

Non-proliferation

Commitment

“We renew our pledge to raise up to \$20 billion over ten years to 2012 for Global Partnership priorities, initially in Russia.”

-Gleneagles Statement on Non-Proliferation⁷⁸²

Background

The Global Partnership Program was launched at the 2002 G8 summit in Kananaskis Alberta. The stated goal of the program was to address the proliferation threats posed by large, often poorly guarded, stocks of weapons of mass destruction, or the materials needed to develop those weapons, in Russia and the Former Soviet Union. Since its inception the primary objectives of the program have been: the destruction of existing chemical weapon stocks; the dismantlement of decommissioned nuclear submarines; securing nuclear and radiological sites; and the redirection and reemployment of former weapons scientists.

At the Kananaskis summit G8 member states pledged to collectively raise US\$20 billion over ten years to fund Global Partnership program initiatives. At the Gleneagles summit the G8 member states renewed their commitment to their 2002 pledge.

The financial commitments of each G8 member state to the Global Partnership break down as follows (all figures in June 2004 U.S. Dollars):

United States – \$10 billion; Russian Federation – \$2 billion; Germany – \$1.5 billion (according to Strengthening the Global Partnership, Germany’s original pledge of €1.5 billion euros was changed to 1.5 billion U.S. dollars at the 2004 Sea Island Summit); Italy – \$1.21 billion; European Union – \$1.21 billion; France – \$909 million; United Kingdom - \$750 million; Canada – \$743 million; Japan - \$200 million. (The remaining \$1.5 billion is to be donated by a number of non-G8 member states).⁷⁸³

Team Leader: Christopher Collins

⁷⁸² G8 Statement on Non-Proliferation, 2005 G8 Gleneagles Summit, (Gleneagles), July 2005. Date of Access: 22 January 2006. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/nonprolif.pdf>.

⁷⁸³ Donor Factsheets, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 15 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/Index.html>; Global Partnership Program: Securing the Future, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 22 November 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/GPX-Annual-Report-en.asp#34.

Assessment

Score	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Country			
<i>Canada</i>			+1
<i>France</i>		0	
<i>Germany</i>			+1
<i>Italy</i>			+1
<i>Japan</i>			+1
<i>Russia</i>	-1		
<i>United Kingdom</i>		0	
<i>United States</i>			+1
<i>European Union</i>		0	
Overall			0.44

Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

1. Canada: +1

The Canadian government thus far complied with its 2005 Gleneagles summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program.

In October 2005, Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew announced that Canada would contribute a further CAD\$55 million for the destruction of chemical weapons in the Russian Federation. The funds will be used at the Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Shchuch'ye, Russia, to destroy almost two million artillery shells filled with nerve agents.⁷⁸⁴ "Keeping chemical weapons—and other weapons of mass destruction—out of the hands of terrorists and those who would harbour them is a key element of Canada's international security agenda," announced Minister Pettigrew. "This contribution, like all others under the Global Partnership, represents a tangible investment in our national and international security.... In this regard, Canada's cooperation at Shchuch'ye is part of an international effort with the United Kingdom, the United States, Russia and other smaller partners."⁷⁸⁵

In November 2005, Minister Pettigrew further reaffirmed Canada's "strong commitment to the Global Partnership," stating that "Canada has moved quickly in undertaking concrete projects and has been instrumental in furthering the initiative... The Global Partnership is another concrete example of an area in which Canada can make a real difference internationally."⁷⁸⁶

Between 2003 and 2005 Canada spent a total of \$90.8 million (all funds given in Canadian dollars) to Global Partnership Program activities, much of which (\$42.6 million) was spent on initiatives assisting

⁷⁸⁴ Canada to Contribute an Additional \$55 Million in Assistance to Destroy Chemical Weapons in Russia, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 21 October 2005. Date of Access: 14 January 2006. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/chem_weapon-en.asp.

⁷⁸⁵ Canada to Contribute an Additional \$55 Million in Assistance to Destroy Chemical Weapons in Russia, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 21 October 2005. Date of Access: 14 January 2006. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/chem_weapon-en.asp.

⁷⁸⁶ Minister Pettigrew Tables Canada's Global Partnership Program Annual Report, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 22 November 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/Pettigrew_tables-en.asp.

with the dismantlement of decaying nuclear submarines in the Russian Federation.⁷⁸⁷ One report delivered to the United States House of Representatives by the Center for Strategic and International Studies in June of 2005 declared that “The Canadians merit special praise: starting with an almost non-existent nonproliferation assistance program in 2002, the Canadians have in only three years completed a legal framework with Russia, stood up an internal bureaucracy, and disbursed funds in a number of project areas.”⁷⁸⁸

Analyst: Christopher Collins

2. France: 0

The French government has not yet complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. Most of France’s spending figures beyond 2004 are not yet available.⁷⁸⁹ However, as a part of the €750 million Paris pledged to support the Global Partnership Program, €110 million is earmarked for ongoing, multi-year projects in plutonium disposition and nuclear safety/submarine dismantlement.⁷⁹⁰ Between 2003 and 2004 France spent €13.1 million on nuclear safety projects, €17 million on nuclear submarine dismantlement, €9 million on chemical weapons destruction, and €8 million on other projects.⁷⁹¹

Analyst: Christopher Collins

3. Germany: +1

The government of Germany thus far complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. In late July 2005, the German Embassy in Moscow announced that Germany will provide further technical assistance to Russia for the construction of a chemical weapons destruction plant in Kambarka, Udmurtia. Berlin will provide components and equipment for a total contribution of €150 million. Germany previously helped Russia build a similar facility in Gornyy. The Kambarka facility was scheduled to be operational by December 2005. In September 2005, the German Ambassador to Russia, Mr. Hans-Friedrich von Ploetz, announced that there is “extensive research underway” into Berlin’s likely participation in the construction of yet another chemical weapons elimination facility in Leondivok. ⁷⁹² Finally, in September 2005, the Chief of Russia’s Chemical Arms Elimination Committee, Mr. Sergei Kiriyyenko, praised Germany as Moscow’s “most stable partner in the process of the elimination of chemical warfare agents.”⁷⁹³

Analyst: Vera Serdiuk

⁷⁸⁷ Global Partnership Program: Securing the Future, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 22 November 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006.

http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/GPX-Annual-Report-en.asp#34.

⁷⁸⁸ The G-8 Global Partnership: Successes and Shortcomings, Center for Strategic and International Studies, (Washington), June 30 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006.

www.house.gov/international_relations/109/flou063005.pdf.

⁷⁸⁹ Donor Factsheet: France, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 15 January 2006.

<http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/France.html>.

⁷⁹⁰ Donor Factsheet: France, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 15 January 2006.

<http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/France.html>;

Global Partnership Program: Securing the Future, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 22 November 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006.

http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/GPX-Annual-Report-en.asp#35.

⁷⁹¹ Donor Factsheet: France, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 15 January 2006

<http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/France.html>.

⁷⁹² Germany is Russia’s most stable arms elimination partner, TASS, (Moscow), 20 September 2005. Date of Access: 23 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Personal%20Use%20Only/GermanyRusCW09.20.05.htm>.

⁷⁹³ Germany is Russia’s most stable arms elimination partner, TASS, (Moscow), 20 September 2005. Date of Access: 23 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Personal%20Use%20Only/GermanyRusCW09.20.05.htm>.

4. Italy: +1

The Italian government thus far complied with its G8 Gleneagles Summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. In July 2005, the Russian news agency Interfax reported that Russian, Italian and French officials were negotiating to develop a plan to dismantle the Russian heavy missile-carrying nuclear cruiser Admiral Ushakov.⁷⁹⁴ In 2004, the Italian government had expressed its readiness to allot €60 million for that ship's dismantling.⁷⁹⁵

More broadly, Italy has committed to spend €360 million from 2004 – 2013 to dismantle decaying Russian nuclear submarines; the first submarine dismantling funded by Italy is scheduled to be completed in 2006.⁷⁹⁶ Rome has also committed to spend €365 million from 2004 – 2008 on chemical weapons destruction, and €80 million for the disposal of plutonium.⁷⁹⁷

Analyst: Christopher Collins

5. Japan: 0

The Japanese government has not yet complied with its G8 Gleneagles summit pledge to continue providing funds to support the Global Partnership Program. Of all the G8 member nations, Japan has pledged the least - US\$200 million – to the Global Partnership Program. Of this \$200 million, one half, \$100 million, has been allotted for plutonium disposition, while the other half is to be used for nuclear submarine dismantlement.⁷⁹⁸ Tokyo has plans to work closely with the Russian government to dismantle decaying nuclear submarines. In January 2005 Sergei Antipov, the deputy head of the Russian Federal Agency for Nuclear Energy (Rosatom), stated that “In the course of 2005, the Russian-Japanese committee is planning to sign an executive agreement with Rosatom on disposing nuclear submarines, to study related technological and financial issues, as well as security aspects, and then, proceeding from the results of this work, sign a financial contract with the bodies recommended by Rosatom.”⁷⁹⁹ In June 2005, Japan's Ambassador to Russia, Mr. Issei Nomura, told a conference on the Global Partnership that Japan was willing to sign off on dismantling the five submarines.⁸⁰⁰ It should be noted that Japan is the only member of the Global Partnership that has taken a roll in dismantling the submarines of Russia's Pacific Fleet.⁸⁰¹

Analyst: Hitomi Roppongi

6. Russia: 0

The Russian government has not committed any new funds to the Global Partnership Program since Gleneagles; however, Moscow continues to work with donor countries on Partnership projects in Russia.

⁷⁹⁴ Italy, France may help dispose of Russian cruiser, Interfax, (Moscow), 23 July 2005. Date of Access 17 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Personal%20Use%20Only/ITFRRUshakovDismantlement.html>.

⁷⁹⁵ Russia: International Assistance Programs: Italy, Nuclear Threat Initiative, (Washington). Date of Access: 17 January 2006. <http://www.nti.org/db/nisprofs/russia/forasst/intnatl/italy.htm>.

⁷⁹⁶ Donor Factsheet: Italy, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 17 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/Italy.html>.

⁷⁹⁷ Donor Factsheet: Italy, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 17 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/Italy.html>.

⁷⁹⁸ Donor Factsheet: Japan, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington), Date of Access: 8 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/Japan.html>.

⁷⁹⁹ Russia, Japan to Scrap Five Nuclear Submarines in 2005, RIA Novosti, (Moscow), 13 January 2005. Date of Access 8 January 2006. <http://www.ransac.org/Publications/News/Nuclear%20News/113200512029PM.html#1A>.

⁸⁰⁰ Nuclear experts from around the world meet in Japan to discuss Global Partnership progress, Bellona, (Moscow), 7 June 2005. Date Accessed: 8 January 2006. http://www.bellona.no/en/international/russia/nuke_industry/co-operation/38388.html.

⁸⁰¹ Nuclear experts from around the world meet in Japan to discuss Global Partnership progress, Bellona, (Moscow), 7 June 2005. Date Accessed: 8 January 2006. http://www.bellona.no/en/international/russia/nuke_industry/co-operation/38388.html.

Among other projects, Russia continued cooperation with donor countries, such as Canada and Germany, in the destruction of chemical weapons and nuclear submarines,

At the same time, as of 17 November 2005 Russia continues to produce weapons-grade plutonium. It is currently estimated that Russia's total stockpile of highly enriched uranium is approximately 1,208 tonnes. Approximately half of Russia's nuclear materials have not had any form of security upgrade for the past 15 years. According to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Russia's current nuclear inventory includes approximately 16,000 weapons, 7,200 of which are considered ready and active. There have been reports, that due to Russia's lack of security at nuclear sites, workers have been able to steal plutonium and sell it on the black market.⁸⁰² Finally, the Russian Agency for Atomic Energy has been criticized for its construction of floating nuclear power plants, which some believe to be highly vulnerable.⁸⁰³

Analyst: Vera Serdiuk

7. United Kingdom: 0

The government of the United Kingdom has continued to support the non-proliferation commitments set out in the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, though no new funds have been committed. In December 2005, the UK's Third Annual Report on the Global Partnership reported that London successfully led negotiations to secure an additional £210 million of funding from international aid donors for the Chernobyl Shelter project.⁸⁰⁴ The Report also noted, among other things, the completion of the major phases of the £15 million construction of the spent nuclear fuel (SNF) storage facility at the Atomflot site in Murmansk and the successful completion of a series of projects at Andreeva Bay in Northwest Russia.⁸⁰⁵ Out of the US\$750 million commitment the British government has pledged to the Global Partnership, £150 million will be met by the end of the 2005 financial year.⁸⁰⁶

Also in 2005, the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) initiated a contribution of "of up to £12m to the US led plutonium reactor shutdown programme and the implementation of a further £4m portfolio of projects to provide sustainable, non-weapons employment, for former nuclear scientists and technicians."⁸⁰⁷ DTI Energy Minister Malcolm Wicks commented on 21 December 2005 that the "DTI is on target to spend £35m this financial year on nuclear safety, security and non-proliferation across the FSU (Former Soviet Union)."⁸⁰⁸

Analyst: Joseph Tabago

⁸⁰² How Secure is Russia's Nuclear Stockpile?" Ransac, (Moscow), 17 November 2005.
Date of Access: 5 January 2006.

<http://www.ransac.org/11212005100139AM.html>.

⁸⁰³ Floating Nuclear Power Plants Easy Prey for Terrorists, Bellona, (Moscow) 7 August 2005.

Access Date: 20 December 2005.

http://www.bellona.no/en/international/russian/nuke_industry/co-operation/39015.html.

⁸⁰⁴ The Global Partnership Third Annual Report 2005, Department of Trade and Industry, (London), 21 December 2005. Date of Access: 4 January 2006.

http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/nuclear/fsu/news/Third_annual_report.pdf.

⁸⁰⁵ The Global Partnership Third Annual Report 2005, Department of Trade and Industry, (London), 21 December 2005. Date of Access: 4 January 2006.

http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/nuclear/fsu/news/Third_annual_report.pdf.

⁸⁰⁶ The Global Partnership Third Annual Report 2005, Department of Trade and Industry, (London), 21 December 2005. Date of Access: 4 January 2006.

http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/nuclear/fsu/news/Third_annual_report.pdf.

⁸⁰⁷ A Year Of Success In Tackling Proliferation Threats In Former Soviet Union, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, (London), 21 December 2005. Date of Access: 5 January 2006.

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1007029391638&a=KArticle&aid=1134649456183>.

⁸⁰⁸ A Year Of Success In Tackling Proliferation Threats In Former Soviet Union, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, (London), 21 December 2005. Date of Access: 5 January 2006.

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1007029391638&a=KArticle&aid=1134649456183>.

8. United States: 0

The American government continued to support Gleneagles' non-proliferation commitments but has not committed any new funds since Gleneagles. Washington is by far the largest contributor to the Global Partnership Program. The annual contribution of the United States to the Global Partnership is divided between three departments that each sponsor projects, the Departments of Defense, Energy, and State.⁸⁰⁹

The United States pledged US\$10 billion (approximately US\$1 billion per year for 10 years) to be spent on the full range of non-proliferation activities occurring as a part of the Partnership.⁸¹⁰ For fiscal year 2004, the United States spent approximately US\$1.02 billion dollars on Partnership initiatives (the majority of this was spent by the Departments of Defence and Energy).⁸¹¹ By 2009, this number is projected to rise to \$7.02 billion (cumulative from 2003).

As a part of the continuous effort by the Bush Administration, the United States also took an active role in the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), a global effort that aims to stop the trafficking of weapons of mass destruction between rouge states and non-state actors⁸¹². Over 70 states now support PSI.⁸¹³

Analyst: Hitomi Roppongi

9. European Union: 0

The European Union (EU) Commission is continuing to strive to meet the €1 billion commitment it pledged at Gleneagles, but it is still a work in progress.

The EU Commission reiterated its commitment to the Global Partnership Program by initiating a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) pilot project. The United Kingdom secured funding from the Global Opportunities Fund to co-sponsor the EU Commission.⁸¹⁴ On 7-8 December 2005, a Conference entitled, "*Strengthening European Action on Non Proliferation and Disarmament: How can Community Instruments contribute?*" was held in Brussels where the United Nations Institute For Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) presented reports that were prepared as a part of the EU pilot project.⁸¹⁵ The research of UNIDIR and SIPRI was carried out as a part of the European Union pilot project.

Analyst: Joseph Tabago

⁸⁰⁹ Donor Factsheet: The United States, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 17 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/US.html>.

⁸¹⁰ Global Partnership Program: Securing the Future, Global Partnership Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, (Ottawa), 22 November 2005. Date of Access: 15 January 2006. http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/global_partnership/GPX-Annual-Report-en.asp#35.

⁸¹¹ Donor Factsheet: The United States, Strengthening the Global Partnership, (Washington). Date of Access: 17 January 2006. <http://www.sgpproject.org/Donor%20Factsheets/US.html>.

⁸¹² The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), United States Department of State, (Washington), May 26 2005. Date of Access: January 8 2006. <http://www.state.gov/t/np/rls/other/46858.htm>.

⁸¹³ Robert G. Joseph, The Bush Administration Approach to Combating the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, United States Department of State, (Washington), November 7 2006. Date of Access: January 8 2006. <http://www.state.gov/t/us/rm/56584.htm>.

⁸¹⁴ Autumn Performance Report 2005, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, (London), December 2005. Date of Access: 5 January 2006. <http://www.fco.gov.uk/Files/KFile/AutumnPerformanceReport2005.pdf>.

⁸¹⁵ Strengthening European Action on WMD Non-proliferation and Disarmament: How Can Community Instruments Contribute?, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, (Stockholm), November 2005. Date of Access: 4 January 2006. <http://www.sipri.org/contents/expcon/euppconfmaterials.html>.