

Appendix 7A. The suppliers and recipients of major conventional weapons

THE SIPRI ARMS TRANSFERS PROGRAMME

I. Introduction

The SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme maintains the SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, which contains information on deliveries of major conventional weapons to states, international organizations and non-state armed groups since 1950 (see <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>). SIPRI ascribes a trend-indicator value (TIV) to each weapon or subsystem included in the database. SIPRI then calculates the volume of transfers to, from and between all of the above-listed entities using the TIV and the number of weapon systems or subsystems delivered in a given year. TIV figures do not represent financial values for weapon transfers; they are an indicator of the volume of transfers. Therefore, TIV figures should not be cited directly. They are best used as the raw data for calculating trends in international arms transfers over periods of time, global percentages for suppliers and recipients, and percentages for the volume of transfers to or from particular states.

The database covers the period from 1950 to the most recent full calendar year. Data collection and analysis are continuous processes. As new data becomes available the database is updated for all years included in the database.¹

Section II outlines the sources and methods for arms transfers data. Tables 7A.1 and 7A.2 present, respectively, the SIPRI TIV for all recipients and suppliers of major conventional weapons for the period 2004–2008. Table 7A.3 presents the sources of the weapons transferred to the 10 largest recipients of major conventional weapons in the period 2004–2008. Table 7A.4 shows the regional distribution of the exports of the 10 largest suppliers of major conventional weapons for the period 2004–2008.

II. Sources and methods for arms transfers data

Sources

The SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme uses a variety of sources to collect data: newspapers; periodicals and journals; books, monographs and annual reference works; and official national and international documents. The common criterion for all these sources is that they are open, that is, published and available to the public.

¹ Thus, data from several editions of the SIPRI Yearbook or other SIPRI publications cannot be combined or compared. Readers who require time-series TIV data for periods before the years covered in this volume should contact the the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme via <<http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/>>.

Such open information cannot, however, provide a comprehensive picture of world arms transfers. Published reports often provide only partial information, and substantial disagreement between them is common. Since publicly available information is inadequate for the tracking of all weapons and other military equipment, SIPRI covers only what it terms major conventional weapons. Order and delivery dates and exact numbers (or even types) of weapons ordered and delivered, or the identity of suppliers or recipients, may not always be clear. Exercising judgement and making informed estimates are therefore important elements in compiling the SIPRI Arms Transfers Database. All sources of data as well as calculations of estimates are documented in the SIPRI Arms Transfers Database. Estimates are conservative and may very well be underestimates.

Selection criteria

SIPRI uses the term ‘arms transfer’ rather than ‘arms trade’ or ‘arms sale’. SIPRI covers not only sales of weapons, including manufacturing licences, but also other forms of weapon supply, such as aid and gifts.

The weapons transferred must be destined for the armed forces, paramilitary forces or intelligence agencies of another country. Weapons supplied to or from an armed non-state actor in an armed conflict are included as deliveries to or from the individual armed non-state actor, identified under separate ‘recipient’ or ‘supplier’ headings. Supplies to or from international organizations are also included and categorized in the same fashion. In cases where deliveries are identified but it is not possible to identify either the supplier or the recipient with an acceptable degree of certainty, transfers are registered as coming from ‘unknown’ suppliers or going to ‘unknown’ recipients. Suppliers are termed ‘multiple’ only if there is a transfer agreement for weapons produced by two or more cooperating countries and if it is not clear which country will make the delivery.

To qualify for inclusion in the database, weapons must be transferred voluntarily by the supplier. This includes weapons delivered illegally—without proper authorization by the government of the supplier or the recipient country—but excludes captured weapons and weapons obtained from defectors. Finally, the weapons must have a military purpose. Systems such as aircraft used mainly for other branches of government but registered with and operated by the armed forces are excluded. Weapons supplied for technical or arms procurement evaluation purposes only are not included.

The coverage: major conventional weapons

SIPRI covers only what it terms major conventional weapons, defined as:

1. *Aircraft*: all fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters, including unmanned reconnaissance/surveillance aircraft, with the exception of microlight aircraft, powered and unpowered gliders and target drones.

2. *Armoured vehicles*: all vehicles with integral armour protection, including all types of tank, tank destroyer, armoured car, armoured personnel carrier, armoured support vehicle and infantry fighting vehicle. Only vehicles with very light armour protection (such as trucks with an integral but lightly armoured cabin) are excluded.

3. *Artillery*: naval, fixed, self-propelled and towed guns, howitzers, multiple rocket launchers and mortars, with a calibre equal to or above 100 millimetres.

4. *Sensors*: (a) all land-, aircraft- and ship-based active (radar) and passive (e.g. electro-optical) surveillance systems with a range of at least 25 kilometres, with the exception of navigation and weather radars, (b) all fire-control radars, with the exception of range-only radars, and (c) anti-submarine warfare and anti-ship sonar systems for ships and helicopters. In cases where the system is fitted on a platform (vehicle, aircraft or ship), the register only notes those systems that come from a different supplier from that of the platform.

5. *Air defence systems*: (a) all land-based surface-to-air missile (SAM) systems, and (b) all anti-aircraft guns with a calibre of more than 40 mm. This includes self-propelled systems on armoured or unarmoured chassis.

6. *Missiles*: (a) all powered, guided missiles and torpedoes with conventional warheads, and (b) all unpowered but guided bombs and shells. Unguided rockets, free-fall aerial munitions, anti-submarine rockets and target drones are excluded.

7. *Ships*: (a) all ships with a standard tonnage of 100 tonnes or more, and (b) all ships armed with artillery of 100-mm calibre or more, torpedoes or guided missiles, with the exception of most survey ships, tugs and some transport ships.

8. *Engines*: (a) engines for military aircraft, for example, combat-capable aircraft, larger military transport and support aircraft, including helicopters; (b) engines for combat ships, such as fast attack craft, corvettes, frigates, destroyers, cruisers, aircraft carriers and submarines; (c) engines for most armoured vehicles—generally engines of more than 200 horsepower output. In cases where the system is fitted on a platform (vehicle, aircraft or ship), the register only notes those systems that come from a different supplier from the supplier of the platform.

9. *Other*: (a) all turrets for armoured vehicles fitted with a gun of at least 20-mm calibre or with guided anti-tank missiles, (b) all turrets for ships fitted with a gun of at least 57-mm calibre, and (c) all turrets for ships fitted with multiple guns with a combined calibre of at least 57 mm. In cases where the system is fitted on a platform (vehicle or ship), the register only notes those systems that come from a different supplier from the supplier of the platform.

The statistics presented refer to transfers of weapons in these nine categories only. Transfers of other military equipment—such as small arms and light weapons, trucks, artillery under 100-mm calibre, ammunition, support equipment and components, as well as services or technology transfers—are not included.

The SIPRI trend indicator

The SIPRI system for the valuation of arms transfers is designed as a trend-measuring device. It allows the measurement of changes in the total flow of major weapons and its geographical pattern. The trends presented in the tables of SIPRI trend-indicator values are based only on actual deliveries during the year or years covered in the relevant tables and figures, not on orders signed in a year.

The TIV system, in which similar weapons have similar values, shows both the quantity and quality of the weapons transferred—in other words, it describes the transfer of military resources. It does not reflect the financial value of (or payments for) weapons transferred. This is impossible for three reasons. First, in many cases no reliable data on the value of a transfer is available. Second, even if the value of a transfer is known, in almost every case it is the total value of a deal, which may include not only the weapons themselves but also other items related to these weapons (e.g. spare parts, armament or ammunition) as well as support systems (e.g. specialized vehicles) and items related to the integration of the weapon in the armed forces (e.g. training, or software changes to existing systems). Third, even if the value of a transfer is known, important details about the financial arrangements of the transfer (e.g. credit or loan conditions and discounts) are often unavailable.²

Measuring the military implications of transfers would require a concentration on the value of the weapons as a military resource. Again, this could be done from the actual money values of the weapons transferred, assuming that these values generally reflect the military capability of the weapon. However, the problems listed above would still apply (e.g. a very expensive weapon may be transferred as aid at a 'zero' price, and therefore not show up in financial statistics, but still be a significant transfer of military resources). The SIPRI solution is a system in which military resources are measured by including an evaluation of the technical parameters of weapons. The purpose and performance of a weapon are evaluated, and it is assigned a value in an index that reflects its value as a military resource in relation to other weapons. This can be done under the condition that a number of benchmarks or reference points are established by assigning some weapons a fixed place in the index, thus forming its core. All other weapons are compared to these core weapons.

In short, the process of calculating the SIPRI TIV for individual weapons is as follows. For a number of weapon types it is possible to find the average unit acquisition price in open sources. It is assumed that such real prices roughly reflect the military resource value of a system. For example, a combat aircraft bought for \$10 million may be assumed to be a resource twice as great as one bought for \$5 million, and a submarine bought for \$100 million may be

² It is possible to present a very rough idea of the economic factors from the financial statistics now available from most arms-exporting countries. However, most of these statistics lack sufficient detail. Such data is available from the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme via <http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/>.

assumed to be 10 times the resource a \$10 million combat aircraft would represent. Weapons with a real price are used as the core weapons of the valuation. Weapons for which a price is not known are compared with core weapons in the following steps.

1. The description of a weapon is compared with the description of the core weapon. In cases where no core weapon exactly matches the description of the weapon for which a price is to be found, the closest match is sought.

2. Standard characteristics of size and performance (weight, speed, range and payload) are compared with those of a core weapon of a similar description. For example, a 15 000-kilogram combat aircraft would be compared with a combat aircraft of similar size.

3. Other characteristics, such as the type of electronics, loading or unloading arrangements, engine, tracks or wheels, armament and materials, are compared.

4. Weapons are compared with a core weapon from the same period.

Weapons in a 'used' condition are given a value 40 per cent of that of a new weapon. Used weapons that have been significantly refurbished or modified by the supplier before delivery (and have thereby become a greater military resource) are given a value of 66 per cent of the value when new. In reality there may be huge differences in the military resource value of a used weapon depending on its condition and the modifications during the years of use.

The SIPRI trend indicator does not take into account the conditions under which a weapon is operated (e.g. an F-16 combat aircraft operated by well-balanced, well-trained and well-integrated armed forces has a much greater military value than the same aircraft operated by a developing country; the resource is the same but the effect is very different). The trend indicator also accepts the prices of the core weapons as genuine rather than reflecting costs that, even if officially part of the programme, are not exclusively related to the weapon itself. For example, funds that appear to be allocated to a particular weapon programme could be related to optional add-ons and armament or to the development of basic technology that will be included (free of cost) in other programmes. Such funds could also act, in effect, as government subsidies to keep industry in business by paying more than the weapon is worth.

In cases where subsystems, such as sensors and engines, are produced and delivered by suppliers other than the supplier of the platform on which the subsystems are fitted, the TIV calculation of the value of the platform would be reduced by the value of components. The TIV of the components would be listed as coming from a supplier different to the supplier of the platform.

Table 7A.1. The recipients of major conventional weapons, 2004–2008

The table includes all countries and non-state actors that imported major conventional weapons in the five-year period 2004–2008. Ranking is according to 2004–2008 total imports. Figures are SIPRI trend-indicator values (TIV). Figures and percentages may not add up because of the conventions of rounding. The right-hand column shows the recipient state's share of global arms imports for 2004–2008.

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^d	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV)						% share, 2004– 2008
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004–08	
1	1	China	3 022	3 468	3 778	1 470	1 241	12 980	11
2	2	India	2 305	1 175	1 414	1 445	1 847	8 186	7
3	3	UAE	1 262	2 176	2 014	982	671	7 105	6
4	5	South Korea	961	661	1 568	1 834	1 898	6 921	6
5	4	Greece	1 535	377	639	1 745	518	4 813	4
6	6	Israel	844	1 115	1 107	967	524	4 557	4
7	9	USA	541	515	578	694	904	3 232	3
8	10	Turkey	184	998	276	858	723	3 040	3
9	7	Egypt	601	657	797	770	119	2 944	3
10	8	Australia	552	538	734	641	344	2 810	2
11	11	Chile	52	400	1 041	742	543	2 779	2
12	12	Pakistan	385	332	262	605	1 094	2 678	2
13	24	Algeria	272	156	188	471	1 590	2 677	2
14	18	Singapore	384	543	47	669	1 014	2 656	2
15	13	Poland	242	97	453	994	611	2 397	2
16	15	Japan	386	301	459	469	578	2 193	2
17	19	South Africa	2	181	689	855	312	2 039	2
18	22	Venezuela	13	27	442	824	733	2 039	2
19	14	UK	243	27	333	722	590	1 915	2
20	16	Italy	441	145	423	451	270	1 730	2
21	17	Taiwan	329	764	625	2	–	1 720	2
22	25	Malaysia	48	55	472	551	529	1 655	1
23	21	Spain	241	391	310	306	363	1 610	1
24	27	Norway	6	14	469	516	590	1 593	1
25	26	Canada	333	125	129	448	434	1 469	1
26	20	Saudi Arabia	941	148	185	68	56	1 398	1
27	23	Iran	129	74	462	340	87	1 093	1
28	35	Iraq	45	164	253	268	351	1 082	1
29	28	Germany	254	225	386	72	104	1 041	1
30	29	Romania	274	535	111	56	37	1 012	1
31	40	Viet Nam	260	333	42	1	250	886	1
32	31	Yemen	312	306	60	160	44	881	1
33	30	Indonesia	86	31	58	402	290	867	1
34	47	Austria	55	21	–	340	434	851	1
35	34	Brazil	117	230	171	166	156	839	1
36	32	Peru	47	368	193	172	–	779	1
37	38	Jordan	150	32	77	179	336	774	1
38	36	Denmark	216	105	130	227	90	770	1
39	33	Czech Republic	7	622	51	15	17	712	1
40	37	Netherlands	153	106	87	200	152	698	1
41	45	Portugal	67	131	218	60	183	657	1
42	41	Switzerland	185	164	82	131	32	594	1

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV)					% share, 2004– 2008	
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004–08	2008
43	39	Sudan	299	96	65	28	94	582	1
44	43	Eritrea	290	281	–	10	–	581	1
45	44	Oman	41	164	281	4	66	555	0
46	42	Finland	68	88	114	111	142	523	0
47	46	Hungary	3	13	277	192	5	490	0
48	53	Georgia	45	71	100	161	63	440	0
49	48	Mexico	303	47	53	11	–	414	0
50	50	Azerbaijan	3	45	142	210	1	401	0
51	60	Bulgaria	12	158	20	43	127	360	0
52	63	Belgium	18	0	4	161	171	354	0
53	51	Sweden	48	62	125	85	21	341	0
54	55	Bangladesh	33	29	214	54	10	340	0
55	54	Kuwait	1	19	–	276	–	296	0
56	56	Colombia	18	15	18	113	131	296	0
57	57	France	93	–	54	63	68	277	0
58	58	Belarus	–	6	254	–	–	260	0
59	52	Thailand	117	61	44	8	12	241	0
60	61	Argentina	162	4	17	25	32	239	0
61	62	Kazakhstan	47	42	46	82	3	220	0
62	84	Ecuador	13	45	15	2	133	208	0
63	49	Ethiopia	207	–	–	–	–	207	0
64	81	Afghanistan	–	31	3	35	134	204	0
65	64	Morocco	–	90	48	32	32	203	0
66	71	Sri Lanka	26	25	42	22	75	190	0
67	65	Tunisia	–	168	2	–	7	177	0
68	66	Bahrain	10	63	63	26	2	164	0
69	79	Namibia	13	–	72	6	66	157	0
70	67	Armenia	151	–	–	1	–	152	0
71	73	Lithuania	58	15	45	4	26	148	0
72	59	New Zealand	50	8	5	71	4	138	0
73	76	Latvia	15	7	11	51	44	128	0
74	80	Syria	19	7	18	–	81	125	0
75	75	Kenya	–	25	–	89	8	122	0
76	69	Angola	9	40	7	29	37	121	0
77	96	Croatia	8	–	–	14	99	121	0
78	74	NATO	–	–	116	–	–	116	0
79	83	Estonia	7	16	6	30	50	109	0
80	77	Russia	–	–	5	100	–	105	0
81	78	Philippines	40	14	20	16	11	101	0
82	70	Nigeria	10	–	14	54	17	95	0
83	106	Uruguay	–	20	7	3	63	93	0
84	101	Chad	–	–	19	19	36	75	0
85	92	Gabon	5	–	23	21	21	70	0
86	91	Ireland	20	4	11	17	16	67	0
87	93	Albania	–	42	–	5	13	60	0
88	88	African Union	–	51	8	–	–	59	0
89	97	Equatorial Guinea	8	–	–	36	14	58	0
90	86	Cyprus	–	20	26	12	–	58	0
91	72	Myanmar	11	23	21	1	–	55	0

328 MILITARY SPENDING AND ARMAMENTS, 2008

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV)					% share, 2004– 2008	
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		
92	89	Cambodia	–	–	14	40	–	54	0
93	90	Ghana	33	0	0	13	–	47	0
94	100	Jamaica	–	13	25	3	2	43	0
95	98	Senegal	–	14	8	19	–	42	0
96	87	Zimbabwe	–	20	20	–	–	40	0
97	117	Barbados	–	–	–	13	25	38	0
98	95	Nepal	32	5	–	–	–	37	0
99	94	Uganda	8	17	5	–	3	33	0
100	99	Slovenia	15	2	2	5	8	33	0
101	103	Congo, DRC	15	–	17	–	–	32	0
102	104	Dominican Rep.	27	2	–	–	–	29	0
103	102	North Korea	9	5	5	5	5	29	0
104	107	Zambia	–	0	23	3	–	26	0
105	108	Burkina Faso	–	19	1	4	–	24	0
106	109	Mali	–	13	–	8	–	21	0
107	110	Bolivia	1	9	5	5	–	21	0
108	85	Tanzania	–	9	9	0	–	18	0
109	113	Rwanda	–	–	3	15	–	18	0
110	114	Malta	–	18	–	–	–	18	0
111	82	Côte d'Ivoire	14	–	–	–	–	14	0
112	152	Mongolia	–	–	–	–	14	14	0
113	116	Tajikistan	–	–	13	–	–	13	0
114	150	Guatemala	–	–	–	–	12	12	0
115	118	Djibouti	4	8	–	–	–	12	0
116	120	Lebanon /Hezbollah ^b	1	0	9	–	–	10	0
117	121	Mauritius	6	–	4	–	–	10	0
118	122	Sierra Leone	–	–	10	–	–	10	0
119	105	Turkmenistan	10	–	–	–	–	10	0
120	111	Kyrgyzstan	5	3	2	–	–	10	0
121	123	Seychelles	–	10	–	–	–	10	0
122	124	Central African Rep.	–	–	9	–	–	9	0
123	112	Botswana	9	–	–	–	–	9	0
124	126	Gambia	7	–	–	–	–	7	0
125	115	Niger	–	–	0	–	7	7	0
126	128	Cameroon	–	5	0	0	–	6	0
127	148	Comoros	–	–	–	–	5	5	0
128	68	Libya	–	–	3	3	–	5	0
129	129	Slovakia	–	4	–	1	–	5	0
130	134	Benin	–	–	–	3	2	5	0
131	131	Congo, Rep. of	–	4	0	0	–	4	0
132	132	Paraguay	4	1	–	–	–	4	0
133	125	El Salvador	–	–	–	–	4	4	0
134	130	Laos	–	4	–	–	–	4	0
135	133	Lebanon	–	1	–	3	–	3	0
136	136	UN	1	1	1	–	–	3	0
137	135	Brunei	0	1	2	–	–	3	0
138	137	Lesotho	1	–	1	–	–	2	0

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV)					% share, 2004– 2008	
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004–08	2008
139	138	Palestinian Authority	–	–	–	2	–	2	0
140	141	Bahamas	–	–	–	1	–	1	0
141	143	Haiti	–	–	–	1	–	1	0
142	149	Guyana	–	–	–	–	0	0	0
143	144	Somalia/UIC ^b	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
144	151	Honduras	–	–	–	–	0	0	0
145	145	Macedonia	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
146	146	Sri Lanka/LTTE ^b	–	0	–	–	–	0	0
147	147	Bhutan	0	–	–	–	–	0	0
–	–	Unknown recipient ^c	–	–	–	1	–	1	0
Total			20 963	20 933	24 439	25 370	22 681	114 386	100

– = nil; 0 = less than 0.5; NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organization; UAE = United Arab Emirates.

Note: The SIPRI data on arms transfers relates to actual deliveries of major conventional weapons. To permit comparison between the data on such deliveries of different weapons and to identify general trends, SIPRI uses a trend-indicator value. This value is only an indicator of the volume of international arms transfers and not of the financial values of such transfers. Thus, it is not comparable to economic statistics such as gross domestic product or export/import figures. The method for calculating the trend-indicator value is described in section II of this appendix and on the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme website, <<http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/atmethods.html>>.

^a The rank order for recipients in 2003–2007 differs from that published in *SIPRI Yearbook 2008* because of subsequent revision of figures for these years.

^b Deliveries to this country include arms received by a non-state actor or rebel group: LTTE = Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam; UIC = Union of Islamic Courts.

^c This represents one or more unknown country or rebel group.

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>.

Table 7A.2. The suppliers of major conventional weapons, 2004–2008

The table includes all countries and non-state actors that exported major conventional weapons in the five-year period 2004–2008. Ranking is according to 2004–2008 total exports. Figures are SIPRI trend-indicator values (TIV). Figures and percentages may not add up because of the conventions of rounding. The right-hand column shows the supplier state's share of global arms exports for 2004–2008.

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^a	Supplier	Volume of exports (TIV)						% share, 2004– 2008
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2004–08	
1	1	USA	6 648	6 786	7 394	7 914	6 159	34 901	31
2	2	Russia	6 353	5 485	6 186	4 559	5 953	28 536	25
3	3	Germany	1 048	1 899	2 406	3 260	2 837	11 450	10
4	4	France	2 224	1 617	1 541	2 639	1 585	9 607	8
5	5	UK	1 169	919	871	1 098	1 075	5 132	4
6	6	Netherlands	208	580	1 221	1 241	554	3 803	3
7	7	Italy	200	806	621	649	484	2 761	4
8	12	Spain	56	133	757	554	623	2 123	2
9	8	Ukraine	209	308	559	774	233	2 083	2
10	9	Sweden	286	538	420	388	380	2 012	2
11	11	Israel	593	313	278	414	410	2 007	2
12	10	China	253	248	583	396	428	1 908	2
13	13	Canada	300	229	231	348	215	1 322	1
14	14	Switzerland	219	203	217	245	378	1 262	1
15	19	Belgium	47	171	58	19	408	704	1
16	15	Poland	43	17	236	157	96	549	0
17	17	South Korea	29	48	94	138	141	450	0
18	18	South Africa	71	24	135	102	95	427	0
19	25	Finland	21	27	97	24	76	244	0
20	22	Montenegro ^b	91	117	–	208	0
21	21	Turkey	20	41	66	45	29	200	0
22	24	Belarus	50	24	35	12	72	193	0
23	20	Denmark	173	1	1	5	12	192	0
24	28	Austria	3	3	62	89	30	186	0
25	16	Uzbekistan	170	4	–	–	–	174	0
26	23	Czech Republic	1	68	45	26	20	159	0
27	31	Brazil	44	10	28	26	48	155	0
28	63	Chile	–	–	–	–	133	133	0
29	30	Libya	60	45	12	–	9	126	0
30	26	Norway	77	12	14	–	–	103	0
31	32	Slovakia	79	–	7	13	3	102	0
32	29	Bulgaria	16	66	5	9	5	101	0
33	38	Jordan	42	17	–	13	20	91	0
34	35	Hungary	–	82	–	6	–	88	0
35	62	Portugal	–	–	–	–	87	87	0
36	41	Moldova	–	18	3	23	37	82	0
37	36	India	26	13	14	21	–	73	0
38	39	Singapore	66	3	–	–	1	71	0
39	37	Greece	31	13	23	–	–	67	0
40	33	Australia	2	50	5	2	6	65	0
41	40	Romania	–	2	8	32	–	42	0
42	43	Indonesia	25	8	8	–	–	41	0

Rank 2004– 2008	Rank 2003– 2007 ^a	Supplier	Volume of exports (TIV)					% share, 2004– 2008	
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008		2004–08
43	42	Iran	1	1	37	–	2	41	0
44	27	North Korea	40	–	–	–	–	40	0
45	44	UAE	2	26	7	3	–	38	0
46	45	Pakistan	9	20	–	–	–	29	0
47	46	Kazakhstan	5	–	12	–	–	18	0
48	34	Kyrgyzstan	–	–	–	–	16	16	0
49	48	Viet Nam	–	–	14	–	–	14	0
50	49	Malta	10	–	–	–	–	10	0
51	47	Thailand	8	–	–	–	–	8	0
52	50	Georgia	7	–	–	–	–	7	0
53	51	Venezuela	1	–	5	1	–	7	0
54	52	Serbia ^b	6	–	–	6	0
55	53	Qatar	–	–	6	–	–	6	0
56	54	Peru	5	–	–	–	–	5	0
57	55	Serbia and Montenegro ^b	5	–	5	0
58	56	Philippines	–	–	–	4	–	4	0
59	57	Syria	–	–	3	–	–	3	0
60	58	New Zealand	1	–	–	–	–	1	0
61	59	Oman	–	1	–	–	–	1	0
62	61	Costa Rica	–	–	–	–	0	0	0
63	60	Luxembourg	–	–	–	0	–	0	0
		Unknown supplier ^c	9	55	18	4	23	109	0
		Total	20 963	20 933	24 439	25 370	22 681	114 386	

– = nil; 0 = less than 0.5; UAE = United Arab Emirates.

Note: The SIPRI data on arms transfers relates to actual deliveries of major conventional weapons. To permit comparison between the data on such deliveries of different weapons and to identify general trends, SIPRI uses a trend-indicator value. This value is only an indicator of the volume of international arms transfers and not of the financial values of such transfers. Thus, it is not comparable to economic statistics such as gross domestic product or export/import figures. The method for calculating the trend-indicator value is described in section II of this appendix and on the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme website, <<http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/atmethods.html>>.

^a The rank order for suppliers in 2003–2007 differs from that published in *SIPRI Yearbook 2008* because of subsequent revision of figures for these years.

^b The figures for Serbia and Montenegro (known as the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia until Feb. 2003) are for the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro until 2005. From 2006 onwards for Serbia and Montenegro are separate states.

^c One or more unknown supplier(s).

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>.

Table 7A.4. The 10 largest suppliers of major conventional weapons and their destinations, by region, 2004–2008

Figures are the supplier's share, as a percentage, of the total volume of exports per recipient region. Figures may not add up because of the conventions of rounding. For the states in each region see appendix 5A. For this table, Turkey is included in the Middle East.

Recipient region	Supplier									
	USA	Russia	Germany	France	UK	Netherlands	Italy	Sweden	Spain	Ukraine
Africa	<0.5	13	14	1	5	<0.5	5	9	5	15
North Africa	<0.5	9	1	<0.5	<0.5	–	<0.5	–	4	2
Sub-Saharan Africa	<0.5	4	12	1	5	<0.5	5	9	1	13
Americas	6	7	7	6	36	28	36	2	28	–
South America	3	7	5	5	10	26	35	1	23	–
Asia and Oceania	37	71	21	36	24	15	10	3	1	29
Central Asia	<0.5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
East Asia	29	46	13	26	9	12	5	<0.5	1	17
Oceania	5	–	6	3	1	2	–	2	–	–
South Asia	4	24	2	7	14	1	5	1	–	10
Europe	20	2	42	16	33	50	41	88	66	34
European Union	19	1	41	16	24	49	40	80	9	1
Middle East	37	14	18	41	5	6	8	–	1	18
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Notes for tables 7A.3 and 7A.4: – = nil; <0.5 = between 0 and 0.5; UAE = United Arab Emirates.

Source for tables 7A.3 and 7A.4: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>.

State	UNROCA		National report		EU annual report	
	Exports or imports	Background information on SALW	Exports	Licence denials ^b	Exports	Complete data set ^c
Philippines	x	x (nil)				
Poland	x	x			x	
Portugal	x	x	x		x	x
Romania	x	x	x	x	x	x
Russia	x					
Saint Kitts and Nevis	x (nil)					
Saint Lucia	x (nil)	x (nil)				
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	x (nil)					
Samoa	x (nil)					
San Marino	x (nil)					
Senegal	x	x				
Serbia	x (nil)		x	x		
Seychelles	x (nil)					
Sierra Leone	x (nil)					
Singapore	x					
Slovakia	x	x	x		x	x
Slovenia	x	x	x		x	x
Solomon Islands	x (nil)					
South Africa	x					
Spain	x		x		x	
Suriname	x (nil)					
Swaziland	x (nil)	x (nil)				
Sweden	x	x	x		x	
Switzerland	x		x			
Tajikistan	x (nil)					
Tanzania	x (nil)					
Togo	x (nil)	x (nil)				
Tonga	x (nil)					
Trinidad and Tobago	x (nil)	x				
Turkey	x	x				
Turkmenistan	x (nil)					
Tuvalu	x (nil)					
Ukraine	x	x	x			
UK	x	x	x	x	x	
USA	x		x			
Vanuatu	x (nil)					
Viet Nam	x (nil)					
Zambia	x (nil)					
Total	136	55	28	9	27	18

EU = European Union; EU annual report = European Union Annual Report according to Operative Provision 8 of the European Union Code of Conduct on Arms Exports; FYROM = Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; SALW = small arms and light weapons; UNROCA = United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

^a An expanded version of this table, including additional category headings, is available at <<http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/atpubs.html>>.

^b Countries that identify the states to which they have denied export licences are marked as providing information about export licence denials.

^c A 'complete data set' is taken to be data on the financial value of both arms export licences and actual exports, broken down by both destination and EU Common Military List category.

^d Since early 2003 the three regional governments of Belgium (Brussels, Flanders and Wallonia) have been responsible for reporting on export licences and exports.

^e Japan submitted background information to UNROCA on the procurement of some SALW units in 2006 and 2007.

^f Panama submitted background information to UNROCA on seizures of illicit SALW for 2006.

Sources: UNROCA: UNROCA online database, <http://disarmament.un.org/UN_REGISTER.nsf>; *National report:* SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme website, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/armstrad/atlinks_gov.html>; *EU annual report:* Council of the European Union, 'Security-related export controls II—military equipment', 29 Apr. 2008, <http://consilium.europa.eu/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=1484&lang=EN>.