues as part of the constraints to eliminating poverty;
- Assemble the evidence and develop a firm argument to show the relevance of SALW to development agencies, especially through linking it to the MDGs and economic analysis;
- Raise awareness amongst senior level staff in development agencies to ensure high-level buy-in for arms issues;

- Ensure that where armed violence is a significant obstacle to development, this issue is included in development policy dialogues with developing country governments; and
- Encourage co-operation across different parts of government and within civil society to ensure that where armed violence is a significant obstacle to development this is articulated in a PRSP process.

## WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES OF INTEGRATING ARMED VIOLENCE ISSUES INTO SPECIFIC AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE?

The majority of development agencies, if they look at arms issues at all, tend to regard them through the lens of conflict management and peace building. Participants noted the need to widen the scope of development interventions to address armed violence within the context of, for example, humanitarian interventions, support for disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration programmes, security sector reform, policing and justice reform and violence reduction programmes. Beyond that, there is a need to look at how to integrate armed violence reduction into 'traditional' development sectors such as urban and rural development or governance, and into related methodologies such as sustainable livelihoods. There was a degree of consensus that this last area was new

territory to most participants.

### Recommendations

- **Integrating arms issues into conflict assessments and evaluations.** Many donor agency representatives argued for a more systematic incorporation of arms issues in conflict assessments, identifying this as the key entry point for further integration and the most effective way to access the strategic planning process for development assistance. The 'how' of conflict assessments is crucial – asking the right questions and getting good, in-depth analysis. It is not enough to simply 'name check' arms issues. Some participants suggested that guidelines could be developed which would help development professionals to propose appropriate arms control and reduction measures within conflict assessments.

■ **Integrating arms management within security sector reform.** The role and behaviour of state security agencies impact directly on opportunities for sustainable development and poverty reduction, and on people's physical security. Transforming the security sector to guarantee the safety of people and to reduce insecurity can play a key role in reducing the demand for small arms and light weapons. Participants noted that the linkages on the ground are very clear but that there was a need for closer policy integration on arms and on security sector reform. Many participants noted that small arms can offer an entry point to wider security sector issues, such as weapons possession, registration and licensing by the military and police forces. Conversely, security sector transformation programmes can offer entry points to engage on small arms

problems, such as defence or policing reviews. A key priority is to engage security sector reform processes on stockpile management, private use of weapons by military/police officers, and training on violence management and gun use.

■ **Integrating arms issues into urban development programmes.** Many urban areas across the world are acutely affected by armed violence and gun crime. Yet SALW controls are rarely integrated into programmes for urban development or violence reduction. Participants saw the potential for integration here but raised a number of questions. How can development agencies adapt urban development projects, such as health, safe water or sanitation to take account of the demand, availability and widespread misuse of guns? How can existing tools, such as conflict assessments, be developed

for more effective use in urban violence settings? One participant suggested that we should evaluate the approaches and methodologies of urban violence reduction programmes that focus on small arms, in countries such as Brazil or South Africa to develop examples of best practice.

- **Addressing armed violence in rural development programmes.** A number of participants argued that security issues tended to be neglected in rural development programming, particularly by bilateral donors working directly with the state. A number of reasons were offered, including the physical security of staff, mandate issues, budgetary inflexibility, inadequate capacity, and lack of expertise on arms issues. This is despite growing recognition of the impact of armed violence on development opportunities in rural communities.

One development agency representative explained how they had chosen to engage on security issues through natural resource management by establishing local conflict management mechanisms and institutions in border zones or areas of conflict over natural resources. In some areas, addressing SALW issues could open the door to engaging communities on wider issues of security and access to justice.

## WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF INTEGRATING SUPPORT FOR SALW CONTROLS INTO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES?

---

The value of promoting the integration of armed violence reduction measures and SALW controls into mainstream development agency policies and programmes was widely recognised. Nevertheless, many participants saw the merits of also continuing to support discrete, ‘stand-alone’ SALW projects. One of the most compelling reasons for retaining mechanisms and budgets to support stand-alone arms projects is that arms policies and programmes are still relatively new and untested. It is too soon to rely on mainstream development programming as the sole mechanism for supporting much-needed SALW control and armed violence reduction programmes. Some participants expressed concern that efforts to mainstream or integrate too quickly could

undermine existing SALW programmes, and that inadequate development agency understanding of the issues could lead to unrealistic aims or criteria for success.

Another argument for retaining donor capacity to support stand-alone SALW programmes is that governments and civil society organisations in many affected countries have developed specific political agreements and implementation programmes for dealing with arms issues. Considerable resources have been invested in raising awareness and building capacity on arms control and reduction issues. A shift in focus too soon could undermine this work.

In addition, not all arms proliferation issues can effectively be addressed through development programming. Issues such as arms export controls and stockpile management, fall within the sphere of foreign and defence ministries and other agencies. Although development agencies should be in a position to contribute to, or

collaborate with, such programme elements, there will be a continuing need in the short term for financial and technical assistance which is not integrated into wider development programmes.

## Recommendations

- Whilst sustained efforts are needed to promote the integration of SALW concerns into development policies and programming, it is premature to consider winding up stand-alone SALW programmes completely. More time is required to consolidate existing programmes and evaluate their success.

## CONCLUSIONS

---

Preventing and reducing armed violence poses major challenges for the international community, including development agencies. It is a complex, crosscutting issue, requiring comprehensive and sustained responses from the full range of relevant government departments, regional and international organisations, civil society groups and other stakeholders.

The impacts of the wide availability and use of SALW in many parts of the world are impeding economic development and poverty reduction. It is therefore desirable that development agencies engage more fully with arms control and reduction measures, and appropriately integrate armed violence issues into mainstream development policies and programmes.

Effective integration remains a challenge. There is a need for increased evidence and recognition of the linkages between arms availability and poverty. Capacity needs to be built within development agencies to enable them to develop their own understandings of armed violence issues and to allow them the space and resources to develop policy, evaluate existing programmes and to integrate these issues into wider development frameworks.

Above all, the Wilton Park workshop suggested that if the SALW community is to persuade development agencies of the centrality of this issue, it needs to conduct further research which is focused on poverty reduction and to radically adapt its messages and approach. Without such changes, small arms control runs the risk of being marginalised as a technical issue rather than an important tool in the global fight against poverty.

## Annex I

---

### Moving the agenda forward: Action points for DFID

---

The discussions at Wilton Park have influenced DFID's approach to work on integrating armed violence issues into the wider poverty reduction strategies. DFID is committed to moving this agenda forward, in partnership with others. Following the Wilton Park workshop, we have identified a number of areas of work in particular that we will pursue in the coming months:

- Continue to support efforts to promote dialogue between small arms actors and development agencies, and to support, with partners, efforts to develop appropriate integration of armed violence issues into development co-operation policies and programmes.

- Commission evaluations of existing SALW projects, both stand-alone and integrated, with a view to developing indicators of successful programmes and developing best practice guides on mainstreaming armed violence reduction issues into poverty reduction work.
- Commission a 6–8 month research project which will:
  - examine and document more systematically how and when armed violence obstructs poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals;
  - generate specific baseline data on a range of economic impacts of arms availability and armed violence at local, national and regional levels; and
  - explore the relationship between armed violence reduction and specific areas of development assistance (conflict

assessment, gender, security sector reform and urban development, for example).

- Publish this and other research as a single guide or handbook for development and small arms practitioners.

We would be interested in working in partnership with other development agencies on this agenda. We would welcome advice and views from other agencies on the possibility of joint co-operation.

## Annex II

---

### MONDAY 14 APRIL

---

1445 – 1500

#### Opening Session

Chair: Geraldine O'Callaghan, DFID

- Welcome: Wilton Park and DFID
- Objectives of meeting
- Introductions

1500 – 1600

#### HOW ARE SALW A DEVELOPMENT ISSUE?

Chair: Geraldine O'Callaghan, DFID

- Presentation:  
**Owen GREENE**, University of Bradford
- Respondent:  
**Keith KRAUSE**, Small Arms Survey
- Discussion

1630 – 1800

#### LESSONS LEARNT FROM DEVELOPMENT-ORIENTED SALW PROGRAMMES

Chair: Robert Muggah, Small Arms Survey

- Presentation: The Development of UNDP's Approach **Robert SCHARF**, Small Arms and Demobilisation Unit, United Nations Development Programme
- Presentation: Reflections on experience in Cambodia **David DE BEER**, European Union Assistance on Curbing SALW in Cambodia
- Presentation: National Plans in East and Southern Africa **Virginia GAMBA**, SaferAfrica
- Discussion

2030 – 2130

## **EVENING DISCUSSION: THE PROS AND CONS OF 'MAINSTREAMING'**

Chair: Keith Krause, Small Arms Survey

Discussion of issues and challenges of 'mainstreaming' conflict: Why mainstream an issue? How to sustain it?

- Presentation: **Mainstreaming Conflict Issues**  
**Sharon MORRIS**, US Agency for International Development
- Respondent: Paul EAVIS, Saferworld

## **TUESDAY 15 APRIL**

---

0900 – 1045

## **INTEGRATING SALW INTO POST CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION, PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND SECURITY SECTOR REFORM**

Chair: **Paul Eavis**, Saferworld

- Presentation: **Operation Harvest, Macedonia**  
**Henry BOLTON**, European Commission (Skopje)
- Presentation: **Great Lakes SALW Strategy**  
**Gilbert BARTHE**, UNDP
- Respondent: **Links between SSR and SALW**  
**Lu ECCLESTONE**, DFID
- Discussion

1115 – 1230

## **WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS: POST-CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION, PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND SECURITY SECTOR REFORM**

**WG1: Post-conflict reconstruction**

**WG2: Security Sector Reform**

1230 – 1300

Plenary feedback and discussion

1500 – 1645

## **INTEGRATING SALW INTO GOVERNANCE PROGRAMMES: POLICE REFORM AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE**

Chair: Kate Joseph, OSCE

■ Presentation: **Community-based policing and SALW control in Malawi Undule**

**MWAKASUNGULA**, Centre for Human Rights and Rehabilitation

■ Presentation: **Community policing in Kenya**

■ **Andy MACLEAN**, Saferworld

■ Discussion

1715 – 1900

## **INTEGRATING SALW INTO URBAN VIOLENCE REDUCTION**

Chair: Julia Saunders, Oxfam

■ Presentation: **Reducing gun violence in Rio de Janeiro Rubem FERNANDES**, Viva Rio

**Respondent: Bill GODNICK, International Alert**

■ Discussion

## WEDNESDAY 16 APRIL

---

0900 – 1045

### **INTEGRATING SALW INTO RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Chair: David Jackman, Quaker UN Office

- Presentation: **Ciru MWAURA**, Oxfam (Horn of Africa)
- Respondent: **Colin GLEICHMANN**, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)
- Discussion

1115 – 1230

### **WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS: CHALLENGES AND OBSTACLES IN MAINSTREAMING SALW INTO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES**

*WG1: Integrating SALW into national  
development strategies*

*WG2: Integrating SALW into development  
programmes*

*WG3: Integrating SALW into development  
institutions*

1400 – 1530

### **FEEDBACK FROM WORKING GROUPS**

Chair: Owen Greene

1600 – 1630

### **ISSUES AND PRIORITIES FOR INTEGRATING SMALL AND LIGHT WEAPONS INTO DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES**

Chair: Owen GREENE

- Presentation: **Key findings and  
Recommendations**  
Geraldine O'CALLAGHAN, DFID; Paul  
EAVIS, Saferworld
- Discussion

## Annex III

---

### WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

---

Mr Philip ALPERS  
Senior Fellow, Harvard Injury Control Research  
Centre Reduction,  
Harvard School of Public Health,  
USA

Mr Gilbert BARTHE  
Programme Manager, Small Arms,  
UNDP-Great Lakes Region,  
KENYA

Mr Henry BOLTON  
European Agency for Reconstruction,  
MACEDONIA

Mr Matias CAPAPELO  
Vice-President/Liaison Officer to Safer Africa,  
ANGOLA

Mr Denis CHOUINARD  
Deputy Director and Head of Research Non-  
proliferation, Project Manager Arms Control  
and Disarmament Division,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International  
Trade,  
CANADA

Mr David DE BEER  
Project Manager,  
European Union Assistance on Small Arms  
and Light Weapons in Cambodia (EU ASAC),  
CAMBODIA

Miss Yuko DOHI  
Associate Expert (Peacebuilding),  
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA),  
JAPAN

Mr Paul EAVIS  
Director, Saferworld,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Lu ECCLESTONE  
Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Rubem FERNANDES  
Director,  
Viva Rio,  
BRAZIL

Ms Virginia GAMBA  
Director,  
SaferAfrica,  
SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Colin GLEICHMANN  
Programme Manager,  
Development Cooperation, Small Arms Control  
GTZ (Gesellschaft für Technische  
Zusammenarbeit),  
GERMANY

Mr William H GODNICK  
Policy Adviser for Latin America,  
International Alert,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Adela GOOCH  
Associate Director, Wilton Park,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Heidi GRAU  
Desk Officer,  
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs,  
SWITZERLAND

Dr Owen GREENE  
Director,  
Centre for International Cooperation  
and Security,  
University of Bradford,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Francis GUENON  
Desk Officer,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,  
FRANCE

Mr Dirk HAUPT  
Desk Officer Conventional,  
Disarmament and CSBMS,  
Federal Foreign Office,  
GERMANY

Ms Claire HICKSON  
Governance Adviser,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Martin HOPPER  
Small Arms Project Officer,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr David JACKMAN  
Consultant,  
Quaker United Nations Office – Geneva,  
CANADA

Ms Kate JOSEPH  
CSBM Officer Organisation for Security  
and Cooperation in Europe,  
(OSCE),  
AUSTRIA

Ms Mary-Honor L KLOEG  
Policy Adviser,  
Small Arms and Light Weapons,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,  
NETHERLANDS

Mrs Riitta KORPIVAARA  
Counsellor,  
Arms Control, Non-proliferation and  
Disarmament Ministry for Foreign Affairs,  
FINLAND

Professor Keith KRAUSE  
Programme Director,  
Small Arms Survey,  
SWITZERLAND

Mr Christer LJUNGQVIST  
Deputy Director,  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs,  
SWEDEN

Mr Andrew MCLEAN  
Head of Communications,  
Head of Arms and Security Programme, Africa,  
Saferworld,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr Sharon L MORRIS  
Senior Adviser,  
Office of Conflict Management,  
USAID,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr Robert MUGGAH  
Project Manager,  
Small Arms Survey,  
SWITZERLAND

Mr Geoffrey MUGUMYA  
Project Leader, Weapons for  
Development Project,  
United Nations Institute for Disarmament  
Research, (UNIDIR GENEVA),  
SWITZERLAND

Mr Undule D K MWAKASUNGULA  
Project Coordinator,  
Community Safety and Empowerment Project,  
MALAWI

Ms Ciru MWAURA  
Regional Policy Co-ordinator,  
Peacebuilding and Conflict Management,  
Horn, East and Central Africa,  
ETHIOPIA

Mr Richard NABUDERE  
Coordinator,  
National Focal Point on SALW,  
UGANDA

Ms Geraldine O'CALLAGHAN  
Senior Adviser – Arms Control,  
Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Tom OWEN-EDMUNDS  
Team Manager, Conflict and Security Policy,  
Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Malcolm A RODGERS  
Senior Policy Officer,  
Christian Aid,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr Julia SAUNDERS  
Policy Adviser, Conflict and Arms,  
Oxfam,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Robert SCHARF  
Chief, Small Arms and Demobilisation Unit,  
United Nations Development Programme,  
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery,  
SWITZERLAND

Ms Solveig SCHUSTER  
Senior Program Officer, Peacebuilding Unit,  
Canadian International Development Agency,  
Multilateral Programmes Branch,  
CANADA

Mr Yusuke SHINDO  
Director of the Conventional  
Weapons Division,  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,  
JAPAN

Mr Luc TIMMERMANS  
Head of Unit, Peace Building,  
National Commission,  
Belgian Directorate for  
Development Cooperation,  
BELGIUM

Mr Dennis VANDI  
Director/ AG Chairman – Interim,  
Ministry of Defence,  
SIERRA LEONE

Mrs Judy WALKER  
Senior Social Development Adviser,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Robert WATT  
Small Arms Programme Manager,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Liz WILLIE  
Security Sector Reform Programme Manager,  
Department for International Development,  
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr José Marcelo ZACCHI  
General Coordinator, Violence Programmes,  
National Secretariat of Public Safety,  
Ministry of Justice,  
BRAZIL

For more information, please contact:

Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department,  
Department for International Development,  
1 Palace Street,  
London SW1E 5HE.

Email: [chadenquiry@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:chadenquiry@dfid.gov.uk)

Tel: (+44) 0845 300 4100

Fax: (+44) (0) 20 7023 0502

## The Department for International Development

The Department for International Development (DFID) is the UK Government department responsible for promoting sustainable development and reducing poverty. The central focus of the Government's policy, based on the 1997 and 2000 White Papers on International Development, is a commitment to the internationally agreed Millennium Development Goals, to be achieved by 2015. These seek to:

- Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Achieve universal primary education
- Promote gender equality and empower women
- Reduce child mortality
- Improve maternal health
- Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Ensure environmental sustainability
- Develop a global partnership for development

DFID's assistance is concentrated in the poorest countries of sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, but also contributes to poverty reduction and sustainable development in middle-income countries, including those in Latin America and Eastern Europe.

DFID works in partnership with governments committed to the Millennium Development Goals, with civil society, the private sector and the research community. It also works with multilateral institutions, including the World Bank, United Nations agencies, and the European Commission.

DFID has headquarters in London and East Kilbride, offices in many developing countries, and staff based in British embassies and high commissions around the world.

DFID, 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5HE

DFID, Abercrombie House, Eaglesham Road, East Kilbride, Glasgow G75 8EA

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7023 0000

Fax: +44 (0) 20 7023 0019

Public Enquiry Point: 0845 300 4100 (from outside the UK: +44 1355 84 3132)

DFID website: [www.dfid.gov.uk](http://www.dfid.gov.uk)

Email: [enquiry@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:enquiry@dfid.gov.uk)