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**International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons**

The International Tracing Instrument (ITI) sets out comprehensive and detailed international standards and measures to be adopted by States in three core areas:

- marking (para. 7-10);
- record-keeping (para. 11-13);
- cooperation in tracing (para. 14-23).

With regard to its implementation, the ITI encourages:

- provision of international cooperation and assistance (para. 27-29);
- cooperation with the UN system (para. 30-32);
- cooperation with INTERPOL (para. 33-35).

The implementation and the future development of the ITI will be reviewed within the framework of the conferences that review the PoA (para. 38).

(a) **Marking**

- New marking technologies were developed, such as laser engraving for import marking
- Many States enacted adequate legislation and procedures for SALW marking, including penalties and evidentiary rules\(^80\)
- Projects to help States develop capacity in marking, including provision of marking machines and related training
- Further achievements?

**Possible issues for consideration**

- Challenges posed by weapons families with similar design features and the trend towards modularity in weapons design\(^81\)
- Falsification, alteration or erasure of markings; difficulty of marking on certain materials\(^82\)
- Practical problems inherent to ensuring durable marks on polymer frames\(^83\)
- Temporary export and re-import of weapons\(^84\)
- Lack of equipment, expertise and other capacity shortfalls related to marking\(^85\)

\(^{80}\) A/66/157, page 5.
\(^{81}\) A/66/157, page 3.
\(^{82}\) A/66/157, page 4.
\(^{83}\) A/66/157, page 4.
\(^{84}\) A/66/157, page 4.
\(^{85}\) A/66/157, page 4.
• Few States exchange information on national marking systems, and fewer still exchange beyond regional frameworks
• Establishment of a technical committee to draft recommendations for marking in light of new developments in weapons manufacture and design
• Consideration of the technical differences between marking of small arms and of light weapons
• Inclusion of information on national marking practices in national reports on ITI implementation
• Other issues?

(b) Record-keeping

• Many States meeting or exceeding the ITI’s minimum standards for record-keeping
• Some States have set up firearms record-keeping systems, or adopted digitalized systems for record-keeping
• Further achievements?

Possible issues for consideration

• Lack of qualified personnel, equipment, and technologies
• Access to available databases to prevent trafficking
• Challenges associated with the conversion of a paper-based system into an electronic one
• Other issues?

(c) Cooperation in Tracing

• Use of digital photography for accurate weapons identification
• High success rates in tracing operations in some cases, especially for weapons produced in recent decades
• Many States use INTERPOL firearms tracing system or are developing systems that complement it
• Further achievements?

---

87 A/66/157, page 5.
88 A/RES/66/47.
93 A/66/157, page 8.
Possible issues for consideration

- Insufficient/inaccurate record-keeping leading to tracing failures\(^{94}\)
- Insufficient/inaccurate identification of weapons leading to tracing failures\(^{95}\)
- Misidentification of the manufacturer/country of manufacture in the case of weapons produced under foreign license
- Legal and bureaucratic impediments to the timely provision of data
- Conflicts between confidentiality requirements for tracing operation and judicial proceedings that require disclosure of information
- Delays in processing of tracing requests that could result in release of suspects due to lack of evidence
- Tracing weapons that crossed multiple borders
- Long and complex chain of ownership of many SALW
- Access to information by national points of contact
- Other issues?

(d) Implementation

- Laws, regulations and administrative procedures related to the implementation of the ITI integrated into the national processes in many States\(^{96}\)
- 97 States have communicated NPC for the ITI to UNODA\(^{97}\)
- Further achievements?

Possible issues for consideration

- Greater resources for international assistance programmes in capacity-building and training of relevant personnel\(^{98}\)
- Confusion/delineation of roles between national points of contact for the PoA and the ITI
- Relatively low rate of reporting on the ITI implementation, despite the firm commitment in the ITI to provide a report every two years
- Low rate of reporting on provision of technical, financial and other assistance,\(^{99}\) and no report on international cooperation in technology development\(^{100}\)
- Other issues?

---

\(^{94}\) A/66/157, page 6.
\(^{95}\) A/66/157, page 8.
\(^{96}\) A/CONF.192/BMS/2008/3, Annex II.3.
\(^{97}\) www.poa-iss.org.
\(^{98}\) UNIDIR analysis of 2008 on national reports 2002-2008.
\(^{100}\) UNIDIR analysis of 2008 on national reports 2002-2008.
(e) Other issues?

• Any other issues to be raised by States under the ITI implementation?

WHICH OF THE ABOVE SUBSTANTIVE ELEMENTS SHOULD BE REFLECTED IN THE PREPCOM OUTCOME DOCUMENT, AND HOW SHOULD THESE BE FORMULATED?