respondent noted that ammunition is shipped in generic packages and the only thing that might give it away was a "Hazardous Material" marking. Another dealer stressed that they would ensure that the carrier was "bona fide" in all aspects regarding security and safety. No one professed knowledge of thefts regarding their ammunition shipments. One respondent noted that theft involving legal shipments was less likely than theft from clandestine or illicit shipments, primarily because theft from legal shipments would be reported to authorities while the other would not. SAAMI indicated that quantities lost were small, at least within the USA.

3. Opinion was divided on how easy it was to set up a clandestine ammunition factory. Some said it would be relatively easy while others stressed the difficulty in obtaining or producing components and thus quality ammunition. One producer said a small basement/hut operation with one individual could produce 5,000 rounds of 9 mm or 1,000 rounds of 7.62 mm in a 24 hour period. Others emphasized that assuming mobility was required, large scale production was out of the question and in any event would be very expensive. The consensus appeared to be that a small scale operation was quite feasible for producing an inferior but probably adequate grade of ammunition assuming there was no access to quality components. One respondent said that there was no reason to set up a clandestine ammunition production facility because relatively cheap, good quality ammunition was readily available from many sources.

4. All respondents said that introducing a short shelf-life on ammunition was a non-starter. At the same time all noted that ammunition has a very long life - examples were given of ammunition that was 50 to 80 years old still firing with reliability. It was also noted that ammunition was and can be manufactured to withstand specific extremes of the tropics. It was observed that military and police forces would not accept a shelf life for many reasons: too expensive in terms of war reserves; unreliability; and, danger to the user. Even civilian users might be exposed to injury or death due to the unstable element in the propellant or primer and the lack of exactitude in decomposition - deterioration at varying rates depending on storage conditions etc. What about liability, if a native hunter was injured or killed because he had no idea what the cartridge life was or that it had been effected by unstable storage conditions? One producer said it had been tried and the cartridge was very unstable. There was also a question of universal application, i.e. all producers in the world.

5. There was some support for cartridge ID with qualifications. First it was suggested that unless all major manufacturers on a global basis were involved it would have limited value. Second, it was noted that for wide distribution to police forces and civilians it was not practical. If a company produces one million rounds which are sold to five dealers which are distributed to 30 sales outlets which are sold to 300 individuals, how is the casing marked? Large lot sales to single buyers, i.e. government to government or commercial company to large customer - a major police force or military force, might be feasible. One producer suggested bar codes. Another said it would be very expensive and time consuming and then pointed out the problems with re-loads and erasing old stamps. Two respondents thought that government or commercial producers could falsify stamps to incriminate others or confuse those trying to establish the source of the ammunition. As for taggants, some thought they had merit if safe, while others thought they