

## Regional options for stockpile destruction

Colin King

### Aim

The aim of the presentation is to outline the findings and implications from the first phase of the study to examine regional options for stockpile destruction.

### Background

The 1997 Mine Ban Treaty showed that meeting obligations for stockpile destruction was far more difficult and expensive than anticipated - particularly for developing nations. The destruction of submunitions, particularly those contained within cluster munitions, is significantly more technically demanding than the destruction of most landmines. Although the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) calls for cooperation and assistance, many nations are concerned about their ability to comply with the 8 year deadline.

Last year, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs funded an initiative by Norwegian People's Aid, in conjunction with C King Associates and the Golden West Humanitarian Foundation, to examine the issues surrounding the destruction of cluster munition stockpiles. With this work complete, the team plan to refine their concepts and implement limited pilot projects in partner countries over the coming year.

### Outline concept

By combining a detailed technical knowledge of submunitions and their parent munitions with extensive engineering and EOD experience, the program aims to develop practical options for nations seeking assistance with the destruction of their stockpiles.

These options will encompass a combination of manual disassembly, mechanised processes and explosive or pyrotechnic destruction. Above all, these systems must be:

- Safe;
- Affordable;
- Easily constructed;
- Simple to maintain and operate;
- Built using readily-available materials;
- Capable of sustaining high rates of output.

### Advantages

Regional stockpile destruction options have a number of potential benefits over centralised industrial options. These include:

- Greater "ownership", participation and regional cooperation in CCM implementation;
- Savings on transportation, storage and security costs;
- Lower inclusive costs (yet to be confirmed);
- Local investment, employment and capacity-building;
- Community benefits through the re-use of by-products and materials.