



Policy Memo

DATE: March 1, 2013

SUBJECT: UN Security Council Resolution 1540: Fostering Regional Momentum

This policy memo is based on a series of discussions by a group of UN and government officials, as well as representatives of regional, subregional, and nongovernmental organizations at the Stanley Foundation’s 44th annual UN Issues Conference, “UN Security Council Resolution 1540: Fostering Regional Momentum,” held in Tarrytown, New York, February 21-23, 2013.

Since 2005, two nongovernmental organizations, Stimson and the Stanley Foundation, have worked closely with the UN’s 1540 Committee, donor governments, and governments across six key regions—the Caribbean, Central America, the Andean region, Eastern Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia—to pioneer an innovative approach to implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1540 (UNSCR 1540). The strategy—the dual-benefit model—seeks to bridge the divide between weapons of mass destruction proliferation and higher priority human security and development issues. In many cases, this approach has yielded new momentum, generating pragmatic implementation by governments and new streams of assistance that meet mutual security and development concerns. In other cases, regional progress has been less evident. The purpose of the discussion at this conference was to consider the lessons learned from these efforts in order to help lay the groundwork for a more robust and fruitful implementation strategy for UNSCR 1540.

Participants reflected on the evolution of the resolution and noted the priorities of the new chair of the 1540 Committee, which were defined as a commitment to revitalizing the committee itself, a vision for a year of universality, and laying the groundwork for increased focus on proliferation financing and transshipment. Participants considered the dual-benefit model and other innovative models of engagement. Discussion focused on how best to foster regional momentum, facilitate buy-in from countries across the Global South, and overcome challenges facing donors and recipient partners, with an eye to seeking additional avenues for the full and effective implementation of the resolution.

Effective Regional/Subregional Implementation

Participants acknowledged that perceptions of UNSCR 1540 have evolved since the resolution was adopted in 2004, and agreed that promoting implementation on regional/subregional levels through the dual-benefit model has proven to be among the most effective approaches. Regional organizations help develop standards to provide their member states guidance. Moreover, their

efforts have helped share the burden of implementation across governments that may lack the institutional or human resources to fully and effectively implement the resolution. In a similar vein, regional workshops convene not only donor and recipient countries but also draw in regional/subregional organizations, nongovernmental representatives, and the private sector to provide their expertise and services to countries. This outreach is not only more economically efficient, it offers the opportunity to share lessons learned and best practices across governments with common challenges.

Participants pointed to the appointment of regional 1540 coordinators, in particular, as providing a valuable channel for enhanced communication and coordination between key regions/subregions and the 1540 Committee. Regional advocates are more knowledgeable about regional contours and challenges and can serve as focal points for not only the committee and donor partners, but also for countries in the region. As such, those in attendance noted that coordinators play a critical role in more effectively implementing the provisions of the resolution, especially in helping to identify linkages between capacity-building assistance and recipient partner needs.

Implementation Challenges Remain

But participants recognized the challenges facing regional implementation of UNSCR1540 in today's constrained fiscal environment, including varying degrees of prioritization from government to government, political challenges, as well as practical challenges that impede progress. Some participants asked whether implementing UNSCR 1540 should be the end goal at all, or if it should be the means through which to build capacity for improving societal security on a more comprehensive scale, allocating resources to achieve the greatest possible amount of risk mitigation per dollar spent.

While the committee has been able to obtain a certain level of political commitment from countries across the Global South, practical and sustainable buy-in has proven more difficult to achieve. The priorities of emerging and developing countries continue to be rooted in day-to-day human security and development concerns that stem from *inter alia* the trafficking of arms, drugs, and humans; piracy; poaching; and development challenges. Participants acknowledged that sometimes, if not most times, there is a sheer lack of financial resources and capacity in the Global South to implement international security mandates, particularly in light of the more visible challenges these states have to confront, which require most, if not all, available resources. To this end, while there has been growing support for the dual-benefit model among UN member states, participants pointed out that a challenge remains in terms of how to more effectively transmit information on linkages between human security, development, and international security mandates beyond, for instance, the 1540 matrix, which is a fairly rigid structure focused solely on 1540.

Additionally, participants noted there is an equal challenge on the donor provision side: institutional stovepipes that make developing a cohesive and nonduplicative approach to providing assistance almost impossible. Pointedly, even political challenges remain that impede the functional implementation of the resolution. For instance, the number of regional coordinators being reduced from three to one in a very short time signals a lack of commitment

from donor partners. Likewise, participants acknowledged that certain countries of the Global South continue to see UNSCR 1540 as a mandate to protect states in the Global North and/or a one-track means by which they can achieve certain national security and development objectives. Nonproliferation in and of itself, as it has been defined in terms of the traditional military-security sense, is not a part of the threat perception for these states.

The Path Ahead: Recommendations for Bridging the Priorities Divide in an Era of Fiscal Contraction

In light of the challenges acknowledged, participants outlined pragmatic and implementable suggestions for the successful implementation and continued relevance of UNSCR 1540 worldwide:

- A continued change in the perception of UNSCR 1540 should be encouraged, progressively moving away from the idea that it is an imposed mandate to the idea that it is an opportunity for governments to fulfill their pressing obligations to citizens. While the dual-benefit model effectively hones in on the human security and economic growth and development benefits that can be achieved with 1540 implementation, a further evolution in perception should emphasize the civil security benefits of implementing UNSCR 1540; for instance, securing radiological sites in hospitals and industrial spaces.
- The dual-benefit approach should be tailored to each country, but also leverage regional/subregional organizations and encourage intraregional coordination in order to act as a force multiplier.
- Within key regions, countries should be identified that can be regional champions for the dual-benefit model. This “pillar state” strategy would help market the benefits of nonproliferation engagement more effectively.
- Greater interagency coordination should be encouraged within implementing countries to avoid duplication of efforts.
- Increased communication between the 1540 Committee and member states is critical in order to encourage mutual feedback and information sharing, and enable the committee to better serve as matchmaker. Therefore,
 - The value added of reporting should be better explicated to member states.
 - In addition to submitting reports and requests for assistance to the 1540 Committee, member states should be given a platform to provide a detailed expression of their day-to-day security and development concerns.
- Regional coordinators should be seen as an extension of the 1540 Group of Experts (GoE). While more institutionalization is likely to create more procedural hurdles, participants agreed that relevant stakeholders should work toward normalizing the role of the regional coordinator and his/her relationship with the 1540 Committee and the GoE. Doing so would provide increased credibility and legitimacy for the coordinators in the

national, regional, and international arenas. There should, similarly, be more political buy-in from the donor community and host regional organizations in order to facilitate continuity and sustainability for the coordinators.

- Stakeholders should work within existing frameworks in-country rather than try to impose a new structure focused on nonproliferation.
- The GoE should be diversified in terms of specialization, particularly in the field of governance and regional expertise, in order to help the 1540 Committee assist states in implementing the resolution.
- The GoE should leverage advances in technology and utilize data-mining and information tools in order to extract and analyze data from country reports and employ search capabilities across the 1540 matrix.
- The GoE should seek out opportunities to more effectively share information and best practices with other relevant committees within the UN system, including the sanctions committees and the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED).
- Donor partners should better coordinate, rationalize, and leverage assistance beyond traditional paradigms in order to stretch increasingly limited funding, avoid duplication of efforts, and be more responsive to the higher priority concerns of requesting partners.
- Donor partners should leverage innovative connection points between UNSCR 1540/nonproliferation and other security assistance that might be applied to the higher priority needs of recipient partners. For instance, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the CTED both operate in structural and implementation capacity-building spaces that overlap deeply with those of the 1540 Committee, and a potential Arms Trade Treaty is likely to as well. Today's constrained fiscal environment and shrinking budgets could provide the impetus for collaborating more effectively in this regard.
- Greater South-South cooperation on implementation of the resolution should be encouraged.
- Greater industry engagement based on enlightened self-interest should be encouraged. Industry may not be interested in UNSCR 1540 implementation in and of itself, but the chemical industry is, for instance, interested in security; thus, leveraging these footholds is critical in this sphere.
- Increased media and member state outreach should be encouraged by making dual-benefit success stories available and accessible, which would counter myths of 1540 implementation having a negative impact on economic growth and development; and the 1540 Committee should hold separate and open briefings in order to enhance visibility of efforts.

- Civil society should be encouraged to map areas and topics of overlap between not only international security mandates and higher priority national security and development concerns in the Global South, but also overlaps between the operating spaces of various existing security assistance apparatuses. Civil society's ability to gather information and identify these matches is critical to successfully implementing 1540 and ensuring its continued relevance.

A full list of conference participants is available [here](#).

The analysis and recommendations included in this Policy Memo do not necessarily reflect the views of the Stanley Foundation or any of the conference participants, but rather draw upon the major strands of discussion put forward at the event. Participants neither reviewed nor approved this document. Therefore, it should not be assumed that every participant subscribes to all of its recommendations, observations, and conclusions.

For further information, please contact Jennifer Smyser at the Stanley Foundation, 563-264-1500.

About The Stanley Foundation

The Stanley Foundation seeks a secure peace with freedom and justice, built on world citizenship and effective global governance. It brings fresh voices, original ideas, and lasting solutions to debates on global and regional problems. The foundation is a nonpartisan, private operating foundation, located in Muscatine, Iowa, that focuses on peace and security issues and advocates principled multilateralism. The foundation frequently collaborates with other organizations. It does not make grants. Online at www.stanleyfoundation.org.