


Briefing Paper

August 2018



THE 2018 SMALL ARMS TRADE TRANSPARENCY BAROMETER

Paul Holtom and Irene Pavesi



Credits and contributors

Copy-editor: Alex Potter
(alex.potter@mweb.co.za)

Proofreader: Stephanie Huitson
(readstephanie@gmail.com)

Infographic: Daly Design
(studio@dalydesign.co.uk)

Design: Rick Jones (rick@studioexile.com)

Layout: raumfisch.de/sign berlin

Print: nbmedia, Geneva, Switzerland

About the authors

Paul Holtom is a senior researcher at the Small Arms Survey. His research focuses on efforts to regulate and monitor the international arms trade, as well as measures to address arms trafficking and diversion. He was the director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's Arms Transfers Programme (2009–13) and served as adviser to the 2013 and 2016 United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on the UN Register of Conventional Arms.

Irene Pavesi is a researcher at the Small Arms Survey. Her research focuses on transparency issues related to the international arms trade, and on methods for monitoring and measuring lethal violence at the global level. Since 2012 she has coordinated the Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer and the Small Arms Survey Database on Violent Deaths.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Eric Berman, Nicolas Florquin, Nicholas Marsh, Robert Perkins, and Matt Schroeder for providing valuable comments on a draft of this report, and Olivia Denonville for her crucial assistance with scoring national reports and validating the 2018 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer scores. The authors extend thanks to Ana Balcazar Moreno, Vincent Baumgartner, Torgeir Pande Braathen, Marco Centurione, Kristina Duric, Yejin Lee, Mathieu Morelato, Sven Richters, Juliana Sokolová, and Aleksandrina Mavrodieva for their assistance in translating and scoring national reports. The authors would also like to thank the production team.

The authors express their gratitude to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) of the government of Australia for its generous financial support of this publication.



Australian Government

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Overview

The 2018 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer (the Barometer) identifies the most and least transparent of 49 major small arms exporters, based on their reporting of their arms-trading activities undertaken in 2015.¹ For the first time the Barometer assesses Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and UN Programme of Action on small arms (PoA) reports to determine small arms exporters' levels of transparency. These sources provide new information for the Barometer's assessment of national transfer control systems, while ATT annual reports on arms exports reveal new data compared to national arms export reports; United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database (UN Comtrade) data, and the UN Register of Conventional Arms (UN Register). Despite the increase in reports containing information on national transfer control systems and small arms exports assessed by the Barometer, no major exporter received full marks for transparency.

Key findings

- The 2018 edition of the Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer identifies, in descending order, Switzerland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Serbia as the most transparent exporters for 2015.
- The least transparent exporters for 2015 are, in ascending order, Iran, North Korea, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, and Israel.
- The average score for the 2018 Barometer is 12.35 out of 25 points. Half of the major exporters under review gained scores below the average.
- The ATT initial and annual reports, together with PoA reports, shed new light on the national transfer control systems and reporting practices of several major exporters.

Introduction

The 2018 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer presents an assessment of reporting on small arms trade activities by 49 countries that exported at least USD 10 million worth of small arms and light weapons, including their parts, accessories, and ammunition, during any calendar year from 2001 to 2015. The score for each major exporter is based on an evaluation of information on its transfer control system and small arms exports made publicly available via national and multilateral instruments. The Barometer uses an established set of standardized scoring guidelines to assess 42 criteria across seven transparency parameters: timeliness, access and consistency, clarity, comprehensiveness, deliveries, licences granted, and licences refused (see Annexe A.1). The Barometer does not verify the accuracy of the information that countries provide. This edition of the Barometer identifies which countries are the most and least transparent major exporters of small arms, based on reporting on their arms trade activities in 2015, and assesses the impact of ATT reports on the transparency of international transfers of small arms.

Transparency Barometer review and revised scoring

When a new transparency mechanism or additional reporting practices on small arms transfers become available, they are integrated into the Barometer's assessment and the scoring guidelines are revised, if necessary. The first editions of the Barometer assessed national reporting practices on the basis of available national arms export reports, submissions to the UN Register, and contributions to UN Comtrade. In 2009 the Small Arms Survey revised the Barometer assessment process and scoring after the introduction of the European Union (EU) Annual Report on Arms Exports (Lazarevic,

2010).² In 2016 the methodology was revised a second time in order to:

1. address the timeliness of the multi-lateral reporting practices under review; and
2. include in the assessment the South-eastern Europe Regional Report on Arms Exports, which is coordinated, compiled, and disseminated by the South Eastern and Eastern Europe

Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC) (Pavesi, 2016).

The submission in 2016 of the first ATT annual reports, which include small arms exports that took place in 2015, led to a third revision of the assessment and scoring for the 2018 Barometer. This revision of the Barometer's scoring guidelines ensures consistency in assessment

practices for all instruments. In light of these changes, direct comparisons should not be made with previous editions. Annexe A.1 of the 2018 Barometer contains a more detailed overview of the revised scoring guidelines.

The 2018 Barometer reviews information gathered from the following sources for 49 major exporters:

- national arms export reports, including submissions to regional reports;³

Box 1 The contribution of ATT initial and annual reports to Transparency Barometer scoring

This box provides a summary of the way in which ATT initial and annual reports can contribute to a country's score in six out of the Barometer's seven parameters (see Annexe A.1).⁴ The timely and consistent submission of ATT initial and annual reports enable a country to score up to 17.75 out of a possible 25 points in the Barometer (see Figure 1). In comparison, the maximum number of points that can be awarded for reporting to the UN Register and UN Comtrade is 13.25 and 10.25 points, respectively.⁵ It should be noted, however, that the final score for each criterion is determined by the highest point scored by any of the sources under review.

- **Timeliness** (ATT reports can score 1.50 out of 1.50 available points): ATT states parties receive full points for submitting an ATT annual report on authorizations or actual exports—and imports—of small arms that took place during the previous calendar year, if this report is made publicly available by the ATT Secretariat within 13 months of the year under observation—for example, if the report on exports that took place during the 2015 calendar year is made available between January 2016 and January 2017. Points are therefore awarded on this basis, regardless of whether the report is submitted before the deadline established by the ATT (that is, 31 May for arms imports and exports in the previous calendar year). This is the same approach used for assessing timelines for reporting under other multilateral instruments.

- **Access and consistency** (1.50 out of 2.00 available points, starting from 2020):⁶ Points are awarded for 'access' if an ATT state party gives permission for its initial and annual ATT reports to be made publicly available on the ATT Secretariat website. An ATT state party can gain points for consistency after its ATT reports have been submitted and made publicly available for three years in a row.

- **Clarity** (3.75 out of 5.00 available points): ATT states parties receive points if their initial report and subsequent updates include information on laws, regulations, administrative procedures, and multilateral commitments to control exports, and regulate the transit or transshipment and brokering of small arms. Points are also awarded for publicly available ATT annual reports that contain information on small arms export licences granted or deliveries.


- **Comprehensiveness** (3.00 out of 6.5 available points, based on the ATT annual report template): If publicly available ATT annual reports contain information on small arms exports disaggregated by sub-category, quantity, value, and importer, then points are awarded. Points are also awarded for additional information, such as indicating the type of end user. The ATT annual report template neither requests nor invites information on transit, transshipment, re-export, or brokering transactions, nor on licence refusals for any types of international transfers. Therefore, it is assumed that points will not be awarded for these areas. Such information can, however, be voluntarily included in ATT annual reports, increasing Barometer scores for this parameter above the 3.00 points indicated above.

Such information can, however, be voluntarily included in ATT annual reports, increasing Barometer scores for this parameter above the 3.00 points indicated above.

- **Deliveries** (4.00 out of 4.00 available points): An ATT state party can receive full points if its annual report contains information on deliveries of small arms in a calendar year that indicates recipient state, specific end user, type, quantity, and value.

- **Licences granted** (4.00 out of 4.00 available points): Full points are awarded if an ATT annual report contains information on licences granted for small arms in a calendar year that indicates recipient state, specific end user, type, quantity, and value.

Figure 1 Attainable Transparency Barometer points for ATT reporting, by parameter



Source: Small Arms Survey (2018)

Points

- ATT initial and annual reports;
- national reports on the implementation of the UN PoA and International Tracing Instrument;
- the UN Register; and
- UN Comtrade.⁷

Including ATT and PoA reports in the Transparency Barometer

The ATT seeks to promote transparency in the international arms trade (UNGA, 2013, art. 1). Within one year of becoming a party to the treaty, states parties are legally obliged to submit an initial report on the measures undertaken to implement the treaty and to communicate updates on new measures (UNGA, 2013, art. 13.1). Further, states parties shall report annually, by 31 May, on their conventional arms imports and exports during the previous calendar year (UNGA, 2013, art. 13.3). To mitigate the additional reporting burden and address reporting fatigue, Article 13.3 notes that states parties can use the same information in their UN Register submissions and ATT annual reports. The previous Small Arms Survey Trade Update noted the differences and similarities between the ATT annual report template⁸ and the UN Register standardized reporting form (Holtom and Pavesi, 2017, pp. 48–49).

Twenty-eight of the 49 countries under review for the 2018 Barometer submitted an ATT annual report in 2016, which covered arms trade activities that occurred in 2015, and an initial report during 2015–16 (see Table 1).⁹ Therefore, all ATT states parties under review have submitted an initial and annual report to the ATT Secretariat, even if not all of these states did so before the respective reporting deadlines. Not all of these reports have been made publicly available (see Table 1). Box 1 describes how comprehensive ATT initial and annual reports can produce high scores for small arms trade transparency in the Barometer.

Table 1 Major small arms exporters that submitted ATT and PoA reports, 2014–16

| Exporter | Arms Trade Treaty | | Programme of Action | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | Initial report | Annual report for 2015 | 2014 report | 2016 report |
| Argentina | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Australia | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Austria | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Belgium | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Brazil | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Bulgaria | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Canada ^a | | | | ✓ |
| China | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Croatia | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Cyprus ^b | ✓* | | ✓ | |
| Czech Republic | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Denmark | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Finland | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| France | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Germany | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Hungary | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| India | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Iran | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Israel | | | | |
| Italy | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Japan | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Mexico | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Netherlands | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| North Korea | | | | |
| Norway | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Pakistan | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Peru ^c | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Philippines | | | | ✓ |
| Poland | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Portugal | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Romania | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Russian Federation | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Saudi Arabia | | | | ✓ |
| Serbia | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Singapore | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Slovakia | ✓ | ✓* | | ✓ |
| South Africa | ✓ | ✓ [†] | ✓ | |
| South Korea ^d | | | ✓ | |
| Spain | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Sweden | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Switzerland | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Taiwan, China | | | | |
| Thailand ^e | | | | ✓ |
| Turkey | | | | ✓ |
| United Arab Emirates | | | | |
| Ukraine | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| United Kingdom | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| United States | | | ✓ | ✓ |

Notes

Grey background: not an ATT state party, as of 26 January 2018.

* Annual or initial report submitted with preference that the report is not made publicly available.

[†] Small arms export data not included in the annual report.

^a Canada submitted a PoA report in 2015.

^b First annual report due by 31 May 2018 (ATT Secretariat, 2018).

^c First annual report due by 31 May 2018 (ATT Secretariat, 2018).

^d Initial report due by 25 February 2018; first annual report due by 31 May 2019 (ATT Secretariat, 2018).

^e Thailand submitted a PoA report in 2015.

“The 2018 Barometer identifies Switzerland as the most transparent small arms exporter, followed by the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Serbia.”

For the first time, this edition of the Barometer also includes reports submitted by UN member states on measures to implement the PoA, which are made publicly available by the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA, n.d.).¹⁰ UN member states are encouraged to report biennially on the implementation of the UN PoA, including on laws, regulations, and administrative procedures to control and regulate international small arms transfers. With the inclusion of the ATT initial reports and PoA reports, for the first time the Barometer takes into account sources that do not contain statistical data on arms exports. These sources can provide points for ‘clarity’ with regard to national transfer control systems, including brokering; measures undertaken to reduce small arms diversion; and existing international and regional commitments.

ATT states parties are obliged to report on exports and imports of all eight categories of conventional arms covered by the ATT. They are encouraged to report using 11 sub-categories for small arms and light weapons and two sub-categories for ‘other’ small arms and light weapons (ATT Secretariat, 2017, p. 11). States can indicate whether information has been withheld due to ‘national security or commercial confidentiality concerns’. For example, Bulgaria’s first ATT annual report contains information for ten sub-categories of small arms and light weapon exports, but also indicates that information had been withheld. Therefore, it is possible that Bulgaria has not provided a complete account of its small arms

exports in its first ATT annual report (ATT Secretariat, n.d.). Conversely, Argentina’s first report contains information only for exports of small arms in the sub-category ‘pistols and revolvers’, but indicates that no information was withheld. These two data points help to determine if a country’s report is incomplete (ATT Secretariat, n.d.). This is not so easy to determine for the other multilateral mechanisms under review. Therefore, comprehensive ATT annual reports can contribute points for the Barometer’s parameters on ‘comprehensiveness’, ‘deliveries’, and ‘licences granted’ (see Box 1).

ATT annual reports shed new light on reporting practices by transparent exporters. For example, previous editions of the Barometer assumed that Germany’s UN Register submission contained data on small arms deliveries, unless otherwise specified. Germany’s submission to the UN Register on its 2010 activities indicated that data pertained to licences granted for commercial international transfers (UNGA, 2011, p. 96), but it has not provided such an indication in subsequent submissions. It was assumed that Germany reports on deliveries, and points were awarded accordingly. However, Germany’s ATT annual report reveals that its small arms export data refers to licences issued, not deliveries. The data contained in the ATT report matches the data in the UN Register submission. Therefore, Germany is not awarded points for data on deliveries in this edition of the Barometer.


The Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer 2018

The 2018 Barometer identifies Switzerland as the most transparent small arms exporter based on information provided on its small arms trade activities conducted in 2015 (with a score of 21.75 points out of a possible 25 points), followed by the Netherlands (20.00 points), the United Kingdom (20.00 points), Italy (19.50 points), and Serbia (19.00 points). All five countries published a national report; submitted an ATT annual report, ATT initial report, and PoA report; and provided data for UN Comtrade. These sources contain information on the national transfer control system and small arms exports that took place in 2015.

Switzerland is the most transparent exporter of small arms according to the 2018 Barometer. It is the only major exporter that releases a dedicated national report on small arms exports, which contains information on export authorizations, including denials, deliveries, transit, and brokering of small arms (SECO, 2016). Switzerland submitted its first ATT annual report in May 2016, despite not being obliged to do so until 31 May 2017 (ATT Secretariat, 2018). To increase its score further, Switzerland needs to report on temporary exports,¹¹ re-exports, and details on the end users of arms deliveries.

The Netherlands releases detailed monthly reports on arms export, transit, and brokering licences. These reports include descriptions of items, including small arms, and distinguish between permanent and temporary exports, which gives the Netherlands one of the highest scores for comprehensiveness (Nederlandse Rijksoverheid, 2016). The Netherlands could increase its Barometer score if it includes the following information in its reports: the number of items subject to licences or delivered, the intended end users, and details of the quantity and value of small arms when a licence is refused.

The 2018 Transparency Barometer



The United Kingdom makes data available on export licences issued and refused through quarterly reports and the Strategic Export Controls: Reports and Statistics website (UK DIT, n.d.; UK ECJU, n.d.), which provides an online tool for creating reports on different types of export licences disaggregated by EU Common Military List category and destination. The quarterly reports include information on licences issued and refused; the value, quantity, and description of the items; and, for some items, the end user or end use. The UK national report, ATT annual report, and UN Register submission contain information on exports of shotguns; these are categorized as ‘rifles and carbines’ in the ATT annual report and UN Register submission. The United Kingdom’s score could be increased if it provided information on deliveries of small arms.

Italy has not reported to the UN Register since 2009, but information on small arms exports contained in its national report, UN Comtrade submission, and ATT report made it one of the most transparent major exporters for 2015. Italy’s first ATT annual report reveals the quantity of small arms authorized for export, broken down by sub-category and importing state. Italy’s national report on arms export licences for 2015 indicates that no small arms export licence applications had been refused (Consiglio dei Ministri, 2016, p. 715). Italy, however, does not disclose intended end users for export licences nor provide disaggregated information on small arms brokering activities. Data on re-exports and transit is partial, because destinations are not listed. Addressing these issues could further boost Italy’s score.

Serbia reports to all multilateral instruments under review and makes information available on the national transfer control system and data on authorizations and deliveries. It also publishes a national report on arms exports and contributes to the South-eastern Europe Regional Report on Arms Exports (Serbia, 2015; SEESAC, 2017). Both the national

and regional reports only become available two years after the year of activity, which is reflected in a lower score for timeliness. Serbia could increase its score by revealing information on temporary exports and the reasons for export licence refusals.

According to the 2018 Barometer, the least transparent major exporters were Iran, North Korea, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Saudi Arabia, and Israel. North Korea and the UAE did not report to any of the transparency mechanisms considered for the Barometer, and therefore scored zero points. Iran and Saudi Arabia submitted PoA reports in 2016. Saudi Arabia’s PoA report contained information on its national transfer control system, but Iran’s PoA report did not contain information that could be assessed using Barometer criteria. Consequently, Iran did not score any points for clarity and scored zero points overall. Israel could only be assessed by using its UN Register submission, which indicated that the country did not export mortars or man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS). The report did not include information on small arms.

On average, the exporters reviewed for the 2018 Barometer scored 12.35 points out of 25 available points. Twenty-five out of 49 exporters under review achieved a score above this average, while three exporters scored zero points. Therefore, the 2018 Barometer has an average score that is almost half of the maximum points that can be awarded, and just over half of the assessed states recorded scores above this.

Conclusion

The 2018 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer marks a break with previous editions of the Barometer due to revisions to the scoring system resulting from the availability of the first ATT initial and annual reports. The 2018 Barometer should therefore be considered as the beginning of a new time series for transparency

Table 2 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer 2018, covering major exporters, 2015*

| Exporter | Total points | National report **/ regional report *** | UN Comtrade** | UN Register** | ATT/PoA | | | Total timeliness (1-50 max.) | Total access and consistency (2-00 max.) | Total clarity (5-00 max.) | Total comprehensive-ness (6-50 max.) | Total deliveries (4-00 max.) | Total licences granted (4-00 max.) | Total licences refused (2-00 max.) |
|----------------------------|--------------|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | ATT annual report | ATT initial report † | PoA † | | | | | | | |
| Switzerland | 21.75 | X | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 4.50 | 5.25 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| Netherlands | 20.00 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 2.00 | 4.50 | 6.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| United Kingdom | 20.00 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 2.00 | 4.50 | 5.00 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| Italy | 19.50 | X/EU | X | o | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.50 | 5.50 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 2.00 |
| Serbia | 19.00 | X/SEE | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.50 | 5.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| Germany | 18.50 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 2.00 | 4.25 | 3.75 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 |
| Romania | 18.00 | X/EU | o | X(14) | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.50 | 5.75 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 0.25 |
| Belgium ^a | 17.75 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | o | 1.50 | 2.00 | 3.75 | 4.00 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Spain | 17.50 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| France | 17.25 | X/EU | X | X(14) | X | X | X | 1.50 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 4.75 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 0.50 |
| Poland | 17.25 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.75 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 2.00 |
| Sweden | 17.25 | X/EU | X | X(14) | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 4.75 | 5.25 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 0.25 |
| Portugal | 16.50 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.25 | 5.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.25 |
| Austria | 16.00 | EU | X | X | X | X | o | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 4.50 | 3.50 | 2.00 | 0.25 |
| United States ^b | 15.75 | X | X | X | o | o | X | 1.50 | 1.75 | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| Czech Republic | 15.25 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 4.75 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 0.25 |
| Norway | 15.25 | X | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.75 | 4.75 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| Slovakia | 15.25 | X/EU | X | X | X* | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.25 | 4.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| Hungary | 15.00 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 4.25 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 0.25 |
| Finland | 14.50 | X/EU | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 3.75 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 |
| Canada | 13.50 | X | X | X | o | o | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Denmark | 13.50 | X/EU | X | o | X | X | o | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 3.75 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| Croatia | 13.25 | X/EU | X | o | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 3.25 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| Bulgaria | 13.00 | X/EU | o | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 1.00 |
| Australia | 12.50 | X | X | o | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.75 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Japan | 12.00 | o | X | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.25 | 3.75 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Mexico | 11.75 | o | X | X | X | X | o | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 3.75 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| South Korea ^c | 11.75 | X | X | o | o | X† | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.25 | 2.50 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| South Africa ^d | 11.50 | X | o | o | X | X | o | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.25 | 3.25 | 0.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Argentina | 11.00 | o | X | o | X | X | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Cyprus | 11.00 | o | X | X | o | X† | o | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 10.25 | SEE | o | X | X | X | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.25 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 1.50 | 0.00 |
| India | 10.25 | o | X | X | o | o | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 3.25 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Thailand | 10.25 | o | X | o | o | o | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.00 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Taiwan, China ^e | 10.00 | X | o | o | o | o | o | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Turkey ^f | 9.75 | X | X | o | o | o | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.50 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| Exporter | Total points | National report **/ regional report *** | UN Comtrade** | UN Register** | ATT/PoA | | | Total timeliness (1.50 max.) | Total access and consistency (2.00 max.) | Total clarity (5.00 max.) | Total comprehensiveness (6.50 max.) | Total deliveries (4.00 max.) | Total licences granted (4.00 max.) | Total licences refused (2.00 max.) |
|--------------------|--------------|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | ATT annual report | ATT initial report [†] | PoA [‡] | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peru | 9.50 | 0 | X | 0 | X | X | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Russian Federation | 9.50 | 0 | X | X | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Singapore | 9.25 | 0 | X | X | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ukraine | 9.25 | X | 0 | X | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.75 | 2.50 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Philippines | 9.00 | 0 | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Brazil | 8.75 | 0 | X | X | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 1.00 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| China | 8.25 | 0 | X | X(14) | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 1.50 | 1.75 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pakistan | 7.75 | 0 | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 1.50 | 0.50 | 1.75 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Israel | 0.75 | 0 | 0 | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Saudi Arabia | 0.50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Iran | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| North Korea | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| UAE | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Notes

The online version of the Transparency Barometer incorporates corrections that may affect country scores and rankings. For this reason, the online version rather than the printed one should be considered definitive. See Small Arms Survey (n.d.).

* Major exporters are countries that export—or are believed to export—at least USD 10 million worth of small arms, light weapons, their parts, accessories, and ammunition in a given year. The 2018 Barometer includes any state that qualified as a major exporter at least once during the 2001–15 calendar years; it assesses arms trade activities for 2015.

** X indicates that a report was issued or submitted by the cut-off date—that is, 13 months after the year in which the trade activities took place. X(year) indicates that, because a report was not issued or submitted by the cut-off date, the country was evaluated on the basis of its most recent submission, which covered activities for the year reported in brackets.

*** The Barometer assesses information provided in the following regional reporting instruments: (1) the EU's *Seventeenth Annual Report* (Council of the EU, 2016), which reflects exports of military equipment carried out by EU member states in 2015 and appears as 'EU' in the Barometer; and (2) the regional report compiled by SEESAC (SEESAC, 2017), which covers data on transfers completed in 2014 by exporters from South-eastern and Eastern Europe and appears as 'SEE' in the Barometer. The SEESAC Regional Report for arms transfers in 2015 was not available when the 2018 Barometer was finalized.

♣ The annual ATT report was submitted to the ATT Secretariat, but the country requested that the report not be made publicly available.

† The initial ATT report was submitted to the ATT Secretariat, but the country requested that the report not be made publicly available.

♦ X indicates that an initial ATT report was submitted during 2015–17.

▲ X indicates that a PoA national report was submitted during 2014–16.

Scoring system

The scoring system for the 2018 Barometer allows exporters to earn up to 25 points on the basis of 42 criteria in 7 parameters: timeliness; access and consistency; clarity; comprehensiveness; and the level of detail provided on actual deliveries, licences granted, and licences refused. For detailed scoring guidelines, see Table A.1 in Annex A1 below.

Explanatory notes

- The 2018 Barometer assesses national arms export reports that were made publicly available between 1 January 2015 and 31 January 2017. It also reflects information submitted by states to regional reporting mechanisms that were published after 31 January 2017 and before the Barometer was finalized (31 May 2018)—although the submission of this data does not receive points for timeliness.
- The 2018 Barometer takes into account national submissions to the UN Register from 1 January 2015 to 31 January 2017, as well as information submitted to UN Comtrade on 2015 exports up to and including 24 November 2016.
- The fact that the Barometer is based on multiple reporting mechanisms—international, regional, and national—works to the advantage of exporters that submit data to all of these mechanisms. While Barometer scores acknowledge the provision of information to any of the reporting mechanisms, the same information is not credited twice.

State-specific notes

^a In addition to the national report issued by the Belgian federal government, each Belgian region (Brussels, Flanders, and Wallonia) reports separately on its arms exports.

^b For the purposes of the Barometer, the US national report refers to the State Department report issued pursuant to Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act on direct commercial sales, as well as the report on foreign military sales, which is prepared by the US Department of Defense (US DoD, 2015; US DoS, 2016). For the first time, the 2018 Barometer assesses information on foreign trade provided via USA Trade Online (US CB, n.d.).

^c The Transparency Barometer 2018 assesses South Korea's national arms export report for the first time, although according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) database on national reports on arms exports, this report is the second edition (SIPRI, n.d.). The national report is produced by the Defence Acquisition Program Administration and provides information on export authorizations.

^d In the evaluation of South Africa's national report the term 'conveyance' is interpreted to mean transit in accordance with the definition provided in the National Conventional Arms Control Act (South Africa, 2002, art. 1(vii)).

^e Data on Taiwan, China was retrieved from the Directorate General of the Customs Administration of the Ministry of Finance (Taiwan, China, n.d.).

^f SIPRI's database on national reports on arms export indicates that the Defence Industry Manufacturers Association publishes an annual report on Turkey's arms exports (SIPRI, n.d.). The Barometer does not consider this report in assessing the country's transparency because it is not produced by a government agency, and thus is not representative of national reporting practices.

“ATT states parties can do more to help fulfil the purpose of the ATT and promote transparency in the international trade in arms.”

scores and as a possible baseline for future assessments of transparency in the small arms trade.

Switzerland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Italy, and Serbia are the most transparent exporters in this edition of the Barometer, while Israel, Saudi Arabia, Iran, North Korea, and the UAE are the least transparent countries. Iran, North Korea, and the UAE each scored zero points.

The addition of PoA reports to the sources assessed by the Barometer revealed information on transfer control systems that allowed points to be awarded to 15 countries, including exporters that are not ATT states parties. The inclusion of ATT initial reports and annual reports on arms exports and imports made a positive contribution to the scores of more than half of the assessed countries in the 2018 Transparency Barometer. In particular, these sources of information reveal more information on transfer control measures and on both authorizations and actual small arms exports than the sources used for previous editions of the Barometer.

Twenty-three of the 25 states that received at least half of the available Barometer points are ATT states parties, indicating that, overall, ATT states parties are the most transparent major exporters. Nevertheless, five ATT states parties that submitted initial and annual reports still recorded scores that were below average, and no ATT state party received full points. Therefore, ATT states parties can do more to help fulfil the purpose of the ATT and promote transparency in the international trade in small arms. ●

Annexe A1: Revised Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer scoring guidelines

The assessment of ATT initial and annual reports for the Barometer led to the third revision of the standardized scoring guidelines (see Table A.1). The revision of the scoring guidelines harmonizes the assessment of information across sources and reflects lessons learned over 15 years of analysing reporting practices.

The Barometer’s previous scoring system assumed that the top and major exporters under review export a wide variety of small arms. Analysis of information contained in UN Register and Comtrade submissions shows that countries can export USD 10 million worth of small arms in a single calendar year due to exports of one sub-category of small arms for one destination or be important exporters for a limited number of small arms sub-categories. For example, in 2013 Peru recorded exports of USD 10 million worth of small arms in UN Comtrade, but the export of small arms ammunition to the United States accounted for USD 9 million worth of this total.¹²

In recognition of the fact that major exporters do not appear to export items in every small arms sub-category, there have been two amendments to the Barometer’s scoring guidelines with regards to sub-categories of small arms in UN Register submissions:

1. Previously, when a state submitted background information on the international transfer of small arms to the

UN Register using the standardized reporting form, it was considered an omission if one or more sub-categories of small arms and light weapons did not contain information on exports. It is now acknowledged that major exporters do not export every sub-category of small arms every year, and that a UN Register submission can legitimately contain exports for some sub-categories, but not for all of them. Therefore, the new scoring guidelines interpret blank fields in sub-categories in a submitted report as ‘nothing to report’, and such reports are awarded full points for each relevant criterion if exports for only one or several sub-categories are recorded. This adjustment ensures consistency with the approach used for assessing other criteria—that is, only the information provided is assessed and assumptions are not made that a state has deliberately omitted information if a sub-category does not contain information on exports. This practice also applies to ATT annual reports, albeit with a slight adjustment, because ATT states parties are requested to indicate if information has been withheld from the report for ‘commercial confidentiality’ or ‘national security’ reasons. If an ATT annual report indicates that information has been withheld on such grounds, full points are not awarded.

2. Previously, full points were only awarded for the provision of information on the quantity and importing country for at least seven of the 13 UN Register sub-categories of small arms contained in the UN Register standardized reporting form. The new scoring guidelines drop this requirement and award full points if information on at least one sub-category of small arms is reported, but information on the quantity and importing country must still be provided for all of the sub-categories for which exports

Table A.1 Overview of revisions to the Barometer scoring guidelines

| Parameter (max. points) | Criteria (points)* | National report (NR)/regional report (RR) | | ATT/PoA** | | | UN Register | UN Comtrade |
|--|--|---|----|-------------------|--------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|
| | | NR | RR | ATT annual report | ATT initial report | PoA | | |
| Timeliness (1.50) | 1.1 Did the exporter submit data in 2015 or 2016? (0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 1.2 Did the exporter submit data in 2016? (0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 1.3 Did the exporter submit data in 2016 that concerned activities in 2015 or 2016? (0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Access and consistency (2.00) | 2.1 Did the exporter make its national report available online free of charge? (0.5) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 2.2 Did the exporter provide interim information—such as bi-annual or quarterly reports—in addition to a consolidated annual report? (0.5) | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | 2.3 Did the exporter use the same tool to report on activities in 2013, 2014, and 2015? (0.5) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 2.4 Did the exporter use a single additional tool to report on activities in 2013, 2014, and 2015? (0.5) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Clarity (5.00) | 3.1 Did the exporter distinguish between government- and private industry-supplied transactions? (1/0.5) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 3.2 Did the exporter distinguish small arms and light weapons from other types of conventional weapons? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 3.3 Did the exporter distinguish small arms and light weapons ammunition from ammunition for other types of conventional weapons? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ |
| | 3.4 Did the exporter provide information on temporary exports? Examples would include transfers to trade shows that must be returned, transfers to troops in peace operations, and material sent to be repaired and returned. (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 3.5 Did the exporter provide information on its small arms-related laws, regulations, and administrative procedures, as well as its multilateral commitments? | | | | | | | |
| | 3.5.1 Did the country provide information on its transfer control system, including brokering control, to any reporting mechanism? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | 3.5.2 Did the exporter provide information on the measures it uses to prevent and detect the diversion of international small arms and light weapons transfers? (0.25) | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | 3.5.3 Did the exporter provide information on its sub-regional, regional, and international commitments relating to the control of international small arms and light weapons transfers, including brokering? (0.25) | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | 3.6 Did the exporter provide information on deliveries? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 3.7 Did the exporter provide information on licences granted? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| 3.8 Did the exporter provide information on small arms brokering authorizations? (0.5) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |

| Parameter (max. points) | Criteria (points)* | National report (NR)/regional report (RR) | | ATT/PoA** | | | UN Register | UN Comtrade |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|----|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|
| | | NR | RR | ATT annual report | ATT initial report | PoA | | |
| Comprehensiveness (6.50) | 4.1 Did the exporter provide information on its exports of guided light weapons, such as MANPADS and anti-tank guided weapons? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 4.2 Did the exporter provide information on its exports of unguided light weapons apart from heavy machine guns and anti-materiel rifles—that is, rocket launchers such as RPGs and anti-tank weapons, grenade launchers, mortars, and recoilless rifles and guns? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 4.3 Did the exporter provide information on exports of sporting and hunting guns or rifles? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 4.4 Did the exporter provide information on exports of pistols and revolvers? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 4.5 Did the exporter provide information on exports of military firearms—automatic rifles; light, medium, and heavy machine guns; sub-machine guns; anti-materiel rifles; and military shotguns—apart from pistols and revolvers? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 4.6 Did the exporter provide information on exports of ammunition of 12.7 mm calibre and below, as well as shotgun shells? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ |
| | 4.7 Did the exporter provide information on exports of ammunition larger than 12.7 mm calibre that is used in light weapons? Single-use light weapons systems that contain both the launcher and the projectile are treated as light weapon in either 4.1 or 4.2, above, and are not considered as ‘ammunition’ here. (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ |
| | 4.8 Did the exporter provide information on exports of parts and accessories for small arms and light weapons? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ |
| | 4.9 Did the exporter provide information on ‘intangible transfers’ concerning small arms and light weapons, their ammunition, or their parts and accessories? Intangible transfers include the provision of technical plants, blueprints, know-how, schematics, and software for the production of small arms, light weapons, their ammunition, or their parts and accessories. (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | 4.10 Did the exporter provide information on permanent re-exports of small arms and light weapons, and/or their ammunition, not including temporary exports covered in 3.4? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 4.11 Did the exporter identify the origin and destination of permanent re-exports of small arms and light weapons and/or their ammunition? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 4.12 Did the exporter provide information on transit or transshipment of small arms and light weapons, and/or their ammunition? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 4.13 Did the exporter identify the origin and destination of the transit or transshipment of small arms and light weapons and/or their ammunition? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |

| Parameter (max. points) | Criteria (points)* | National report (NR)/regional report (RR) | | ATT/PoA** | | | UN Register | UN Comtrade |
|--|--|---|----|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----|----------------|----------------|
| | | NR | RR | ATT annual report | ATT initial report | PoA | | |
| Deliveries (4.00) | 5.1 Did the exporter provide information on delivery recipients? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 5.2 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND specific end user—such as riot control police, air force, museum, or private dealer? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 5.3 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND the types AND quantities of weapons and/or ammunition delivered? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | 5.4 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND the types AND values of weapons and/or ammunition delivered? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Licences granted (4.00) | 6.1 Did the exporter provide information on licence recipients? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 6.2 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND the types AND quantities of weapons and/or ammunition delivered? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 6.3 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND the types AND quantities of weapons and/or ammunition delivered? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| | 6.4 Did the exporter provide information on the state of import AND the types AND values of weapons and/or ammunition delivered? (1/0.5) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Licences refused (2.00) | 7.1 Did the exporter identify the countries of prospective import that were refused licences? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |
| | 7.2 Did the exporter provide a reason or explanation for its refusal to grant a licence to the applicant or state of prospective import? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |
| | 7.3 Did the exporter provide information on the types AND quantities of weapons and/or ammunition that were the subject of a licence refusal? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | 7.4 Did the exporter provide information on the types AND values of weapons and/or ammunition that were the subject of a licence refusal? (0.5/0.25) | ✓ | | | | | | |

Notes

* For some criteria only full points are awarded, while for others both partial and full points can be awarded, depending on the comprehensiveness of the information provided by the exporters. In the latter case, two possible scores are given, for example (1/0.5).

** New source for the 2018 Transparency Barometer.

- Grey background: not applicable
- Orange background: changes in interpretation of nil reports
- Green background: drop of threshold for number of categories reported

- Yellow background: changes based on revision of best practices
- ✓ Voluntary information
- ✓ Not scored in the 2018 Transparency Barometer but will be taken into account in subsequent editions of the Barometer

are indicated. As above, this is to ensure consistency in the application of the Barometer’s methodology. This practice also applies to ATT annual reports, with the proviso that the state doesn’t indicate that it has withheld information for ‘commercial confidentiality’ or ‘national security’ reasons.

Other changes are based on emerging practice identified as a result of analysis of national transfer control processes described in ATT and PoA reports:

- Criterion 3.5.1 (national transfer control system) and criterion 3.5.2 (brokering control) were merged because measures to regulate arms brokers and brokering should be part of the national transfer control system. The new scoring guidelines award full points for a detailed explanation of the national transfer control system using the ‘voluntary information’ sections of ATT initial reports and PoA reports. Partial points are awarded for indicating that measures are in place—that is, by ticking boxes in the reporting templates for the ATT and PoA reports—and for listing relevant legislation and regulations.
- Criterion 3.7 (licences granted) is an addition to the scoring guidelines for the Barometer assessment because the provision of information on licences granted and licences refused should not be assessed in a single criterion. Therefore, criterion 3.7 now awards full points when data is provided on export authorizations disaggregated by small arms sub-category or type. Partial points are awarded if information is provided by Wassenaar Arrangement Munition List or EU Common Military List category.¹³
- Finally, new criterion 3.8 (brokering authorizations) shifts the focus of assessment from information on individual arms brokers to brokering licences. This change is due to the fact that no major exporter provides details of registered arms brokers in

its national reports or for multilateral reporting mechanisms, but it is an emerging practice to provide information on licences issued for brokering activities. Information is provided on the country of origin and destination, the small arms being transferred, their value or quantity, and in some cases licences refused. In addition to the availability of such information, the licensing of brokering transactions provides for case-by-case assessment and greater scrutiny than the registration of brokers alone. A two-stage process of registration to be a broker and licensing for each transaction is an encouraged practice. Therefore, points are now awarded in recognition of the availability of information and emerging practice.

Notes

- 1 In the Small Arms Survey’s Trade Update a distinction is drawn between major and top exporters. Top exporters are those trading at least USD 100 million worth of small arms and light weapons, including their parts, accessories, and ammunition, in a calendar year. For major exporters the threshold is USD 10 million worth of exports. In the Barometer, top exporters are included in the ‘major exporters’ category, and the distinction only becomes significant in terms of the wider analysis of the Trade Update.
- 2 EU Annual Report on Arms Exports according to Article 8(2) of Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP defining common rules governing the control of exports of military technology and equipment (Council of the EU, 2008).
- 3 For the purposes of the Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer, national arms export reports also include national submissions (1) by EU member states to the EU Annual Report on Arms Exports (Council of the EU, 2016), and (2) by South-east European states for the regional report compiled by SEESAC (SEESAC, 2017).
- 4 The ATT annual report template neither requests nor invites information for the seventh parameter—licences refused. Therefore, scoring for this parameter continues to rely solely on information included in national reports on arms exports (Lazarevic, 2010; Pavesi, 2016).

- 5 The maximum number of points that can be awarded for submitting information for a regional report is 8.5 points, and 1.0 points for a PoA report.
- 6 The maximum possible score for the access and consistency of ATT initial and annual reports in this edition of the Transparency Barometer is 0.5 out of 2.00 available points, because the maximum score is given for consistency in reporting over three years in a row. Therefore, ATT states parties that have submitted a 2015 report will only be able to achieve full points for consistency for ATT reporting in 2020.
- 7 The Transparency Barometer assesses UN Comtrade data as elaborated by the Norwegian Initiative on Small Arms Transfer (NISAT) (see Marsh, 2005).
- 8 The ATT does not provide a template for the annual report. The current reporting template was developed by an informal working group and recommended for use by the Third Conference of States Parties to the ATT.
- 9 Of the 49 countries assessed for the 2018 Transparency Barometer, 27 were ATT states parties that were obliged to submit their first annual report to the ATT Secretariat on trade activities that took place during the 2015 calendar year. All 27 ATT states parties provided such a report during the 2016 calendar year. In addition, Switzerland also submitted its first annual report in 2016, even though it was not obliged to do so until 31 May 2017, covering conventional arms exports and imports that took place during the 2016 calendar year.
- 10 The Small Arms Survey has recently undertaken an assessment of the implementation of the PoA using information provided by UN member states in PoA reports during 2012–17 (Holtom and Ben Hamo Yeger, 2018).
- 11 Temporary exports imply that small arms are exported for a determined period and then imported back by the exporters. Examples include when the army takes arms on a temporary peacekeeping assignment, when arms are exported for repair or to be displayed in films or expositions, or when individuals take their firearms on a hunting expedition in a foreign country.
- 12 Email correspondence with NISAT, 8 March 2016.
- 13 Categories 1–4 of the Wassenaar Arrangement Munitions List and EU Common Military List cover small arms, light weapons, ammunition, and their parts and accessories (Council of the EU, 2018; Wassenaar Arrangement, 2017).

List of abbreviations and acronyms

ATT Arms Trade Treaty

EU European Union

MANPADS Man-portable air defence system(s)

NISAT Norwegian Initiative on Small Arms Transfers

PoA Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects

RPG Rocket-propelled grenade

SEESAC South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons

SIPRI Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

UAE United Arab Emirates

UN Comtrade United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database

UN Register United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

USD United States dollar

References

- ATT (Arms Trade Treaty) Secretariat. 2016. *Final Report of the Second Conference of States Parties*. ATT/CSP2/2016/5. 26 August.
- . 2017. *Reporting Authorized or Actual Exports and Imports of Conventional Arms under the ATT: Questions and Answers*. Annexe D to the ATT Working Group on Transparency and Reporting Co-chairs' Draft Report to CSP3. 31 July.
- . 2018. *States Parties to the ATT (in Alphabetical Order): Status as of 25 June 2018*.
- . n.d. 'Reporting: Status: as of 08 March 2018.' Arms Trade Treaty Secretariat website. Accessed 4 April 2018.
- Consiglio dei Ministri (Italy). 2016. *Relazione sulle Operazioni Autorizzate e Svolte per il Controllo dell'Esportazione, Importazione e Transito dei Materiali di Armamento (Anno 2015)*. Vol II.
- Council of the EU (European Union). 2008. 'European Union Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 Defining Common Rules Governing the Control of Exports of Military Technology and Equipment.' *Official Journal of the European Union*, 13 December, pp. L 355/99–L 355/103.
- . 2016. *Seventeenth Annual Report According to Article 8(2) of Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP Defining Common Rules Governing Control of Exports of Military Technology and Equipment*. *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 163, Vol. 59. 4 May.
- . 2018. 'Common Military List of the European Union adopted by the Council on 26 February 2018.' *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 98. 15 March.
- Holtom, Paul and Irene Pavesi. 2017. *Trade Update 2017: Out of the Shadows*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.
- Holtom, Paul and Moshe Ben Hamo Yeger. 2018. *Implementing the Programme of Action and International Tracing Instrument: An Assessment of National Reports, 2012–17*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.
- Lazarevic, Jasna. 2010. *Transparency Counts: Assessing State Reporting on Small Arms Transfers, 2001–08*. Occasional Paper. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.
- Marsh, Nicholas. 2005. *Accounting Guns: The Methodology Used in Developing Data Tables for the Small Arms Survey*. Unpublished background paper. Oslo: Norwegian Initiative on Small Arms Transfers/Peace Research Institute Oslo. 14 November.
- Nederlandse Rijksoverheid. 2016. *Maandelijkse Rapportage Uitvoer Militaire Goederen*. Accessed 1 April 2018.
- Pavesi, Irene. 2016. *Trade Update 2016: Transfers and Transparency*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey.
- SECO (Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs). 2016. *Le contrôle à l'exportation dans le domaine des armes légères et de petit calibre (ALPC) relevant de la législation sur le matériel de guerre*.
- SEESAC (South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons). 2017. *Regional Report on Arms Exports in 2014*. Belgrade: SEESAC.
- Serbia. 2015. *2014 Report on Performed Activities of Export and Import of Arms, Military Equipment and Dual-use Goods, Brokerage Services and Technical Assistance*. Serbia: UNDP SEESAC.
- SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute). n.d. *National Reports on Arms Exports Database*. Accessed 1 May 2018.
- Small Arms Survey. 2018. 'The Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer 2018: Scoring Guidelines.'
- . n.d. 'Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer: Interactive Map.' Accessed 1 May 2018.
- South Africa. 2002. 'National Conventional Arms Control Act, 2002. Act No. 41 of 2002.' *Government Gazette*, Vol. 452, No. 24575. 20 February 2003.
- Taiwan, China. n.d. 'Trade Statistics Search.' Customs Administration, Ministry of Finance. Accessed 25 March 2018.
- UK DIT (United Kingdom Department for International Trade). n.d. 'Strategic Export Controls: Reports and Statistics.' Accessed 1 May 2018.
- UK ECJU (United Kingdom Export Control Joint Unit). n.d. Export Control Joint Unit. Website. Accessed 1 May 2018.
- UNGA (United Nations General Assembly). 2011. *United Nations Register of Conventional Arms: Report of the Secretary-General*. A/66/127 of 12 July.
- . 2013. Arms Trade Treaty: Certified True Copy (XXVI-8) ('ATT'). A/RES/67/234B of 2 April.
- UNODA (United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs). n.d. 'Programme of Action on Small Arms and Its International Tracing Instrument.' Accessed 1 May 2018.
- US CB (Census Bureau). n.d. 'USA Trade Online.' Accessed 1 April 2018.
- US DoD (Department of Defense). 2015. 'Foreign Military Sales, Foreign Military Construction Sales And Other Security Cooperation Historical Facts, As of September 30, 2015.' Prepared by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.
- US DoS (Department of State). 2016. 'Report to Congress on Direct Commercial Sales Authorizations to Foreign Countries and International Organizations for Fiscal Year 2015 as Required by Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as Amended.' Directorate of Defense Trade Controls.
- Wassenaar Arrangement. 2017. *Control Lists. Munitions List*. December.

About the Small Arms Survey

The Small Arms Survey is a global centre of excellence whose mandate is to generate impartial, evidence-based, and policy-relevant knowledge on all aspects of small arms and armed violence. It is the principal international source of expertise, information, and analysis on small arms and armed violence issues, and acts as a resource for governments, policy-makers, researchers, and civil society. It is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and is a project of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.

The Survey has an international staff with expertise in security studies, political science, law, economics, development studies, sociology, and criminology, and collaborates with a network of researchers, partner institutions, non-governmental organizations, and governments in more than 50 countries.

For more information, please visit: www.smallarmssurvey.org

Contact

Small Arms Survey
Maison de la Paix
Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2E
1202 Geneva
Switzerland

t +41 22 908 5777

f +41 22 732 2738

e info@smallarmssurvey.org

Follow the Small Arms Survey

 www.facebook.com/SmallArmsSurvey

 www.twitter.com/SmallArmsSurvey

 www.smallarmssurvey.org/multimedia



A publication of the Small Arms Survey, with support from the
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia



Australian Government

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade