

The issue of policing should also be addressed when speaking of SALW since policing is a part of governance. Civilians feel more secure with the existence of fair policing that may, in turn, make them more willing to give up their weapons, depending upon why they they have been acquired in the first place. The failure of civil policing often feeds into the rise of armed opposition. There is a need for states to spend more resources on setting up civil policing, and to acknowledge the need to separate policing as a social process from policing as force. This type of training could become part of international assistance in a conflict zone or a part of post-conflict reconstruction.

Recommendations:

- ▶ Set up a legal seminar in Ottawa to create an expert legal team to agree on a text and program of work to deal with the issue of non-state actors and SALW. This should be based on agreed international law.
- ▶ A code of conduct on SALW for state actors needs to be created, one that differs from the European Union Code of Conduct by actually recognizing and adhering to international law standards.
- ▶ Need to find out whether international responses exist for opposition groups that are not armed. Why does the act of arming make them legitimate enough for international action?

Additional questions

- What kind of trade is illicit?
- Why are we trying to control transfers to non-state actors?
- How can we control transfers to non-state actors?
- Where do we call on the international community to become involved?
- What role does the international community play? What role should it play?