Match or Mismatch?: Comparing Formal Requests and Offers for Assistance in Border and Export Controls

RICHARD CUPITT AND MARY VECELLIO[1]

Abstract

This study assesses how well formal requests to the 1540 Committee for border and export control assistance match with assistance projects and programs.[2] The article begins by reviewing typical challenges in effectively creating partnerships between states seeking assistance with states, IGOs, and NGOs offering it. Next, the authors outline key collections of assistance information and how they are insufficient in delivering a comprehensive picture of the assistance process. Thereafter, this study examines a current project called the Assistance Support Initiative and explains how it is a unique and valuable tool to the process of assistance. After outlining its methodology for collecting and analyzing data, this study compares data on border and export control assistance projects and programs with data on formal requests to the 1540 Committee for such assistance. To explore this relationship, data has been collected from two assistance sources—the 1540 Committee's Requests for Assistance website and the Henry L. Stimson Center's Assistance Support Initiative (ASI) database. In closing, this study provides some lessons learned on what data may reveal about the border and export control assistance process.

---

1   Dr. Richard T. Cupitt is a Senior Fellow and Director of the Partnerships in Proliferation Prevention Program at the Stimson Center where he oversees the 1540 Assistance Support Initiative among other projects. He has held posts at the United Nations Security Council's 1540 Committee, in the U.S. government, and in academia, as well as a serving as a consultant to governments, international organizations, and other entities. Mary C. Vecellio is a Research Associate with the Partnerships in Proliferation Prevention Program at the Stimson Center. Her research focuses on WMD nonproliferation with specific focus on radiological source security, the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1540 assistance processes, and chemical weapons-related material security.

2   Aspects of this study's analysis and methodological approach are based upon Richard T. Cupitt's paper titled "Assistance for Preventing WMD Proliferation: The Challenge of Effectively Matching Offers and Requests for Assistance" presented at the Joint Meeting of the International Security Studies Section of the International Studies Association and the International Security and Arms Control Division of the American Political Science Association from October 13-14, 2017 at American University in Washington D.C.

Keywords

Assistance Partnerships, Border and Export Controls, United National Security Council Resolution 1540, Nonproliferation, Assistance Challenges, Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

Introduction

What happens when dozens of states request assistance in implementing border and export control obligations to prevent the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and dozens of states and international organizations (IGOs) offer to provide such assistance?[3] Almost nothing in the eyes of the United Nations Security Council. Between 2004 and 2018, the Committee established pursuant of United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004)—commonly known as the 1540 Committee—received requests for border and export control assistance from 36 States and 25 positive responses from states and IGOs.[4] Despite these positive responses to specific requests for border and export control assistance, the 1540 Committee neither received notification nor could identify the delivery of more than a handful of assistance actions. Although the experts supporting the 1540 Committee knew informally and anecdotally of states and IGOs providing directly relevant assistance, the shortcomings of the formal assistance process reverberated throughout statements made by states, IGOs, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) during the 2016 Comprehensive Review of the resolution. Most notably, the then Chair of the 1540 Committee, Ambassador Oyarzun of Spain, stated:

> …We need to admit that a significant number of requests are not specific enough or technically sound enough to be adequately considered. Ways should be found to meet this challenge, and thereby enhance the Committee's ability to facilitate assistance.[5]

In other words, the processes to request and provide international assistance, including for

---

3 WMD typically refer to nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery. In this paper, the authors include radiological devices under the rubric of WMD. Although the obligations under United Nations Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) refer only to nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, their means of delivery, and related materials, the resolution also refers to the importance of measures taken under other nonproliferation instruments, including a specific reference to protecting materials relevant to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. Further, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings also places use of a radiological weapon in the same category as a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon. Finally, most States have submitted information to the 1540 Committee on efforts to prevent the proliferation of radiological weapons.

4 1540 Committee, "Summary Requests for Assistance from Member States Since 2010," Requests for Assistance, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/request-for-assistance/current-requests-from-member-states.shtml>; 1540 Committee, "Previous Requests for Assistance from Member States Received Before 2010," Previous Requests from Member States, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/request-for-assistance/previous-requests-from-member-states.shtml>; and 1540 Committee, "Offers of Assistance," United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/offers-of-assistance/offers-from-member-states.shtml>.

5 Román Oyarzun Marchesi, "Two Years before the Mast," *1540 Compass*, No. 11 (Winter 2016), pp. 11-12, <http://spia.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Compass_11-Winter2016.pdf>.

border and export controls, have fallen short of their promises. Developing assistance proposals requires a range of skills, resources, and time that many national and international actors, especially officials in low-capacity states, simply do not have. At the same time, potential assistance partners have no common application process or requirements for WMD nonproliferation assistance, and these differing requirements often remain opaque to those seeking such assistance. Essentially, mere willingness to form assistance partnerships—though necessary within the assistance process—has proven insufficient. States need help in requesting (and delivering) assistance.

Ultimately, these implementation gaps need to be addressed. If left unresolved, many states will remain vulnerable to proliferators exploiting uneven levels of border and export controls within states and across regions. As noted in the Final Document of the second Comprehensive Review of resolution 1540, a significant challenge the international community faces is an increasing risk of proliferation to and use of such weapons by non-state actors, "arising from developments in terrorism and in relation to the potential for misuse arising from rapid advances in science, technology and international commerce."[6] These vulnerabilities give improving the border and export control assistance process a greater sense of urgency. Also, failing to meet this demand for assistance not only leaves many states more susceptible to exploitation by terrorists, criminals, and other proliferators, it undermines the legitimacy of the resolution, the UN Security Council, and nonproliferation efforts of the international community more generally.

In this article, the authors aim to assess how well formal requests for border and export control assistance correlate with available assistance projects and programs. The article begins with a review of some of the typical challenges in effectively creating partnerships between states seeking assistance with states, IGOs, and the NGOs offering it. Next, the authors outline key collections of assistance information and how they are insufficient in delivering a comprehensive picture of the assistance process. Thereafter, the authors examine a current project called the Assistance Support Initiative and explain how it is a unique and valuable tool to the process of assistance. The authors then describe their methodology for collecting and comparing data on border and export control assistance projects and programs with formal assistance requests related to border and export controls. Following this, to explore trends and challenges specifically related to border and export control assistance for nonproliferation efforts, the authors assess data on assistance projects and programs and compare it with data on formal requests to the 1540 Committee for such assistance. In closing, the authors provide lessons learned on what their data may reveal about the border and export control assistance process and why this study's findings are important.

---

6   1540 Committee, "Final Document on the 2016 Comprehensive Review of the Status of Implementation of Resolution 1540," United Nations, 2016, <https://undocs.org/S/2016/1038>, p. 3.

General Challenges in Creating Assistance Partnerships

Extensive literature documents the many challenges–and frequent failures–of assistance projects.[7] These challenges can be divided into several categories, both internal and external, that can impede assistance partnerships. External factors include election cycles and changes in government, general governance capacity and effectiveness, the safety and security of stakeholders and partners, corruption, civil tensions and disturbances, among others.[8] Potential assistance partners have little control over these factors other than making decisions to cooperate or not cooperate based on larger evaluations of political and other risks. Internal challenges, however, stem from decisions one or both prospective partners make within an assistance partnership. These decisions include allocation constraints, approaches to planning, selecting domestic stakeholders, selecting foreign partners, and the interactive effects of these factors.

Allocation constraints refer to the limits that those entities who offer aid place on their largess. The providers of aid, for example, may require recipients to use, purchase, or otherwise favor goods or services specified by the provider.[9] This "tied" form of aid can prevent recipients from obtaining less expensive or higher quality goods and services sourced elsewhere, including items produced domestically that could have a greater positive multiplier effect. Perhaps more commonly, entities place a range of general conditions on their aid.[10] States offering aid bilaterally, for example, may limit their programs to assisting countries in specific (usually neighboring) regions or prohibit aid going to governments with a record of human rights abuses. Finally, donors may further restrict the use of aid or capacity-building to specific end-users for unique purposes, limiting the fungible nature of the aid.[11] For instance, states may provide advanced heat sensing equipment, but only for use in airports to screen passengers for fever-causing illnesses and not for use by firefighters to evaluate the differing intensity of heat inside buildings, fearing diversion to other ends. Those offering aid usually make these

---

7   See, for example, William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Jeffrey Monaghan, *Security Aid: Canada and the Development Regime of Security (*Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017); and Jennifer D.P. Moroney and Joe Hogler, *Building Partner Capacity to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2009).

8   Patrick Marren, "Overseas Development Aid: Is It Working?" in Gerard McCann and Stephen McCloskey, eds., *From the Local to the Global: Key Issues in Development Studies* (London: Pluto Press, 2015), pp. 59-77; Dierk Herzer and Oliver Morrissey, "Foreign Aid and Domestic Output in the Long Run," *Review of World Economics*, Vol. 149, No. 4 (2013), pp. 723-748; and Jennifer D. P. Moroney and Joe Hogler*, Building Partner Capacity to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (Arlington, VA: RAND Corporation, 2009).

9   Davis Bobrow and Mark Boyer, *Defensive Internationalism: Providing Public Goods in an Uncertain World (*Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005) and Ferdinand Bakoup, *Africa and Economic Policy: Developing a Framework for Policy Makers* (New York: Anthem Press, 2014).

10   Ibid., Bakoup. Also see William J. Long, "Nonproliferation as a Goal of Japanese Foreign Assistance," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (Mar-Apr 1999), pp. 328-347.

11   Sanjeev K. Sobhee and Shyam Nath, "Is Donor's Concern about the Fungibility of Foreign Aid Justified?: A Panel," *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring 2010), pp. 299-311; Nina M. Serafino, "Foreign Assistance in Camouflage? Measuring the Military Security and Cooperation Role," in Gordon Adams and Shoon Murray, eds., *Mission Creep: The Militarization of US Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014), pp. 120-144.

decisions well before entering an assistance partnership, while those seeking aid must decide to accept these constraints or forego the aid (unless the partners can negotiate an exception).[12]

Assistance partners also face decisions for planning aid programs. Typically, the design of capacity-building programs fits somewhere on a continuum from a "Planners" model to a "Seekers" model.[13] Planners tend to design projects based on relevant principles, norms, or best practices identified by the international community. In contrast, Seekers design projects primarily by listening to the desires expressed by the targeted recipients of the aid, and with less regard to international principles, norms, and best practices linked to the stated objectives of the partnership. Potential partners must agree where on this continuum their planning will reside. The potential partners also need to decide whether to make the assistance more activity-based (e.g., training a certain number of persons or transferring an amount of knowledge, skills, or abilities) or more outcome-based (e.g., reduction in illicit diversion of WMD related materials risks or improvements in public health agencies pathogen detection capabilities).[14] Also, one can classify partnerships as either more systematic, such as a comprehensive and phased program to address interrelated vulnerabilities, or more *ad hoc*, often one-off projects to address a singular problem.[15]

Furthermore, deciding which set of actors constitutes the stakeholders poses a major challenge for an assistance partnership, especially when deciding which stakeholders will have ownership over the aid within the recipient state. Research suggests that without one or more domestic stakeholders exerting ownership, including finding individuals who can act as local champions for the project and the partnership, assistance efforts will generate only short-term benefits that will quickly fade.[16] At the same time, potential partners need to understand the motivations of the domestic stakeholders and what effect the reputation of these stakeholders will have on the project. For example, a key stakeholder with a reputation for incompetence may cause other important stakeholders to withhold critical resources or dampen commitment to the success of a project. Similarly, stakeholders may have divergent and conflicting motives for participating in aid projects that will likely reduce the odds of project success.[17]

---

12   For examples of partners negotiating assistance see Lindsay Whitfield and Alastair Fraser, "Negotiating Aid: The Structural Conditions Shaping the Negotiating Strategies of African Governments," *International Negotiation,* Vol. 15 (2010), pp. 341-366.

13   William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009) and Ferdinand Bakoup, *Africa and Economic Policy: Developing a Framework for Policy Makers* (New York: Anthem Press, 2014).

14   Ibid., Bakoup. Also see Julia Cagé, "Measuring Policy Performance: Can We Do Better Than The World Bank?" in Akbar Norman and Joseph E. Stiglitz, eds., *Industrial Policy and Economic Transformation in Africa (*New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), pp. 268-292.

15   Sanjeev K. Sobhee and Shyam Nath, "Is Donor's Concern about the Fungibility of Foreign Aid Justified?: A Panel," *The Journal of Developing Areas*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring 2010).

16   Akio Hosono, Shunichiro Honda, Mine Sato, and Mai Ono, "Inside the Black Box of Capacity Development," in Homi Kharas, Koji Makino, and Woojin Jung, eds., *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), pp. 179-201.

17   Ibid.

Even where national and local government agencies operate as the primary stakeholders, the partners will still need to decide what role, if any, exists for non-State actors.[18] States and IGOs offering assistance projects and programs, for example, often rely on NGOs or private companies to deliver the assistance, from technical experts to conference organizers to equipment manufacturers.[19] Several important WMD nonproliferation capacities, such as having effective export controls, may also inherently require close cooperation with industry and/or academia for success.

Finally, even a small set of stakeholders will likely require considerable attention to issues of information sharing, such as what information to share, when, and with whom, and the integrative requirements of the project across stakeholders with different integrative capacities. The interdisciplinary nature of most WMD nonproliferation projects also suggests that one or more key stakeholders need system engineering skills, especially in the case of very large projects, to ensure project success.[20]

The challenges noted above generally factor into a decision to *establish* an assistance partnership, such as decisions on which stakeholders and partners to include in the project, and in planning, designing, and executing projects. In the case of the formal requests before the 1540 Committee, however, it appears that some critical obstacle or obstacles emerge at an even earlier stage in the process, in *identifying or initially engaging* potential partners.

Not least, of course, those seeking aid need to engage with appropriate assistance partners. Sometimes potential assistance partners will come to them unbidden, as when the secretariat of a nonproliferation IGO reaches out to its members to offer aid and prompt requests that further the mandate and objectives of the IGO. At other times, those seeking aid will initiate a request independently, either to the broad international community or to specific potential partners. In either instance, those seeking assistance must consider the motives, reputation, and capabilities of the potential partners.

Equally as important, states requesting assistance need to have sufficient information on the assistance offered, and entities offering aid need to have sufficient information in the requests before they can evaluate if they should engage and seek to negotiate a partnership in the first place. For requesters to develop more detailed requests and for providers to have a better understanding of the need a state has, information on assistance actions should be easily accessible. This raises an interesting question about the assistance process: what sources of information are actually available to show what assistance projects and programs are being offered?

---

18   Jane Nelson, *"The Private Sector and Aid Effectiveness,"* in Homi Kharas, Koji Makino, and Woojin Jung, eds., *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2011), pp. 83-111.

19   Galia Chimiak, "The Rise and Stall of Non-Governmental Organizations in Development," *Polish Sociological Review*, Vol. 185, 2014, pp. 25-44.

20   Sonia Ben Ouagrham-Gormley, *Barriers to Bioweapons: The Challenges of Expertise and Organization for Weapons Development* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).

What Collections of Assistance Information are Available?

In UNSC resolution 1673 (2006), the Security Council expanded the 1540 Committee's assistance mandate to encourage a dialogue with states and international, regional, and sub-regional organizations about the availability of programs to support implementation of UNSC resolution 1540. This call for more information on assistance projects and programs was reiterated again two years later in UNSC resolution 1810 (2008).[21] Evidently, the UN Security Council views making assistance information readily available as integral to the success of the assistance process.

Consequently, there are currently several different collections of assistance information. One collection is the publicly available 2012 Annex compiled by G7 Global Partnership Against the Spread of WMD which was partially updated in 2013. This Annex marks an important starting point for understanding the extent and quality of information available to states seeking assistance.[22] It also created more opportunities for members of the Global Partnership that offer aid—members that undoubtedly control a substantial majority of the total supply of WMD nonproliferation assistance—to coordinate and collaborate and use scarce resources more efficiently and effectively. The Global Partnership, however, did not make a new Annex available until late 2018, after this article's research was completed. Prior to December 2018, the 2012 Annex did not incorporate assistance information from its partners for the last five years.[23]

Another source of assistance information is the Biological Weapons Convention Implementation Support Unit (BWC-ISU) Article X Submissions database. This database was established to help State Parties exchange information on requests for and offers of assistance in implementing Article X of the BWC.[24] However, only offers of assistance are publicly accessible on the database; requests for assistance can only be viewed in the restricted area of the BWC website which requires personalized log-in data and passwords.[25] Because this assistance information is

---

21   United Nations Security Council Resolution 1673, S/RES/1673, New York, April 2006, Operative Paragraph 5 (b); United Nations Security Council Resolution 1810, S/RES/1810, New York, April 2008, UNSCR 1810, Operative Paragraphs 5 and 11 (c).

22   United States Department of State, Global Partnership Working Group, *GPWG Annual Report Consolidated Report Data 2012 Annex* (Washington DC: US Department of State, 2012).

23   The 2018 Annex can be found here: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/wp4slrrmm4hxwop/GP%20Project%20Annex%20%282018%29%20.pdf?dl=0>.

24   Article X of the Biological Weapons Convention, "The State Parties to the Convention undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the ful lest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the use of bacteriological (biological) agents and toxins for peaceful purposes. Parties to the Convention in a position to do so shall also co-operate in contributing individually or together with other States or international organisations to the further development and application of scientific discoveries in the field of bacteriology (biology) for the prevention of disease, or for other peaceful purposes." Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, United Nations Office of Disarmament Affairs, 1975, <http://disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/bwc/text>.

25   "Assistance and Cooperation Database," United Nations Office of Geneva,<https://www.unog.ch/bwc/database>.

not readily or easily accessible, utilization of this database by State Parties has been reportedly low.[26]

A third source of assistance information is the 1540 Committee's Offers of Assistance website.[27] This site provides information on states and international organizations that have offered or are currently offering assistance. Additionally, the site includes a list of these providers' assistance programs. As of April 2011, 46 states and 12 international organizations have made their assistance programs readily available through this platform.[28] And yet, as mentioned previously, one of the main challenges the Committee currently faces is a lack of reporting from states and international organizations when assistance is provided informally (i.e. outside of the Committee itself):

> *The Committee and its experts are aware of several ongoing assistance programmes, including in those States that have made requests for assistance to the Committee, even though, in most instances, the existence of the programmes has not been officially communicated to the Committee.[29]*

Furthermore, the 1540 Committee does not recognize NGOs as assistance providers and, therefore, forgoes sharing a significant amount of assistance information. Ultimately, a lack of reporting from states and the omission of NGOs results in the 1540 Committee website being an incomplete source for assistance information.

Lastly, in 2016, the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) in Pretoria created a compendium of recent chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) related capacity-building assistance projects and programs in Africa. This compendium consists of 57 different entities of states, IGOs, the European Union, and NGOs, which collectively provide 238 assistance projects and programs in Africa.[30] Though this data set is thorough and relatively recent, it only provides information on available assistance in African countries.

In sum, although there are sources of information on what assistance is available, these sources are insufficient in filling the information-sharing gap in the assistance process. These collections do not provide a complete picture of what assistance projects and programs are available and

---

26   Daniel Feakes, "The Biological Weapons Convention and Article X Implementation: An Introductory Overview," Presentation at the International Workshop on Cooperation and Assistance under Article X of the Biological Weapons Conventions, Geneva, Switzerland, June 22, 2018, <https://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B8954/(httpAssets)/49B90ACD9D4F854FC12582B8004233E6/$file/The+BWC+and+Art+X+implementation+-+An+introductory+overview+.pdf>.

27   1540 Committee, "Offers of Assistance," United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/offers-of-assistance.shtml>.

28   1540 Committee, "General Information," United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/general-information.shtml>.

29   1540 Committee, "Final Document on the 2016 Comprehensive Review of the Status of Implementation of Resolution 1540 (2016)," United Nations, <http://undocs.org/S/2016/1038>, p. 28.

30   Annie DuPre and Nicolas Kasprzyk, "CBRN Assistance and Capacity-Building Programmes for African States," Institute for Security Studies (Pretoria), 2016, <https://issafrica.s3.amazonaws.com/site/uploads/research-directory-cbrn.pdf>.

who is offering them. In order for states, IGOs, regional and sub-regional organizations, and NGOs to fully understand what assistance is out there - who needs it, who provides it, who receives it, and what it is - there needs to be a tool that stays current, is easily and publicly accessible, incorporates assistance information from a variety of institutions, and is not limited to a specific country or region. Based upon this specific need and following up from Canadian recommendations made during the 2016 Comprehensive Review of UNSCR 1540, The Henry L. Stimson Center launched, with encouragement and funding from Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), the Assistance Support Initiative (ASI) project in 2017.[31]

The Stimson Center's Assistance Support Initiative (ASI)

Many states have expressed the need for international support for their 1540 implementation efforts and, as demonstrated by the various sources of assistance information, many entities in the international community have offered such assistance. And yet, few effective assistance partnerships have emerged in response to these requests, as noted by the 1540 Committee.[32] The Stimson Center's Assistance Support Initiative project seeks to mitigate this problem of building effective partnerships in two ways. First, the project attempts to answer the "who" question: Who are potential assistance providers? The Stimson Center has developed a public, online, and searchable database of assistance projects and programs related to the nonproliferation of CBRN weapons and their means of delivery.[33] This database clearly identifies over 50 providers for more than 1,000 assistance projects and programs.[34] Although the Stimson Center is continually expanding and verifying the data, this constitutes a major step forward in increasing transparency for the assistance process and allows officials and civil society to gain a much better understanding of the full range of CBRN nonproliferation assistance activities by unifying project lists from various disparate sources into a single database. For states seeking assistance, knowing which partners exist and the requirements for engaging them successfully

---

31   United Nations, "Security Council Adopts Resolution 2325 (2016), Calling for Framework to Keep Terrorists, Other Non-State Actors from Acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction," S/12628, December 15, 2016, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/sc12628.doc.htm>.

32   In this case, "effective assistance partnerships" is defined as relationships in which provider states have a clear understanding of what kind of assistance requesting states need, and requesting states have a clear understanding about the kind of assistance that is being offered. This mutual understanding helps to establish expectations for each party and ensure the assistance is directly tending to a legitimate and recognized need. For more information, see 1540 Committee, "Final Document on the 2016 Comprehensive Review of the Status of Implementation of Resolution 1540 (2016)," United Nations, <http://undocs.org/S/2016/1038>, p. 28, 38.

33   Located at <https://1540assistance.stimson.org>.

34   This information was gathered from several different sources on assistance including: the 1540 Committee lists of States and IGOs offering assistance, the information in the Global Partnership 2012 and 2013 Annexes, information on the European Union Centres of Excellence projects, the Institute for Security Studies (Pretoria) CBRN Compendium for Africa, an online database of foundations, and participants in CBRN nonproliferation conferences.

are necessary information that was previously difficult to find (if at all).[35]

The second way the Stimson Center's ASI project aims to address the difficulty behind facilitating assistance partnerships is through its attempt to answer the "how" question: How do states engage potential assistance partners? The database provides a partial answer, particularly through linking projects and programs with Points of Contact and, where available, information on the specific requirements for assistance proposals.

It is important to note that the ASI database is constantly being reviewed, edited, and updated to ensure the content is as accurate and relevant as possible. This database can be a valuable tool to the process of assistance that is unique from the other sources of assistance information. The Assistance Support Initiative's database is purposefully designed to be easily accessible by anyone — requesters, donors, implementers, governments, IGOs, NGOs, private industry, academia, students, and global citizens. It seeks to provide as up-to-date information on assistance projects and programs as possible and to establish a historical memory of past partnerships. It has information on assistance provided by governments, IGOs, regional and sub-regional organizations, NGOs, and even academia. Finally, the database includes assistance activities that have been or currently are offered globally, regionally, or for specific states. Ultimately, the ASI database is the only tool that currently offers the fullest picture of nonproliferation assistance projects and programs worldwide.

Methodological Approach to Analyzing Assistance Requests and Projects

Within this study, the authors review and compare two sets of assistance sources, with particular focus on border and export controls — the 1540 Committee's Requests for Assistance website and the Stimson Center's ASI database.[36] The objective is to assess how well formal requests for border and export control assistance match with available assistance projects and programs. To analyze this relationship, the authors determined that there are 79 assistance projects and 19 assistance programs within the ASI database related to border and export controls. It is important to clarify that this study has independently differentiated between assistance *projects* and assistance *programs*.[37]

---

35   In addition, those entities offering assistance often want to know what assistance has been provided, a question that all partners often struggle to answer, which the database can help address.

36   1540 Committee, "Summary Requests for Assistance from Member States Since 2010", Requests for Assistance, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/request-for-assistance/current-requests-from-member-states.shtml> and 1540 Committee, "Previous Requests for Assistance from Member States Received Before 2010," Previous Requests from Member States, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/request-for-assistance/previous-requests-from-member-states.shtml> and 1540 Assistance Database, <https://1540assistance.stimson.org/>.

37   As the database creators at the Stimson Center have made clear, they are still gathering information on assistance projects and programs and inputting it onto the database. In other words, the database is still growing, which means there may be some missing information at the time of this study. For example, the database only has information on the EXBS program, and not its accompanying assistance projects that are facilitated within the program. Consequently, this study identifies trends and gaps between requests and assistance projects based on the information that is *currently available* to the authors.

This study's process to categorize border and export control entries from the database as "projects" or "programs" involves simple criteria. If an entry's title name or description includes the word "program" or "project," it is categorized accordingly. For example, the entry titled "Export Control and Related Border Security (EXBS) Program" is categorized as a program. Also, if an assistance activity is a single event (e.g. workshop or seminar), it is categorized as a project. For example, the entry titled "Training Course on Improvements to Implementation of Security Export Controls in Asia" is regarded as a project. Finally, if the database entry is somewhat ambiguous, the authors conducted independent research to find additional information on the entry to help in its categorization. Therefore, because the Assistance Support Initiative database contains 98 total assistance projects and programs, the study regards this as one dichotomous variable of 79 projects and 19 programs. To be clear, this categorization of projects and programs is distinctive; there are *no* instances in which some projects or programs are hybrids (e.g. both a project and a program). Additionally, the authors determined that of the 77 formal requests made between 2004 and 2018, 47 requests were related to border and export controls. In order to analyze these 47 requests, 79 projects, and 19 programs, the authors utilize three additional variables: CBRN risk type requested or addressed (Table 1), type of assistance requested or addressed (Table 2), region where requests were made, and region where projects and programs occurred (Table 3).

Regarding CBRN risk type, this study attributes all 47 requests, 79 projects, and 19 programs to a specific CBRN risk of Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, or Multiple CBRN. For example, if a request asks for assistance in providing radiological equipment to enhance border security, that request is categorized as "Radiological." The purpose of this variable is to assess how states perceive border and export controls as a risk.

Similarly, this study categorizes the type of assistance involved in the 47 requests, 79 projects, and 19 programs. The Stimson Center database identifies nine types of assistance: Conference/Workshop, Knowledge Sharing/Best Practices, Infrastructure/Equipment Support, Legislative/Regulatory Assistance, Technical Training, Network Development/Outreach, Emergency Preparedness/Response, Funds, and Other. Because 22 requests, 29 projects, and 13 programs incorporate multiple types of assistance, some assistance activities are categorized multiple times. For example, if a project provides equipment and training for border protection agents on how to use that equipment, that project is categorized twice as both "Infrastructure/Equipment Support" and "Technical Training." Consequently, some requests, projects, and programs are counted multiple times; therefore, data for this variable will not equal 100%. The purpose of this variable is to reveal if the types of assistance available match with the types of assistance that are requested.

Furthermore, this study divides requests, projects, and programs into ten regions: North America, Central America, South America, Caribbean, Europe, Africa, Asia, Middle East, Oceania, and Global. Like the previous variable, because 11 border and export control assistance projects and programs are available for multiple regions, these projects and programs are categorized multiple times. For example, a single project may have the capacity to deliver assistance to both the Caribbean and Central America. As a result, some projects and programs are counted multiple times; therefore, data for this variable will also not equal 100%. The purpose of this variable is to determine if assistance is being directed where it is most expressly needed.

It is important to acknowledge that there is a discrepancy regarding the region variable—the number of countries within a region vary amongst regions. As a result, Table 3's data may not *proportionally* represent the number of requests being made regionally. To put it differently, Africa has more countries in its region than the Caribbean; thus, Africa has more countries that could submit a request. This could affect the study's analysis between formal requests for border and export control assistance and projects and programs that provided such assistance by region. To account for this discrepancy, the authors have determined the *average number of requests made by an individual country per region* by dividing the total number of requests a region made from 2004 to 2018 by the total number of countries in that region, regardless of whether a country requested assistance or not (Table 4). These regional averages are used to ensure that this study's findings represent the current condition of the assistance process as accurately as possible and allow for cross-regional comparison free from influence from the varying sizes of the regions. Ultimately, this method and these variables are intended to reveal if and how border and export control assistance requests compare with projects and programs, and, thus, identify where these assistance activities can be buttressed to establish stronger and more effective assistance partnerships.

Comparing Requests with Projects

Upon examination of the 1540 Committee's Requests for Assistance Website, 61% of formal assistance requests address border and export control vulnerabilities. This demonstrates that states are more often than not asking for this specified assistance, which reveals a clearly perceived need. In terms of offers, by differentiating between projects and programs, this study focuses on 79 border and export control assistance projects and 19 border and export control assistance programs (independently identified by the authors).

In reviewing the 47 requests, 79 projects, and 19 programs, five main categories of CBRN risks are addressed. Table 1 portrays the distribution of the requests and the projects. It is clear that assistance requests, assistance projects, and assistance programs related to border and export controls mostly focus on addressing chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear risks as a collective threat. It appears people regard border and export control vulnerabilities as a cross-cutting issue, especially those who are requesting this specialized assistance.

CBRN Risk Type	Number of Border/Export Control **Requests** Addressing Specific CBRN Risk	Number of Border/Export Control **Projects** Addressing Specific CBRN Risk	Number of Border/Export Control **Programs** Addressing Specific CBRN Risk
Chemical	0	3 (3.8%)	1 (5.3%)
Biological	0	3 (3.8%)	1 (5.3%)
Radiological	5 (10.6%)	6 (7.6%)	0
Nuclear	0	5 (6.3%)	2 (10.5%)
Multiple CBRN	42 (89.4%)	62 (78.5%)	15 (78.9%)

Table 1. Border/export control assistance requests and projects by type of CBRN risk

Additionally, the types of assistance requested and the types offered in assistance projects and programs to address border and export control vulnerabilities are separated into nine categories, as seen in Table 2. It is evident that most states request Technical Training (55.3%) and Infrastructure/Equipment Support (42.6%). Yet, of the 79 border and export control projects in the Assistance Support Initiative database, only 13 projects offer Technical Training (16.5%) and only 17 projects offer Infrastructure/Equipment Support (21.5%). Interestingly, of the 19 assistance programs available, 12 programs include Technical Training (63.2%) and 14 provide Infrastructure/Equipment Support (73.7%). Moreover, while only one request (2%) was made for a workshop or conference, 22 projects (27.9%) and four programs (21.1%) offer workshops related to border and export controls. The only types of assistance where a relatively balanced relationship exists between requests, projects, and programs are: "Legislative/Regulatory Support" with 17 requests (36.2%), 25 projects (31.6%), and five programs (26.3%); and "Funds" with four requests (8.5%), six projects (7.6%), and two programs (10.5%). Essentially, this data suggests that assistance providers may be more inclined to offer the more costly and lengthy types of assistance (like training and physical protection support) when there is a stronger and prolonged assistance partnership established between stakeholders through a program. Meanwhile, providers offering an assistance project appear to prefer to engage in partnerships to share technical knowledge which does not require as great of a commitment in terms of time and resources.

Type of Assistance Requested for Border/ Export Control Projects	Number of Border/ Export Control Assistance **Requests** Addressing Specific Types of Assistance	Number of Border/Export Control **Projects** Addressing Specific Type of Assistance	Number of Border/Export Control **Programs** Addressing Specific Type of Assistance
Conference/Workshop	1 (2%)	22 (27.9%)	4 (21.1%)
Knowledge Sharing/ Best Practices	4 (8.5%)	13 (16.5%)	2 (10.5%)
Infrastructure/ Equipment Support	20 (42.6%)	17 (21.5%)	14 (73.7%)
Legislative/Regulatory Assistance	17 (36.2%)	25 (31.6%)	5 (26.3%)
Technical Training	26 (55.3%)	13 (16.5%)	12 (63.2%)
Network Development/ Outreach	0	15 (19%)	4 (21.1%)
Emergency Preparedness/Response	0	4 (5.1%)	1 (5.3%)
Funds	4 (8.5%)	6 (7.6%)	2 (10.5%)
Other	1 (2%)	0	0

Table 2. Border/export control assistance requests and projects by type of assistance

It is also interesting to note that there are no requests for Network Development/Outreach or for Emergency Preparedness/Response regarding border and export control vulnerabilities; and yet, 15 projects (19%) and four programs (21.1%) provide network development, and four projects (5.1%) and one program (5.3%) offer emergency preparedness assistance. This raises several interesting questions: Are states aware that network development and emergency preparedness are types of assistance that can be requested? Do they perceive network development as a need? Are partners that offer assistance driving these projects to meet their own needs or have they identified needs unperceived by requesting states?

Overall, Table 2 appears to reveal positive and negative findings of the assistance process. On a positive note, all types of requested assistance are being provided for. However, there is an overwhelming disproportion—with the exception of Legislative/Regulatory Support and Funds—between the number of requests for specific types of assistance and the number of projects and programs that provide those specific types of assistance.

Furthermore, to better understand the relationship between the 1540 Committee's formal requests for assistance and the ASI database's border and export control assistance projects and programs, it is valuable to explore how many requests have been made per geographic region and how many assistance projects and programs are available per region. This data is important because it can reveal if assistance is offered where it is most expressly needed. Table 3 shows the distribution of border and export control requests, projects, and programs throughout ten

regions.

The most evident discrepancy regionally is amongst Asia, Europe, and Africa. Between 2004 and 2018, nine requests (19%) for border and export control assistance were made from Asia. And yet, 26 assistance projects (32.9%) and eight assistance programs (42.1%) are available in the region. Similarly, five requests (10.6%) were made from European countries, while 16 assistance projects (20.3%) and two assistance programs (10.5%) are available in Europe. Meanwhile, 15 requests (32%) were made from African states while only 13 projects (16.5%) and two programs (10.5%) are available in Africa. In other words, Asian and European states are receiving a large amount of assistance for border and export controls, most of which they are not requesting through the 1540 Committee process. African states, on the other hand, are clearly expressing a strong need for border and export control assistance but the number of assistance projects and programs available for this region meets only a little over half of this perceived need.

Region	Number of **Requests** for Border/Export Control Assistance from 2004 to 2018	Number of Border/ Export Control Assistance **Projects**	Number of Border/ Export Control Assistance **Programs**
North America	3 (6.4%)	1 (1.3%)	0
Central America	2 (4.3%)	5 (6.3%)	0
South America	2 (4.3%)	3 (3.8%)	0
Caribbean	1 (2%)	4 (5.1%)	0
Europe	5 (10.6%)	16 (20.3%)	2 (10.5%)
Africa	15 (32%)	13 (16.5%)	2 (10.5%)
Asia	9 (19%)	26 (32.9%)	8 (42.1%)
Middle East	5 (10.6%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (5.3%)
Oceania	5 (10.6%)	1 (1.3%)	0
Global	Not Applicable	19 (24.1%)	9 (47.4%)

Table 3. Border/export control assistance requests and projects by region

The disproportion between requests, projects, and programs for the Oceanic region is also worth noting. Five (10.6%) out of 47 total border and export control requests have been formally submitted by Oceanic states. Yet, only one border and export control project out of 98 total projects and programs—approximately 1%—is available in Oceania. Similarly, the Middle Eastern region has submitted five requests (10.6%), but only three projects (3.8%) and one program (5.3%) are available in the region. For both Oceania and the Middle East, less than half of the regions' needs for border and export controls are addressed with available assistance. A final detail to highlight is that the Caribbean has only submitted one request (2%) since 2004 and yet four projects (5.1%) are in the region. Even though the Caribbean does not have access to border and export control assistance programs, the region is still receiving over 50% more assistance than requested while Oceania and the Middle East struggle to get half their needs addressed.

To account for the discrepancy in the varying number of countries within each geographic region (and thus the discrepancy in Table 3's data), this study has also collected data on the *average* number of requests for border and export control assistance made by states per region (including countries within each region that did not submit a request), as seen in Table 4. For the most part this data supports the authors' conclusions drawn from Table 3, apart from the Middle Eastern region. Table 4 reveals that from 2004 to 2018, on average 0.26 requests for border and export control assistance were made from an Asian state. Also, on average 0.11 assistance requests were made by a European state. Meanwhile, an average of 0.30 requests were made from an African state. On average, Africa has submitted more formal requests than Asia and Europe, yet both receive significantly more assistance than Africa. Similarly, Oceania has submitted an average of 0.33 requests, which is the second highest requesting region in the world, but only has one assistance project in its region.

Region	Average Number of **Requests**
North America	1 (too small of sample size)
Central America	0.29
South America	0.15
Caribbean	0.04
Europe	0.11
Africa	0.30
Asia	0.26
Middle East	0.36
Oceania	0.33
Global	Not Applicable

Table 4. Average number of requests for border/export control assistance by states per region

What is most revealing about the data in Table 4 is the fact that the Middle East is the region with the most requests for border and export control assistance with an average of 0.36 requests from 2004 to 2018. Had this study not accounted for the different number of countries per region, the data from Table 3 on its own would have suggested that Africa was the region with the highest concentration of requests—15 requests in comparison to the Middle East's five requests. Yet, despite the Middle East's average number of requests being the highest relative to other regions, it only receives three assistance projects and one assistance program.

To sum up, this data reveals a couple different trends. For example, there is evidence of proportionate matching between requests and projects and programs within some regions. South America and Central America's requests-to-projects-and-programs ratio are balanced— both regions are receiving a proportionate amount of assistance to their expressed needs. On the other hand, there is a clear mismatch amongst some regions between how much assistance a region is requesting and how much assistance they are receiving—namely Asia, Europe, Africa, Oceania, the Middle East, and the Caribbean. Nonetheless, for the regions that are not receiving

enough assistance to match their needs, the projects and programs that are offered globally—19 projects (24.1%) and nine programs (47.4%)—can potentially mitigate this problem. It is also valuable to highlight the fact that every region has at least one assistance project or program to address border and export control vulnerabilities. Evidently, both assistance requesters and providers recognize some level of importance in enhancing border and export controls across the globe.

Conclusion: Lessons Learned and Next Steps

The prior discussion on how border and export control assistance requests compare with assistance projects and programs reveals common trends within the assistance process. This discussion also illustrates some of the problems facing the international community if it wishes to increase the initiation and effectiveness of assistance partnerships in response to requests for such assistance. These issues go beyond some of the internal and external challenges described earlier in establishing assistance projects and programs more generally.

First, at least for those states submitting assistance requests to the 1540 Committee, the number of assistance projects and programs for border and export controls that offer the type of assistance they want and need seem to be fewer or of less interest than the number of assistance projects that entities offer and supply. The data suggests that states are most interested in training programs, equipment, and physical protection capabilities. It appears that assistance programs are adequately offering these types of assistance. The fact that programs predominantly offer Technical Training and Infrastructure/Equipment Support while projects largely do not may indicate that providers prefer to supply these types of assistance when there is a longer-term commitment within a partnership. However, there is a significant number of projects and programs that provide workshops and opportunities to share best practices despite a minimal expressed need by states for this assistance. This trend is most likely because workshops and knowledge sharing opportunities involve less commitment and resources on the assistance provider's part. A workshop can be a relatively low cost, one-time event.

In addition, it is clearly evident there is a regional imbalance regarding how much border and export control assistance is requested and how much assistance is available. These disproportions may be provider-driven. Assistance providers may have their own perceptions of where globally the greatest threats and risks are in terms of border and export controls. However, if this is the case, then assistance providers' perceptions of need may be inaccurate and require some adjustment, as virtually every state has radioactive materials, sensitive chemicals, diagnostic labs, and other items or facilities at risk of exploitation by terrorists, other criminals, and even state proliferators. This study's data suggests providers view Asia and Europe as the greatest risks, but the Middle East, Oceania, and Africa have, on average, expressed a greater need for border and export control assistance. The Assistance Support Initiative's database can prove valuable in this respect because it can raise awareness amongst assistance providers of what types of assistance are currently available and where they are being delivered. The database can be an effective tool to prevent the duplication of assistance efforts and adjust the proportion of projects and programs available regionally.

Furthermore, by offering to accept requests for assistance, the 1540 Committee sets an expectation

that it will match states with an assistance provider. By not meeting these expectations, the 1540 Committee unintentionally hampers enhancing border and export controls in states. States that formally request assistance must wait for the 1540 Committee to facilitate a match that may never occur. In the meantime, their border and export control systems remain vulnerable. The Committee needs to facilitate timely and effective assistance partnerships; otherwise, the Committee itself may inadvertently act as an impediment to the implementation of obligations under UNSC resolution 1540.

Finally, and more generally, confusion reigns within the assistance process. Certainly, assistance providers receive many informal requests for assistance outside of the 1540 Committee. Frequently, assistance providers cannot or do not share these informal requests, which easily results in requests languishing in the wrong place and going unaddressed. What is more, as discussed at the 2016 Comprehensive Review, the requests rarely provide the specific information most often sought by those offering aid.[38] For instance, Ethiopia's request for border and export control assistance did not include a point of contact.[39] From the perspective of those seeking assistance, a bewildering range of projects and programs exist. For instance, the Assistance Support Initiative's database has over 1,000 assistance projects and programs worldwide. However, prior to this database, the information had not been centrally located or easily found, and the process to apply for such assistance is challenging. Essentially, states seeking assistance must navigate a veritable assistance maze. Taken together, it comes as no surprise that nonproliferation assistance processes related to border and export controls, especially those of the 1540 Committee, have not met the increasingly urgent need for all states to fulfill their WMD nonproliferation obligations and commitments under UNSC resolution 1540.

Nevertheless, it is important to qualify these lessons learned since this study collects half of its data from the Assistance Support Initiative database, a source that is still gathering and inputting assistance data. For example, the EXBS Program is included in the database, but the Stimson Center has not yet inputted data on the program's accompanying assistance projects. Consequently, this study's findings and lessons learned may change as the database grows and is used by assistance stakeholders. As discussed earlier in the study, this limitation of data is not a unique or novel challenge when exploring the current state of the nonproliferation assistance process. However, this study's findings are based upon *the most comprehensive source of assistance information currently available*. What is more, it is the authors' hope that their findings *do* eventually change because that change can act as an indicator that greater awareness has been raised about these implementation gaps and that concrete steps have been taken to address them.

Ultimately, this study on assistance and lessons learned is important because border and export controls are an integral tool in implementing a comprehensive CBRN nonproliferation strategy, the obligations of UNSC resolution 1540 (2004), and various binding UNSC nonproliferation

---

38   1540 Committee, "Final Document on the 2016 Comprehensive Review of the Status of Implementation of Resolution 1540 (2016)," United Nations, <http://undocs.org/S/2016/1038>, p. 3.

39   1540 Committee, "Points of Contact," United Nations,<http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/assistance/points-of-contact.shtml>.

sanctions resolutions. And to be most effective in preventing proliferation and eliminating safe harbors for illicit activities, border and export control systems need to be applied uniformly and consistently across states, regions, and the world.[40] If not, then:

> *Nonstate actors might use any state as a route for illicit trafficking or for export, transit, transshipment, or reexport of related materials for prohibited purposes. No state is completely immune to serving as a place where nonstate actors can take advantage of legislative and regulatory differences or shortfalls in implementation to accomplish their ends.*[41]

If states needing assistance are not receiving it, then their borders and export systems remain susceptible to CBRN proliferation by terrorists, criminals, and other proliferators. And if the assistance is not coordinated to foster uniformity and consistency, susceptible borders and export systems can potentially result in nonstate actors using these vulnerabilities to expand the scope of their nefarious activities, including in the trafficking of CBRN-related materials. If efforts are not made by both providers and requesters to mitigate the implementation gaps in the assistance process and facilitate more effective partnerships relating to border and export controls, CBRN nonproliferation will continue to threaten global trade, security, and stability.

In terms of next steps for the ASI project, the Stimson Center and the Government of Canada recognize that the database presents a comprehensive picture of the existing projects and programs that might become platforms for new assistance partnerships. Therefore, the Stimson Center continues to research, update, and refine the database. Additionally, much of the Point of Contact information for each entry currently links to the UNSCR 1540 Points of Contact. The Stimson Center will upgrade this contact information to include Points of Contact for the assistance provider and the assistance implementer for each project and program entry on the database. Also, given how large the database already is, the Stimson Center will create a video (with subtitles translated into the six UN languages) on how to most effectively use the database. If the database continues to be updated with new assistance information and when these upgrades are implemented, the authors believe the Assistance Support Initiative database can be an effective tool to reduce redundancy and resolve the systemic lack of information-sharing within the assistance process. Ultimately, it is the authors' hope that this study and the ASI database raise awareness of the full range of available assistance projects and programs to help all stakeholders identify gaps between the priorities of those seeking assistance and the aid on offer to improve strategies for creating effective assistance partnerships.

---

40   Michael David Beck, Richard T. Cupitt, Scott A. Jones, and Seema Galhaut, *To Supply or to Deny: Comparing Nonproliferation Export Controls in Five Key Countries (*Frederick: Aspen Publishers, Inc. 2003), Preface.

41   "UNSCR 1540 Review Conference," *1540 Compass*, Winter 2016, pp. 6-7, <http://spia.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Compass_11-Winter2016.pdf>.