

## **Arms Trade Treaty Voluntary Trust Fund**

# **FINAL REPORT**

### **KAZAKHSTAN**

**Project No.:** ATT.VTF.G2019.001KAZ

29 November 2019

### **Arms Trade Treaty Voluntary Trust Fund - Final Report**

Project Number	ATT.VTF.G2019. 001KAZ
Grantee name	Kazakhstan- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Project title	Arms Trade Treaty Universalization and Implementation Workshop for Central Asia and Mongolia
Grant Amount	USD\$ 97'160
Final Report submission date	29 November 2019
Period covered under this report (MM/DD/YY – MM/DD/YY)	10- 06-2019 to 30- 09 -2019

### 1. Project activities and outcomes

### a Describe the project outcomes.

Government experts from Central Asia and Mongolia, working in relevant ministries involved in the arms trade, took part in discussions, both with each other, and with representatives from the ATTS, ATT-VTF, BAFA, Chatham House, Control Arms, Stimson Centre and UNRCPD. Participants and experts discussed the main provisions and obligations of the ATT; benefits and reasons for being parties to the ATT; regional priorities and concerns; as well as practical issues of the Treaty implementation and tools for assistance.

Participants remained engaged throughout the workshop and queried experts directly for clarifications on specific technical implications or elements of the Treaty. Those included queries regarding whether all small arms, including hunting and sports use arms, are covered by the Treaty, and if so, how transport of these is covered; the nature of data collection; translation into national law; establishment of national control lists; and how certification can be implemented.

Mongolian representatives noted existing conventional weapons agreements and asked about the impact of each on succeeding to the ATT. ATTS noted the different purposes of all, with the APL Ban Treaty and CCM, for example, banning certain types of weapons, which the ATT does not. Further, that States that have acceded to SALW-control instruments will find accession to ATT easier, especially as systems have already been established, it making the most sense to utilize synergies to expand these systems, rather than establish new ones.

Experts noted throughout the number of ways in which synergies with existing instruments and national mechanisms would ease compliance with the ATT, including the fact that most States in the region have provided both types of reports the ATT requires already (legal and process reports for the PoA and item/transaction reports via UNROCA).

States and NGOs noted confusion when conflating conventions with the ATT, which is explicitly not a disarmament treaty, and accepted advice to more fruitfully compare it with export control regimes. Kazakhstan explicitly emphasized that it had not found a burden from the ATT, especially as national standards are already more stringent. They

further noted that many Ministries had suggested that existing security-related agreements such as CSTO, prevented accession to ATT, but that these have not done so. Kazakhstan representatives demonstrated their internal licensing system, and the online portals developed for those seeking licenses. They further underlined that the transparent nature of the online system had positive implications for opportunities for corruption.

Representatives of Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan underlined their concern as to whether accession to the ATT would require reports on State holdings, and were informed that it would not. The ATTS representative clarified for the participants that transit, and transshipment count as transfers, along with import and export, though underlined that this does not apply to international movement of conventional arms that remain under the ownership of States Parties. In all cases, States received their requested clarifications with satisfaction, and indicated their interest in the details provided.

b	Describe how the project has assisted your implementation of the ATT.
	cipating States showed serious consideration for the implementation of the ATT and three gations confirmed their serious interest in further action.
С	List all States that benefitted from the project.
Kaza	khstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.
d	Were all the project activities as specified in the Project Schedule (see Annex G) completed?
	Yes No
	If no, explain why and describe any problems, constraints and difficulties experienced in implementing the project.

Project progress must be indicated against the Project Schedule (see Attachment 1). Please indicate the Status of all activities highlighted in YELLOW in the Project Schedule. Please also include comments where you think appropriate (e.g. to explain why certain activities have not been completed on time).

	•		as the project suit	ed to existing					
Not relevant at all	Not very relevant	Moderately relevant	Relevant	Very relevant					
	your answer:    Secussions and clarifications were extremely engaged, and it is notable that the diverse of participants largely seemed to accept the benefits of accession.    How would you rate the effectiveness of the project (to what extent has the project attained its stated objectives)?   Fective at all   Not very effective   Moderately   Effective   Very effective   Fefective   Very effective   Very efficient   Very effic								
e How would you rate the relevance of the project (was the project suited to existing priorities and policies of the benefitting State(s))?    Not relevant at all   Not very relevant   Moderately relevant   Relevant   Very relevant									
				that the diverse					
		veness of the project	to what extent h	nas the project					
Not effective at all	Not very effective		Effective Very effective						
xplain your answe	er:								
Participating State	es engaged througho		ous consideration	of the issues					
Participating State surrounding their  How would	es engaged througho potential accession I you rate the <i>efficien</i>	to the Treaty.  ncy of the project (to							
Participating State surrounding their How would attained or	es engaged througho potential accession I you rate the <i>efficien</i> In time and within bu	to the Treaty.  ncy of the project (todget)?  Moderately	what extent were	e the project result					
Participating State surrounding their How would attained or	es engaged througho potential accession I you rate the <i>efficien</i> In time and within bu	to the Treaty.  ncy of the project (todget)?  Moderately	what extent were	e the project result  Very efficient					
Participating State surrounding their How would attained or Not efficient at all	es engaged througho potential accession I you rate the <i>efficien</i> time and within bu	to the Treaty.  ncy of the project (todget)?  Moderately	what extent were	e the project result  Very efficient					
Participating State surrounding their  How would attained or  Not efficient at all	es engaged througho potential accession of d you rate the <i>efficien</i> time and within but Not very efficient	to the Treaty.  ncy of the project (todget)?  Moderately efficient	what extent were	e the project result  Very efficient					

delegations confirmed their serious interest in further action. It is recommended to explore with

them further avenues for supporting accession.

i	How would you rate the <i>sustainability</i> of the project (to what extent can the project
	benefits continue after the project has finished)?

Not sustainable at all	Not very sustainable	Moderately sustainable	Sustainable	Very sustainable

### Explain your answer:

Three national delegations confirmed, both through the meeting itself and on the margins, their interest in serious considering further action. Other delegations showed interest in investigating the issue further, and all were particularly interested in availing themselves of AT-VTF facilities to do so.

j	How will the Project outcomes be further used or applied in the future? Are there plans for the activities to be continued or for the experience gained to be shared?

### 2. Final expenditure report

<u>Please complete the Worksheet titled 'input' in the VTF Expenditure Template – Final Report (Kazakhstan) in Attachment 2.</u>

### 3. Certification

<u>Please complete a separate certification for each consultant engaged to undertake the project activities that have been implemented.</u>

For the purposes of this certification:

Grantee means Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Consultant means United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific

I [Insert name of authorised person making the declaration] being a person duly authorised by the Grantee hereby certify that:

- 1. The Consultant was engaged by the Grantee on or after the date the Grant Agreement was executed to deliver services to the Project.
- 2. The service provided by the Consultant to the Grantee has been completed in accordance with the Grant Agreement.
- 3. The amount paid by the Grantee to the Consultant for the provision of services to help implement the Grant project to date is [Insert total \$ funding amount in United States dollars]
- 4. I have attached the tax invoice provided to the Grantee by the Consultant for the provision of services for the Grant project to date.
- 5. I have attached a receipt from the Consultant confirming that the amount referred to in 3 above has been paid in full by the Grantee.
- 6. All the information I have provided to the ATT Secretariat (including the contents of this declaration) is complete, true and correct.
- 7. I am aware of the Grantee's obligations under their Grant Agreement, including the need to keep the ATT Secretariat informed of any circumstances that may impact on the objectives, completion and/or outcomes of the agreed project.
- 8. I am aware that the Grant Agreement empowers the ATT Secretariat to terminate the Grant Agreement and to request repayment of funds paid to the Grantee where the Grantee is in breach of the Grant Agreement.

Signed	Date
[Position/title]	

Please submit this report and signed declaration to ATT Secretariat along with;

- A copy of the tax invoice issued to you by the Consultant for the provision of services
- Proof the Consultant was paid. This could be a receipt issued to you by the Consultant or a bank statement.

# ATT Final Expenditure Report

| AN | The state of Grant Reciberal Resultation | The state of Security of Security Alleges | Mustry of Secusion Alleges | All

Vendor Code (xxxx)]

Accounting Details	etails		General Details	大き 一日	Total budget		Actual spend to date**	date**	Balance of budget available	Balance of funds received
sting Date Project code Budget Line Ref. N	e Budger In	e Ref.			OSD	Ibeal Amount	Rate	osn	USD	150
		-1	Economy flights for five participants from Kyrgysstan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	ZZ	3,000	() Appropriate			2,029	
	,	7	Economy flights for five participants from Mongolia to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	Round trip flights of 5 participant from Mongolia to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	13,000	167,8	-	16/8	4,209	72,623
		m	Conomy flights for five participants from Tajikistan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan		3,500				3,500	72,823
		4	Economy flights for five participants from Turkmenistan to Nur- Sultan, Kazakhstan		8,000				8,000	72,823
		5	Economy fights for five participants from Utbekistan to Nur-Sultan, Round trip fights of 4 participant from Utbekistan to Kazakhstan	Round trip flights of 4 participant from Usbekistan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	4,000	1,052		1,052	2,948	117,17
		9	Economy flights for three experts from international NGOs and President of CSPS to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	Round trip flights of 3 experts from international NGOs and participant of CSPS to Nur-Sultan, Katakhstan	12,000	7,254	-	7,254	4,746	64,517
		_	Economy flights for two experts from domestic NGOs to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan		1,000			•	1,000	64,517
		∞	Economy flights for three UNRCPD staff to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	Round trip flights for 3 UNRCPD staff to Nur-Sultan, Kazakistan	7,800	172,6	-	172,6	-1,471	55,246
27		6	Four terminal expenses each for the participants from Kyrgysstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, CSPS and NGOs	Terminal expenses for the participants from Kyrgysstan, Mongolia, Utbekistan, CSPS and NGOs	5,828	1,504	1	1,504	4,324	53,742
		9	Four terminal expenses each for the three UNRCPD staff	Terminal expenses for UNRCPD staff	366	498	-	498	-132	53,244
		11	Total 3 days of DSA each for the participants from Kyrgysstan. Mongolia, Tajikstan, Turkmenistan, Utbekistan, CSPS and NGOs (for 31 persons)	DSA for the participants from Kytgytstan, Mongolia, Utbekistan, CSPS and NGOs	16,926	7,269	1	7,269	9,657	45,976
		12	Total 4 days for DSA each for the three UNRCPD staff	DSA (or UNRCFD Staff	2,184	2,268	-	2,268	-84	43,708
		n	Conference room rental (per day)		100					
		14	Equipment hire (audio-visual equipment) (per day)	Conference room rental package including ball rent.	400				and the second	
		21	Lunch (40 participants x 2 lunches)	euipment hiring, lunch and coffee breaks	2,400	1,530		1,530	2,470	42,178
		16	Coffee break (40 participants x 2 days workshop x 2 coffee breaks)		800	1	act of Boundary of			
		17	Reception (40 participants x 1 dinner)	a reception dinner event	1,600	765	-	765	835	41,413
		. 81	Interpretation service (English-Russian)	Hired interpretation services for the workshop	000'9	2,900	7	2,500	3,100	38,513
		19	Stationary packs for the workshop (notebooks, pens, USBs, etc.)	Purchased stationary packs for the workshops	800	358		358	442	38,154
		20	Printing of workshop materials	Printing of workshap materials	300	2112	-	m	523	37,877
		21					1	1		37,877
					-	1	-	-		

Signature:

Anar Farydova, Permanent Mission of Kazakhstan to the UN and

1202-90-91 Date:

-/60x/90/e8

Date:

### RECONCILIATION STATE-ATT.VTF.G2019.001KAZ 2019

Description	Total budget	Actual spend (Final Report)	Actual spend (Total)	Balance of budget available	Balance of funds received	% of over- or under-spend
Personnel costs Travel costs	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	
Economy flights for five participants from Kyrgyzstan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	3,000	971	971	2,029	81,615	32%
Economy flights for five participants from Mongolia to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	13,000	8,791	8,791	4,209	72,823	68%
Economy flights for five participants from Tajikistan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	3,500	-		3,500	72,823	0%
Economy flights for five participants from Turkmenistan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	8,000	-	•	8,000	72,823	0%
Economy flights for five participants from Uzbekistan to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	4,000	1,052	1,052	2,948	71,771	26%
Economy flights for three experts from international NGOs and President of CSP5 to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	12,000	7,254	7,254	4,746	64,517	60%
Economy flights for two experts from domestic NGOs to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	1,000	•	-	1,000	64,517	0%
Economy flights for three UNRCPD staff to Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan	7,800	9,271	9,271	- 1,471	55,246	119%
Four terminal expenses each for the participants from Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan. CSP5 and NGOs	5,828	1,504	1,504	4,324	53,742	26%
Four terminal expenses each for the three UNRCPD staff	366	498	498	- 132	53,244	136%
Total 3 days of DSA each for the participants from Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan. CSP5 and NGOs (for 31 persons)	16,926	7,269	7,269	9,657	45,976	43%
Total 4 days for DSA each for the three UNRCPD staff	2,184	2,268	2,268	- 84	43,708	104%
Equipment costs						
Operating Costs						
Conference room rental (per day) Equipment hire (audio-visual equipment) (per day)	4,000	1,530	1,530	2,470	42,178	38%
Lunch (40 participants x 2 lunches)						
Coffee break (40 participants x 2 days workshop x 2 coffee breaks)						
Reception (40 participants x 1 dinner)	1,600	765	765	835	41,413	48%
Interpretation service (English-Russian)	6,000	2,900	2,900	3,100	38,513	48%
Stationary packs for the workshop (notebooks, pens, USBs, etc.)	800	358	358	442	38,154	45%
Printing of workshop materials	800	277	277	523	37,877	35%
Total Direct Costs	90,804	44,709	44,709	46,095	37,877	49%
Total Indirect Support Costs - 7%	6,356	3,130	3,130	3,227	34,747	49%
Total	97,160	47,839	47,839	49,322	34,747	49%
Amount nof 1st installment	92 596					

Amount nof 1st installment 82,586
Amount of 2nd installment
Balance owing to VTF 34,747

Jan Jan