



Florida High Schools Model United Nations

FHSMUN 33

GENERAL ASSEMBLY FIRST COMMITTEE

MEASURES TO PREVENT TERRORISTS AND TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS FROM ACQUIRING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Authors: Christopher Gebhardt & Brian D. Sutliff

Introduction

The purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are centered on international peace and security; as such, terrorism is a direct threat to the fundamental principles of the United Nations. In a resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 20 September 2006, the General Assembly strongly condemned terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, committed by whomever, wherever, and or whatever purposes, as it constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security.¹

The General Assembly resolved that measures aimed at addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism, including but not limited to prolonged unresolved conflicts, dehumanization of victims of terrorism in all its forms, and manifestations, lack of rule of law and violations of human rights, ethnic, national and religious discrimination, political exclusion, socio-economic marginalization and lack of good governance, while recognizing that none of those conditions can excuse or justify acts of terrorism.² The General Assembly resolved to continue to strengthen and make best possible use of the capacities of the United Nations in areas such as conflict prevention, negotiation, mediation, conciliation, judicial settlement, rule of law, peacekeeping and peace building, in order to contribute to the successful prevention and the peaceful resolution of prolonged unresolved conflicts.

Measures outlined by the General Assembly have been updated since the creation of the United Nations, and with the expansion of technology around the world these measures will need to be updated more and more. However, the ideas of transparency and communication between all member states will never change in the measures outlined by the General Assembly. To strengthen coordination and cooperation among States in combating crimes that might be connected with terrorism, including drug trafficking in all its aspects, illicit arms trade, in

¹ The United Nations Global Counter Terrorism Strategy, September 20, 2006 p. 1. (A/RES/60/288).

² Ibid p. 4

particular of small arms and light weapons, including man-portable air defense systems, money-laundering and smuggling of nuclear, chemical, biological, radiological and other potentially deadly materials.³ Improved communication between regional and subregional organizations would encourage a stronger international effort in combating terrorism. One measure recommended is a single comprehensive database on biological incidents, ensuring that it is complementary to the biocrimes database contemplated by the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL).⁴

Ten Years After...

Since the devastating attacks in New York and Washington DC on September 11, 2001, concerns over terrorist groups and related non-state actors acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) have been repeatedly articulated by politicians and strategists. Then US President George W. Bush and members of his Cabinet, including Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld⁵, frequently asserted that the government of Iraq had maintained contacts with terrorist groups, such as al-Qaeda, that might provide these non-state actors with biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons (BCN).⁶ Now that the US-led war in Iraq has officially ended, concerns are surfacing over potential chemical weapons materials and missiles that are currently unsecured in Libya⁷ as well as concerns about biological and chemical weapons attacks originating from al-Qaeda groups based in Yemen⁸; without directly contradicting the statements of former Libyan President Muammar Qaddafi and then US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in 2006, the concerns about Libyan chemical stockpiles point to the difficulties of accurately assessing both the capabilities and intentions of various international actors.⁹ Continuing concerns about unsecured or “loose nukes” in Pakistan and the former Soviet Union are also frequently cited as major concerns regarding the possibility of terrorists acquiring WMDs or at the very least the materials needed to potentially develop them.¹⁰

The Fundamental Rule of Politics: Follow the Money

The clichés about the power and effects of money are nearly endless but it is certainly true that very few political actors can sustain themselves without regular access to money. Governments and other interested civil society stakeholders have seized on this condition as one key component of any comprehensive strategy to combat terrorism. Then British Chancellor of the Exchequer, and later Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, remarked in 2006 that “as Chancellor, I have found increasingly that an important part of the role of a finance minister is to address

³ Ibid p. 5

⁴ Ibid p. 6

⁵ Philip Shenon and David Stout, “Rumsfeld Says Terrorists Will Use Weapons of Mass Destruction” *New York Times* May 21, 2002.

⁶ Peter Crail, “Bush Says Iraq Oil May Fuel Al Qaeda WMD” *Arms Control Today* April 2008.

⁷ Olivia Lang, “Fears over Libya’s missing missiles” *BBC News* September 8, 2011.

⁸ Eric Schmitt and Tom Shanker, “Qaeda Trying to Harness Toxins for Bombs” *New York Times* August 23, 2011.

⁹ Helene Cooper, “Isolation Over, Libyan Leader Meets with Rice” *New York Times* September 5, 2008.

¹⁰ Stephen Mulvey, “Could terrorists get hold of a nuclear bomb” *BBC News* April 12, 2010.

issues of international terrorism.”¹¹ Given the global reach of several terrorist groups, as well as solid evidence of links between some nationally and regionally based terrorist organizations and these global terrorist groups, it is abundantly apparent that any strategy to deny terrorists the funds they need for recruiting and operations must incorporate significant sustained cooperation between governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), businesses, and civil society representatives. One practical reason for the necessity of this sustained international cooperation is that terrorist groups often seek to disguise the origins and destinations of their funds and they often transfer them between various banks requiring law enforcement and counter-terrorism officials to seek these monies in many different countries and financial institutions.

Governments are finding that they must adjust their domestic legislation to grant themselves greater authority to review and subpoena financial records as well as to freeze and seize the assets of suspected terrorists. When governments claim greater authority to review and seize the financial records and assets of suspected terrorists, they also find that their desires to increase their control over financial institutions and records may run up against their own laws guaranteeing privacy for depositors and investors. These domestic tensions over increased government authority to examine and subpoena financial records versus guarantees of privacy for depositors and investors can become even more complicated and vexing when both funds and investigations cross state borders. When countries have different laws regarding the privacy of bank deposits and financial records, they may confront significant difficulties in reconciling these different laws and perspectives on the primacy of investor privacy. The more that this data is collected and disseminated, however, particularly if it is contracted out to private companies, the greater the likelihood that it will be exploited or misused. The European Union (EU) and the United States find themselves at odds over the collection and use of financial data, including the enormous amount of data collected by a Belgian company, Swift. In 2006, “it emerged that a private company, Swift, which handles up to 11 million money transfers a year, had been passing information to the US authorities in violation of EU privacy rules.”¹² “SWIFT says it was complying with subpoenas from the American government, had limited the data handed over and had told its senior committee (made up of central-bank officials) what was going on. Still, questions remain about who knew what when, as well as the legality of it all.”¹³ Disputes about the legality of particular strategies to track and intercept terrorist funds may exacerbate other already existing tensions regarding appropriate law enforcement or military strategies to combat terrorism.

International Actions to Suppress Terrorism Financing

¹¹ *BBC News*, “Brown vows war on terror funding” February 10, 2006.

¹² *BBC News*, “EU concern at US data transfers” January 31, 2007.

¹³ *The Economist*, “Wired” June 29, 2006.

Greater cooperation to suppress terrorism financing must be amongst the highest priorities for governments and other civil society representatives. In 1999, governments assembled to sign the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Financing. As of December 22, 2011, 176 countries had ratified the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, with the vast majority of those ratifications occurring shortly after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. Delegates to the General Assembly Second Committee should familiarize themselves with the Convention¹⁴ and delegates should pay considerable attention to the obligations that state parties agree to undertake. The controversy about American requests for financial records in EU member states falls under the provisions contained in Article 12 of the Convention: “2. States Parties may not refuse a request for mutual legal assistance on the ground of bank secrecy. 3. The requesting Party shall not transmit nor use information or evidence furnished by the requested Party for investigations, prosecutions or proceedings other than those stated in the request without the prior consent of the requested Party.”¹⁵ One provision that may cause problems for countries, however, is found in Article 15 of the Convention which allows countries to deny requests if they have “substantial grounds for believing that the request for extradition for offences set forth in Article 2 or mutual legal assistance with respect to such offences has been made for the purpose of prosecuting or punishing a person on account of that person’s race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin or political opinion or that compliance with the request would cause prejudice to that person’s position for any of these reasons.”¹⁶

Additional UN System initiatives include the UN Global Programme Against Money Laundering which is administered by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The UNODC also combats terrorism directly through its Global Project Against Terrorism and all of these initiatives and programs work very closely with the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) established in Security Council Resolution 1373 (S/RES/1373) that was adopted on September 28, 2001. The UN also works very closely with the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) to improve coordination between governments, international organizations, and financial institutions to combat money laundering and terrorism financing. Governments may also find that other governments, and even international organizations, will blacklist them, if they are not seen as doing enough to fight terrorism, including the financing of terrorism. In 2002, the IMF and the FATF began jousting over their differing philosophies about blacklisting of countries that the FATF views as not doing nearly enough to combat the financing of terrorism. In response, “several IMF board members – particularly from developing countries – are strongly opposed to it, accusing the FATF of punishing poor states while letting its richer members off the hook.”¹⁷ In September 2006, the General Assembly adopted the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy; in it, the UN’s member states emphasized the need to develop state capacity

¹⁴ The Convention may be found at: <http://www.un.org/English/Terrorism/conv12.pdf>

¹⁵ The International Convention on the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, 1999.

¹⁶ The International Convention on the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, 1999.

¹⁷ Jeremy Scott-Joynt, “IMF blocks terror fund blacklist” September 2, 2002.

to combat terrorism, including through improvements in their data collection and reporting systems. States are also encouraged to work extensively with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank to combat the ills of money laundering and terrorism financing. Former Secretary-General Kofi Annan noted that “terrorists generate funds in many ways, with monies moved through both formal and informal sectors. Whereas some terrorists may fund their activities from drug cultivation and trafficking, terrorists operating through decentralized networks that once raised and moved money through formal channels and otherwise legitimate sources such as private business and charities are turning to methods that are more difficult to monitor, such as the use of cash couriers.”¹⁸ Governments, NGOs, businesses and civil society representatives must be flexible enough in their responses to adapt to the changing tactics that terrorist groups are using.

The UN’s strongest method of fighting terrorism, including its financing, comes under the auspices of the Security Council and its ability to authorize the use of armed force against threats to international peace and security as well as the authority of the Security Council to create and enforce sanctions regimes against states and non-state actors, including terrorist groups. Annan noted that “the Security Council has long since imposed an arms and travel ban and financial sanctions against members of al-Qaeda and associated entities, and has monitored their implementation in particular through the Security Council committee established pursuant to resolution 1267[S/RES/1267] (1999).”¹⁹ Sanctions must properly targeted and enforced, however, in such a way as to ensure that they do not inflict horrible, even unbearable, costs on innocent civilian populations but do little or nothing to punish the targets of those sanctions. Sanctions regimes must also work more transparently and with far greater accountability than prevailed under the now notorious “Oil-for-Food” program that the UN directed for Iraq from 1996-2003.

International Agreements Designed to Prevent Terrorists from Acquiring WMDs

While international agreements require a sustained willingness for effective enforcement, the accumulation of more international agreements designed to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) indicates that many states are actively seeking to eliminate these destabilizing and debilitating threats to their own and the world’s security. The aforementioned International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Financing is significantly closer to universal accession and/or ratification at the beginning of 2012 and obtaining universal ratification for as many of these agreements must be a top priority for the delegates to the General Assembly First Committee. Following the drafting of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Financing and building upon resolutions dating back to 1996 (A/RES/51/210), the General Assembly opened up the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism in 2005, with the treaty entering into force in July

¹⁸Kofi Annan, “Uniting Against Terrorism Report” May 2, 2006.

¹⁹Kofi Annan, “United Against Terrorism Report” May 2, 2006.

2007. This relatively new International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism builds upon the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (1980) and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (1997). Most recently, in 2012 the international community introduced the International Convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Relating to International Civil Aviation; some of the provisions of this new 2010 civil aviation convention criminalize the use of civil aircraft as a weapon to cause death and/or injury, similar to the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States, as well as the use of civil aircraft to launch or discharge biological, chemical and nuclear weapons (BCN). Delegates to the General Assembly First Committee should familiarize themselves with all of these conventions as well as their respective governments' status of accession and/or ratification as well as any reservations submitted at the time of ratification.

International Agencies and Organizations Aiming to Prevent Terrorists from Acquiring WMDs

IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) implements a comprehensive plan for strengthening nuclear security, including preventing acquisition by non-State actors of nuclear explosive devices. For effective assistance and coordination, the IAEA has expanded the use of Integrated Nuclear Security Support Plans, which serve as a reference and framework for implementing nuclear security activities in States. The Illicit Trafficking Database (ITDB) is the IAEA's information system on incidents of illicit trafficking and other unauthorized activities involving nuclear and other radioactive material. As of 31 December 2008, it benefited from the participation of 103 IAEA member States and 1 non-member State. Also as of that date, States had reported and otherwise confirmed 1,562 incidents to the ITDB, of which 336 involved the seizure of nuclear material or radioactive sources from persons who possessed the illegally and, in some cases, attempted to smuggle them across borders.²⁰

UNODC

Since 2006, the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has increasingly been giving attention to the issue of nuclear, chemical, and biological terrorism, as part of its ongoing technical assistance delivery on counter-terrorism legal and related capacity-building issues.²¹ Specialized activities have been organized pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 2005/19 and recent General Assembly resolutions, which recognize the role of the Branch of the UNODC in assisting States in ratifying and implementing the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and

²⁰ Report of the Secretary-General, *Measures to Prevent terrorist from acquiring weapons of mass destruction* 16 July 2009 p. 13

²¹ *Ibid* p. 16

other recent instruments, including the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material of 1979.

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty prohibits “any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion” and requires States Parties to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under their jurisdiction or control. The Treaty contributes to preventing nuclear weapons from falling into the hands of non-State actors, including terrorists and terrorist networks, by functioning in tandem with other international agreements and measures. With more fissile material in circulation, and more actors handling that material, the Treaty helps strengthen the international legal system to prevent nuclear terrorism, providing a last barrier against nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosion. In addition, the capacity-building activities and programs of the Preparatory Commission contribute to strengthening subregional, regional and international Cooperation in this area. A number of States have already brought into force the penal provisions criminalizing the act of carrying out a nuclear explosion or causing, encouraging, preparing for or in any way intentionally participating in such an explosion.²²

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) policy framework is stipulated in the Alliance’s strategic concept of 1999 and, more recently, in the Comprehensive Political Guidance of 2006. In the Comprehensive Political Guidance, NATO member States expressed their concern that terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction were likely to be the principal threats to the Alliance over the next 10-15 years; most dangerously in the case of terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction. In response to those threats, the Alliance will enhance its political efforts to reduce dangers arising from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. In the meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the summit, the Heads of State and Government issued a “Declaration on alliance security”, reaffirming that NATO will continue to play its part in reinforcing arms control and promoting nuclear and conventional disarmament. NATO will therefore continue to support existing multilateral non-proliferation agreements. The principal goal of the Alliance and its member States remains to prevent proliferation from occurring or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means.²³ The Alliance will continue to follow the broad approach to security of the 1999 strategic concept and perform the fundamental security tasks it sets out, namely security, consultation, deterrence and defense, crisis management and partnership. In the light of the new threats, NATO security is increasingly tied to that of other regions. The Alliance continues to provide an essential transatlantic dimension to the global response against terrorism. Allies remain committed to dialogue and cooperation with partners and other international organizations to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and reiterate their determination to protect Allies populations, territories, infrastructure and forces against the consequences of terrorist attacks and the potential use of weapons of mass

²² Ibid p. 17

²³ Ibid p. 18

destruction, especially those including hazards created by the deliberate release of CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear) toxic industrial materials.²⁴

Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004)

On 28 April 2004, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1540 (2004) under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, obliging States, inter alia, to refrain from supporting by any means non-State actors from developing, acquiring, manufacturing, possessing, transporting, transferring or using nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and their delivery systems. Resolution 1540 (2004) imposes binding obligations on all States to establish domestic controls to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and their means of delivery, including by establishing appropriate controls over related materials. It also encourages enhanced international cooperation on such efforts, in accord with and promoting universal adherence to existing international non proliferation treaties. The 1540 Committee released its report to the United Nations Security Council on implementation of the Resolution in April 2006.²⁵

Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 1540 in April 2004, the Committee established pursuant to that resolution has made considerable progress in promoting full implementation of the resolution through its intensive work programs. That work includes assisting the Security Council in monitoring the implementation of the resolution through the examination of relevant measures taken by all States Members of the United Nations, the organization of intensive outreach activities, the development of deeper and mutually beneficial cooperation with other Security Council counter-terrorism bodies as well as with global, regional, and subregional intergovernmental organizations, the creation of new tools to facilitate assistance and transparency, and the enhancement of its dialogue with individual States.²⁶

Many States have responded to the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to non-State actors by using the same principles they currently apply to imports. These include electronic lodgement of accurate information prior to loading items for shipment; risk assessment through intelligence evaluation of all information using both advanced computer systems and the experience of customs officers; the examination of cargo identified as of interest to customs, using non-invasive technology or physical inspection as required; and voluntary arrangements with business to encourage compliance, backed by legislation and regulation as necessary. Consequently, the matrices the Committee has prepared include information on measures for the legislative and enforcement capacity of States to prevent, through adequate controls, the flow across their borders of items related to weapons of mass destruction. The Committee has identified, from the data of all States, that 114 States have border and/or customs controls. In response to potential terrorist threats, several customs authorities have undertaken initiatives to improve security in the international supply chain. One such initiative reported to the Committee obliges carriers to provide electronic manifest data 24 hours before loading sea containers, and requires air cargo carriers to supply information upon departure. This enables customs authorities

²⁴ Ibid p. 18

²⁵ <http://www.un.org/sc/1540/>

²⁶ Letter dated 8 July 2008 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolution 1540 addressed to the President of the Security Council

to select high-risk shipments via automated targeting systems. Most supply chain security initiatives support moving pre-approved eligible goods across the border quickly and verifying trade compliance away from the border. Shipments for approved companies, transported by approved carriers using registered drivers, will be cleared with greater speed and certainty, and at a reduced cost of compliance.²⁷

An ad-hoc committee (known as 1540 committee) for an initial mandate of 2 years under the Security Council charging the examination on the implementation of this resolution was established under paragraph 4 of the resolution. The committee released its first report to the Security Council on implementation of the resolution in April 2006. With the adoptions of Resolution 1673 (2006) and later Resolution 1810 (2008), its mandate was extended for a further two years and then another period of three years. Its mandate was extended for a further ten years by Resolution 1977 (2011), adopted in April 2011. The committee presented a second report in July 2008. As requested in Resolution 1810 (2008), the committee held an open meeting in 2009 with broad participation in order to prepare a comprehensive review of the status of the implementation of Resolution 1540. Its current chair (for 2011) is South Africa.

Resolution 1540 was adopted by the UN Security Council in response to the unmasking of the Abdul Qadeer Khan proliferation network but also with the aim of preventing the acquisition of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons by terrorist groups. Resolution 1540 is a notable development both in that it explicitly recognizes non-state proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as a threat to peace and security in and of itself and in that it obliges member states to make internal legislative changes. Previous non-proliferation agreements all took the form of multilateral accords such as the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty or cooperation mechanisms such as the Proliferation Security Initiative, based on the consent of the parties. Resolution 1540, on the other hand, is obligatory for all UN members, whether or not they support its aims.

Despite the unanimity of the vote it is worth noting that several Security Council members expressed reserves in their accompanying statements. Representing Pakistan, Munir Akram insisted that, “Pakistan shared the view expressed in the Council’s open debate that the Council could not legislate for the world, he said. The Council could not assume the stewardship of global non-proliferation and disarmament issues. Composed of 15 States, it was not a representative body. It could not enforce the obligations assumed by five of its members which retained nuclear weapons since they also possessed the right of veto.” He added that “Pakistan had been obliged to develop nuclear weapons and related delivery systems to maintain credible minimum deterrence against external aggression, especially once similar capabilities had been developed and demonstrated by its eastern neighbor. The nuclear non-proliferation regime needed to accommodate the reality of the existence of nuclear weapons in South Asia. Given that reality, Pakistan would not accept any demand for access, much less inspections, of its nuclear and strategic assets, materials and facilities, he said. It would not share technical, military or political information that would negatively affect its national security programs or its national interests. Pakistan would continue to develop its nuclear, missiles and related strategic capability to maintain the minimum credible deterrence vis-à-vis its eastern neighbor, which was embarked

²⁷ Ibid p. 13

on major programs for nuclear weapons, missiles, anti-missiles and conventional arms acquisition and development.”²⁸

Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force

In 2005, then Secretary-General Kofi Annan announced the creation of the UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), consisting of 25 UN agencies and entities as well as InterPol. As mentioned above, in resolution 60/288 (A/RES/60/288), the General Assembly adopted the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in September 2006 and this is the predominant focus of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF). The CTITF Working Group on Preventing and Responding to Weapons of Mass Destruction Attacks released its most recent report on strategies for responses to radiological attacks in August 2010.²⁹ Ensuring that the recommendations of the CTITF are implemented throughout the UN System as well as in the respective member states must be considered a critical priority for the General Assembly First Committee.

InterPol

InterPol, the international agency responsible for sharing information between national police forces and investigating international criminal activity, is actively involved in coordinating information sharing related to preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks, InterPol created the Fusion Task Force (FTF) that now coordinates the analyses of six regional groupings with designated FTF officers posted in at least 120 countries.³⁰ InterPol also manages the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and explosives (CBRNe) program that assists national police forces in assessing the potential threats to their populations of these various forms of attacks as well as to provide national police forces with strategies for preventing such attacks.³¹ Delegates to the General Assembly First Committee may wish to consider how to scale up the critical work and analyses coordinated by InterPol, particularly as it relates to preventing and responding to WMD attacks.

Conclusion

Preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is a fundamental goal for the international community. Governments that have invested billions of dollars and devoted tremendous productive resources to developing their own stockpiles of WMDs are unlikely to wish to cede control over these weapons to volatile non-state actors who may then direct these biological, chemical and nuclear (BCN) weapons against targets of their

²⁸ <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc8076.doc.htm>

²⁹ Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), “Interagency Coordination in the Event of a Nuclear or Radiological Attack: Current Status, Future Prospects” New York August 2010. The full report may be found at: <http://www.un.org/terrorism/pdfs/10-48863%20CTITF%20WMD%20Working%20Group%20Report%20Interagency%20coordination%20web.pdf>

³⁰ <http://www.interpol.int/Crime-areas/Terrorism/Fusion-Task-Force>

³¹ <http://www.interpol.int/Crime-areas/Terrorism/CBRNE-programme>

own choosing, potentially including the very same governments who provided the research, delivery systems, and weapons in the first place. States that do not have stockpiles of WMD are loath to witness WMD fall under the control of terrorist groups as well. Disarmament advocates may also point to the threat of terrorists acquiring WMD as a greater incentive for states with WMD stockpiles to begin the process of eliminating these stockpiles.

Guiding Questions:

Does your government have stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)? If so, what safeguards are in place to ensure that these weapons and the knowledge required to produce them are not accessed by terrorist organizations? Has your government worked with neighboring states to improve these safeguards? If your country does not have any WMD, does any neighboring or potentially hostile states maintain such stockpiles? What measures have your government implemented to minimize the potential threat posed by such WMD?

Has your government signed and ratified the relevant international agreements designed to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, including the: International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism?; International Convention for the Suppression of Nuclear Terrorism?; and the International Convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Civil Aviation? If not, why not?

What legislative and policy actions have your government taken to disrupt terrorism financing networks? How effectively has your government worked with other governments, Interpol, the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), and other relevant international organizations including the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the IMF?

How can all relevant civil society stakeholders, governments, and international organizations work together to disrupt terrorism financing networks and still preserve the privacy that depositors and investors covet?

Resolutions:

General Assembly:

A/RES/66/105 “Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism”

A/RES/66/64 “Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty”

A/RES/66/50 “Measures to Prevent Terrorists from Acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction”

A/RES/65/74 “Preventing the Acquisition by Terrorists of Radioactive Sources”

A/RES/65/62 “Measures to Prevent Terrorists from Acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction”

A/RES/60/288 “The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy”

Security Council:

S/RES/1989 “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts”

S/RES/1988 “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts”

S/RES/1977 “Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction”

S/RES/1540 “Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction”

S/RES/1373 “Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts”