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Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement: to reduce the harmful world-wide effects of at-risk, illicitly proliferated, and indiscriminately used conventional weapons of war.

- Program established in 1993
- Coordinated multi-agency effort
  - Department of State
  - Department of Defense
  - U.S. Agency for International Development
- Over $2.5 billion in assistance to over 90 countries
- PM/WRA manages the State contribution ($152 million in FY 2015 estimate)
OFFICE OF WEAPONS REMOVAL AND ABATEMENT  
BUREAU OF POLITICAL-MILITARY AFFAIRS

U.S. CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION PROGRAM

- Humanitarian Mine Action
  - Demining/UXO Clearance
  - Mine Risk Education
  - Victims Assistance
- SA/LW and Ammunition Destruction
- Physical Security and Stockpile Management

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

- Enhance regional security by reducing illicitly proliferated or indiscriminately used conventional weapons of war.
  - Secure or destroy stockpiles of surplus, obsolete, or otherwise at-risk weapons and munitions
- Increase civilian security by protecting lives and property.
  - Reduce the risk of accidental detonation at military depots
  - Clear mines and ERW
  - Enhance host nation’s CWD program capacity
  - Return of land and infrastructure to productive use
- Promote U.S. foreign policy interests.
Challenges to a Life-Cycle Management Approach

1. Significant capacity gaps exist in areas underpinning life-cycle management of munitions.

2. Difficult for a typical assistance program to encompass the entire life-cycle munitions management process.

3. Affected states are not always convinced of the need for destruction/PSSM assistance.

Challenges to a Life-Cycle Management Approach

Life-cycle management requires well-trained personnel, long-term planning, and substantial financial resources. Some capacity gaps in affected states:

- Education (literacy)
- Long-term planning for procurement & disposal
- Investment in logistics capabilities
- Accountability
No single set of programs addresses the wide range of capabilities required to sustain a life-cycle management approach.

- Education (literacy) \(\leftrightarrow\) Development aid? Professional military education?
- Long-term planning for procurement & disposal \(\leftrightarrow\) Arms transfers? Destruction assistance?
- Investment in logistics capabilities \(\leftrightarrow\) Professional military education? Financial assistance?
- Accountability \(\leftrightarrow\) ???

Owing to a number of factors, it is much more difficult to persuade affected states to accept assistance in destruction or PSSM compared to other types of assistance.

- Emphasis on procurement and sales vs. disposal
- Sensitive information (type/quantity of arms, location of stockpiles, etc.)
- Political sensitivity (impact of arms disposal on regional security perceptions)
U.S. Approach to Stockpile Management

The United States offers a range of ammunition stockpile management assistance programs.

- Stockpile assessment and training
- Destruction
- Physical security upgrades
- Emergency response

Potential entry points for cooperation:

- Approach by donor state or request from state needing assistance
- Bilateral v. multilateral approach
- Using different types of assistance as an enticement
- Defense reform
- International agreements
- Engagement by regional organizations
- Unplanned explosions at munitions sites (UEMS)
Way Forward

• Need to better educate states on the components of the life-cycle management process.

• Need to coordinate more closely with donor states to identify comparative advantages of respective assistance programs.

• Provide comprehensive assistance package to affected states willing to invest national resources into sustainment.

• But need to be careful not to duplicate previous efforts.