

Appendix 6A. The suppliers and recipients of major conventional weapons, 2006–10

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 1950.¹ 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: the database is updated as new data becomes available.²

Section II outlines the sources and methods for arms transfers data. Tables 6A.1 and 6A.2 present, respectively, the SIPRI TIVs for all recipients and suppliers of major conventional weapons for the period 2006–10. Table 6A.3 presents the sources of the weapons transferred to the 10 largest recipients of major conventional weapons in the period 2006–10. Table 6A.4 shows the regional distribution of the exports of the 10 largest suppliers of major conventional weapons for the period 2006–10.

Revision of methods in 2010

In 2010 the coverage of the database was expanded to include air refuelling systems that are used on tanker aircraft if such systems are transferred by a supplier different from the supplier of the tanker aircraft itself. Air refuelling systems have become widespread in recent years and are important in terms of technology, influence on military doctrine and force multiplier effects.

Coverage of the category ‘ships’ was extended to include fast patrol craft of less than 100 tonnes that are technically advanced and militarily important. To

¹ SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/armstransfers/>>.

² 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 years prior to 2006 should contact the SIPRI Arms Transfers Programme via <<http://www.sipri.org/>>.

capture the quality of such ships other than the size, speed (in kilometres per hour) is multiplied by size (as full load in tonnes), and ships with a resulting score of at least 3500 are included.

Revisions of coverage are applied retroactively for the whole period covered by the database, that is from 1950 onwards.

II. Sources and methods for arms transfers data

Sources

Data on arms transfers are collected from a wide variety of sources: newspapers and other periodicals; annual reference books; monographs; official national and international documents; information from industry; and blogs and other Internet publications. The common criterion for all these sources is that they are open; that is, published and available to the public.

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 database. Estimates are conservative.

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. Weapons on loan or lease are included as transfers if the loan or lease is for at least three months. Extensions of loans or leases are not counted as new transfers. Weapons returned at the end of a loan or lease are not counted as a transfer to the original supplier.

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. The term ‘multiple’ is only used in the database for transfers for deals on which no deliveries have taken place yet. As soon as a delivery is known it is generally possible to identify in which of the cooperating countries final assembly has taken place. This country is then registered as the supplier.

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, such as civilian air transport services, but registered with and operated by the armed forces are excluded. Weapons supplied for technical or arms procurement evaluation purposes only are not included.

Generally, the SIPRI Arms Transfers Database tries to capture relations between states as a function of decisions on transfers made by governments. When designating suppliers, this sometimes leads to situations where a choice is made between a supplier from whose territory a transfer takes place and the country in which the system or the design originates. For example, many Chinese-produced armoured vehicles use German-designed engines that are produced under licence in China. In the database the vehicle is registered as originating in China, but the engines are registered as coming from Germany. Also, in cases where a system is supplied to an end-user via a third party or the supply is arranged (brokered) by a third party, that third party is considered neither a supplier nor a recipient—even if the third party has held temporary legal ownership. For example, helicopters bought by the United States from Russia for the Afghan armed forces and modified in the USA before delivery to Afghanistan are still considered deliveries from Russia to Afghanistan.

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 a minimum loaded weight of 20 kilograms. Exceptions are 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. 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 km, 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 to 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 or with multiple barrels with a combined calibre of at least 70 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, (b) all ships armed with artillery of 100-mm calibre or more, torpedoes or guided missiles, and (c) all ships of less than 100 tonnes where the maximum speed (in km per hour) multiplied by the full tonnage equals 3500 or more. Exceptions are 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 database only includes those systems that come from a different supplier to 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, (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 database only includes those systems that come from a different supplier to the supplier of the platform, and (d) air refuelling systems as used on tanker aircraft in cases where the system is delivered by a supplier different to the supplier of the tanker

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, armour 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.³

Measuring the military implications of transfers would require concentrating on the value of the weapons as a military resource. Again, this could be done from the actual monetary 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 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.

³ 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/research/armaments/transfers/>>. See also appendix 6B.

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-kg 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. In some cases used weapons are modernized to the extent that they become as good as new and are then assigned the full value of the new weapon.

The SIPRI TIV system 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 country without such forces; 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 the components. The TIV of the components would be listed as coming from a supplier different to the supplier of the platform.

Table 6A.1. The recipients of major conventional weapons, 2006–10

The table includes all countries and non-state actors that imported major conventional weapons in the five-year period 2006–10. Ranking is according to 2006–10 total imports. Figures are SIPRI trend-indicator values (TIVs). 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 2006–10.

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV, thousands)						% share, 2006– 2010
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006–10	
1	2	India	1 287	2 185	1 794	2 537	3 337	11 139	9
2	1	China	2 860	1 693	1 618	993	559	7 724	6
3	3	South Korea	1 745	1 839	1 802	886	1 131	7 403	6
4	10	Pakistan	275	637	1 028	1 106	2 580	5 626	5
5	5	Greece	603	1 808	559	1 266	703	4 939	4
6	4	UAE	2 049	953	744	560	493	4 801	4
7	7	Singapore	67	384	1 178	1 695	1 078	4 402	4
8	9	Algeria	304	471	1 424	1 121	791	4 112	3
9	14	Australia	680	628	384	684	1 677	4 054	3
10	8	United States	551	752	871	929	893	3 995	3
11	13	Malaysia	401	570	541	1 577	411	3 500	3
12	12	Chile	1 121	780	525	347	434	3 206	3
13	6	Israel	1 142	859	653	148	43	2 845	2
14	11	Turkey	452	614	579	663	468	2 776	2
15	20	Venezuela	383	785	743	344	365	2 619	2
16	15	Egypt	774	692	250	174	681	2 572	2
17	21	United Kingdom	337	729	547	386	518	2 517	2
18	18	Norway	522	552	611	593	205	2 482	2
19	17	Japan	445	552	634	382	369	2 381	2
20	19	Poland	443	987	599	156	142	2 328	2
21	16	South Africa	680	847	466	134	183	2 309	2
22	23	Saudi Arabia	185	191	217	721	787	2 101	2
23	29	Portugal	222	60	149	414	941	1 786	1
24	24	Iraq	282	257	367	388	464	1 758	1
25	22	Spain	291	332	375	275	313	1 587	1
26	26	Indonesia	59	571	240	461	198	1 529	1
27	28	Canada	107	432	428	93	373	1 434	1
28	27	Italy	423	515	173	79	85	1 275	1
29	30	Brazil	197	211	200	165	314	1 086	1
30	31	Iran	423	331	78	77	88	997	1
31	42	Afghanistan	3	41	152	344	407	947	1
32	25	Taiwan	578	12	11	130	143	874	1
33	38	Colombia	54	218	112	312	172	868	1
34	33	Austria	2	305	220	330	5	862	1
35	34	Netherlands	78	251	145	217	162	852	1
36	32	Germany	406	76	101	129	101	813	1
37	41	Viet Nam	44	2	166	66	515	793	1
38	39	Jordan	48	186	161	237	114	746	1
39	48	Syria	70	–	253	167	167	657	1
40	43	Azerbaijan	148	210	29	143	62	592	0
41	46	NATO	116	–	–	420	–	536	0
42	50	Belgium	21	170	200	90	30	511	0

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV, thousands)						% share, 2006– 2010
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006–10	
43	47	Finland	123	115	156	43	72	508	0
44	49	Hungary	265	205	5	4	18	496	0
45	40	Oman	285	4	66	93	36	483	0
46	35	Peru	193	172	2	41	60	467	0
47	44	Denmark	122	174	49	98	16	458	0
48	51	Georgia	98	175	94	34	–	401	0
49	36	Romania	61	88	68	60	109	385	0
50	67	Nigeria	14	57	20	81	189	360	0
51	59	Ecuador	17	2	140	69	116	344	0
52	57	Bangladesh	214	73	13	–	45	344	0
53	52	Bulgaria	22	47	124	129	17	339	0
54	63	France	60	69	8	78	120	336	0
55	56	Kuwait	–	279	5	18	17	319	0
56	69	Mexico	69	5	–	57	188	319	0
57	55	Sweden	126	58	44	46	35	310	0
58	58	Qatar	–	–	–	285	20	305	0
59	54	Sudan	66	33	106	76	14	295	0
60	61	Morocco	44	29	46	37	138	294	0
61	53	Switzerland	82	114	16	34	34	280	0
62	45	Yemen	57	151	39	5	7	258	0
63	60	Belarus	254	–	–	3	–	257	0
64	62	Kazakhstan	41	82	25	38	57	243	0
65	71	New Zealand	5	81	2	48	71	207	0
66	64	Thailand	45	8	13	51	83	199	0
67	78	Lithuania	45	4	26	26	81	182	0
68	66	Bahrain	63	26	20	–	71	179	0
69	37	Czech Republic	52	17	21	6	73	169	0
70	72	Chad	9	18	79	35	17	158	0
71	70	Namibia	72	6	66	14	–	158	0
72	73	Myanmar	27	7	36	1	76	147	0
73	68	Sri Lanka	40	31	64	–	5	140	0
74	75	Latvia	11	49	44	12	15	131	0
75	80	Russia	5	100	–	7	19	130	0
76	77	Croatia	–	14	99	4	10	127	0
77	81	Uruguay	8	3	65	10	36	121	0
78	74	Estonia	6	19	38	44	1	107	0
79	95	Lebanon	–	5	1	40	60	106	0
80	84	DRC	17	–	18	45	25	105	0
81	85	Cambodia	12	60	–	4	28	104	0
82	79	Equatorial Guinea	–	28	41	30	–	98	0
83	86	Argentina	9	24	23	16	17	90	0
84	118	Slovenia	2	2	–	7	73	85	0
85	83	South Sudan	–	37	44	1	–	82	0
86	97	Brunei	2	–	–	40	40	82	0
87	125	Kenya	–	8	–	–	73	81	0
88	76	Angola	7	25	29	20	–	80	0
89	101	Armenia	–	1	–	36	36	74	0
90	104	Hezbollah (Lebanon) ^{b9}	–	–	–	25	25	59	0
91	89	Philippines	20	16	10	1	8	57	0

300 MILITARY SPENDING AND ARMAMENTS, 2010

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV, thousands)						% share, 2006– 2010
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006–10	
92	82	Albania	–	5	13	25	13	55	0
93	91	Ireland	11	18	21	1	1	51	0
94	129	Trinidad and Tobago	–	6	–	–	45	51	0
95	93	Gabon	17	17	17	–	–	50	0
96	111	Turkmenistan	–	–	–	20	29	49	0
97	119	Dominican Republic	–	–	–	10	33	43	0
98	92	Senegal	8	19	6	4	4	41	0
99	99	Rwanda	3	15	7	13	–	38	0
100	90	Cyprus	26	12	–	–	–	38	0
101	100	Barbados	–	13	13	13	–	38	0
102	108	Mongolia	–	–	14	11	13	37	0
103	103	Zambia	30	5	–	–	–	35	0
104	98	Uganda	5	–	5	22	1	33	0
105	102	Laos	–	–	7	26	–	33	0
106	96	Jamaica	13	15	2	–	–	30	0
107	94	Zimbabwe	25	–	–	–	–	25	0
108	109	Ghana	0	16	–	6	–	22	0
109	112	Tajikistan	13	7	–	–	–	20	0
110	121	Botswana	–	–	–	10	10	20	0
111	155	Timor-Leste	–	–	–	–	20	20	0
112	106	Tanzania	10	0	–	9	–	20	0
113	115	Palestinian Authority	–	2	–	14	4	19	0
114	113	Bolivia	8	2	3	5	1	19	0
115	110	North Korea	5	5	5	5	1	19	0
116	105	Mali	–	8	2	9	–	19	0
117	116	Maldives	15	–	–	–	4	19	0
118	120	Libya	2	2	–	7	7	18	0
119	88	African Union	9	–	7	–	–	16	0
120	123	Slovakia	–	1	0	5	8	14	0
121	153	Serbia	–	–	–	–	14	14	0
122	128	Cameroon	2	–	1	–	9	11	0
123	134	Luxembourg	–	–	–	5	5	10	0
124	122	Sierra Leone	10	–	–	–	–	10	0
125	124	Central African Rep.	9	–	0	–	–	10	0
126	126	Niger	–	–	7	1	–	8	0
127	65	Tunisia	2	–	3	–	2	7	0
128	107	Burkina Faso	1	4	–	2	–	6	0
129	130	Comoros	–	–	6	–	–	6	0
130	133	Panama	–	–	–	5	–	5	0
131	156	Mauritania	–	–	–	–	4	4	0
132	136	El Salvador	–	–	4	–	–	4	0
133	87	Eritrea	–	4	–	–	–	4	0
134	137	Benin	–	2	–	1	0	4	0
135	145	Paraguay	–	–	–	–	3	3	0
136	138	United Nations	1	1	0	–	–	2	0
137	139	Malawi	–	–	2	–	–	2	0
138	132	Congo	0	0	–	1	–	2	0
139	135	Kyrgyzstan	2	–	–	–	–	2	0
140	140	Cape Verde	–	–	–	2	–	2	0

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Recipient	Volume of imports (TIV, thousands)						% share, 2006– 2010
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006–10	
141	141	Burundi	–	–	–	2	–	2	0
142	143	Bahamas	–	–	–	1	–	1	0
143	131	Nepal	–	–	1	–	–	1	0
144	144	Lesotho	1	–	–	–	–	1	0
145	154	Togo	–	–	–	–	1	1	0
146	146	Honduras	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
147	147	Guatemala	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
148	148	Guyana	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
149	152	Mozambique	–	–	–	–	0	0	0
150	142	Guinea	–	0	–	–	–	0	0
151	149	UIC (Somalia) ^b	0	–	–	–	–	0	0
152	150	Macedonia	0	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Unknown recipient ^c	–	–	6	–	5	11	0
Total			23 787	26 384	23 236	24 020	24 987	122 415	100

0 = <0.5; DRC = Democratic Republic of the Congo; NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organization; UAE = United Arab Emirates; UIC = Union of Islamic Courts.

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 above.

^a The rank order for recipients in 2005–2009 differs from that published in *SIPRI Yearbook 2010* because of subsequent revision of figures for these years.

^b These are deliveries to a non-state actor or rebel group.

^c One or more unknown recipient(s).

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/armstransfers/>>.

Table 6A.2. The suppliers of major conventional weapons, 2006–10

The table includes all countries and non-state actors that exported major conventional weapons in the five-year period 2006–10. Ranking is according to 2006–10 total exports. Figures are SIPRI trend-indicator values (TIVs). 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 2006–10.

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Supplier	Volume of exports (TIV, thousands)						% share, 2006– 2010
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2006–10	
1	1	United States	7 453	8 003	6 288	6 658	8 641	37 043	30
2	2	Russia	5 095	5 426	5 953	5 575	6 039	28 088	23
3	3	Germany	2 567	3 194	2 500	2 432	2 340	13 033	11
4	4	France	1 643	2 432	1 994	1 865	834	8 768	7
5	5	United Kingdom	855	1 018	982	1 022	1 054	4 931	4
6	6	Netherlands	1 187	1 326	530	545	503	4 091	3
7	8	China	597	430	586	1 000	1 423	4 035	3
8	7	Spain	843	590	610	998	513	3 554	3
9	9	Italy	502	684	417	514	627	2 744	2
10	12	Sweden	432	366	454	383	806	2 441	2
11	11	Israel	299	438	281	807	472	2 297	2
12	10	Ukraine	553	728	330	320	201	2 132	2
13	13	Switzerland	284	301	482	255	137	1 460	1
14	14	Canada	226	334	227	169	258	1 214	1
15	16	South Africa	137	153	164	165	80	699	1
16	17	South Korea	94	220	80	163	95	652	1
17	18	Poland	253	162	76	81	8	580	0
18	15	Belgium	58	18	228	242	7	554	0
19	20	Norway	17	55	107	128	141	449	0
20	23	Brazil	44	47	92	36	179	398	0
21	19	Belarus	35	6	225	42	–	308	0
22	21	Finland	97	30	67	41	34	268	0
23	22	Turkey	61	37	65	46	31	239	0
24	24	Austria	62	100	18	24	33	236	0
25	27	Montenegro	71	109	–	–	14	193	0
26	30	Australia	5	1	6	54	119	184	0
27	35	Uzbekistan	–	–	–	90	90	180	0
28	32	Jordan	–	13	12	60	88	172	0
29	28	Chile	–	–	133	–	–	133	0
30	29	Portugal	–	–	87	46	0	133	0
31	25	Czech Republic	42	31	34	21	3	131	0
32	26	Libya	18	10	18	32	28	105	0
33	33	Iran	92	–	2	5	5	103	0
34	31	India	33	21	11	22	4	90	0
35	39	Singapore	–	–	–	46	27	74	0
36	36	Moldova	3	19	29	20	–	71	0
37	61	Saudi Arabia	–	–	–	–	58	58	0
38	42	Denmark	9	6	15	14	11	54	0
39	45	Syria	3	–	–	25	25	53	0
40	46	UAE	12	3	–	–	37	52	0
41	38	Venezuela	7	–	3	40	–	50	0
42	41	Serbia	4	4	36	1	5	50	0

Rank 2006– 2010	Rank 2005– 2009 ^a	Supplier	Volume of exports (TIV, thousands)					% share, 2006– 2010	
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2010		2006–10
43	40	Romania	8	32	–	4	–	44	0
44	44	Slovakia	7	18	8	–	–	33	0
45	34	Bulgaria	5	9	3	14	–	30	0
46	43	Greece	23	–	–	–	–	23	0
47	49	Kyrgyzstan	–	–	14	–	–	14	0
48	50	Kazakhstan	12	–	–	–	–	12	0
49	51	Viet Nam	12	–	–	–	–	12	0
50	48	Indonesia	8	–	–	–	–	8	0
51	37	Hungary	–	6	–	–	–	6	0
52	52	Qatar	6	–	–	–	–	6	0
53	53	Ireland	–	–	1	4	–	5	0
54	54	Philippines	–	4	–	–	–	4	0
55	47	Pakistan	4	–	–	–	–	4	0
56	55	Argentina	2	–	–	–	–	2	0
57	58	Luxembourg	–	0	–	–	–	0	0
58	59	Costa Rica	–	–	0	–	–	0	0
59	60	Malaysia	–	–	–	0	–	0	0
60	56	Oman	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
61	57	New Zealand	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Unknown supplier ^b	7	1	69	13	20	109	0
Total			23 787	26 384	23 236	24 020	24 987	122 415	100

0 = <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 above.

^a The rank order for suppliers in 2005–2009 differs from that published in *SIPRI Yearbook 2010* because of subsequent revision of figures for these years.

^b One or more unknown supplier(s).

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/armstransfers/>>.

Table 6A.3. The 10 largest recipients of major conventional weapons and their suppliers, 2006–10

Figures are the supplier's share, as a percentage, of the total volume of imports per recipient. Only suppliers with a share of 1 per cent or more of total imports of any of the 10 largest recipients are included in the table. Smaller suppliers are grouped together under 'Other'. Figures may not add up to 100 because of the conventions of rounding.

Supplier	Recipient									
	India	China	South Korea	Pakistan	Greece	UAE	Singapore	Algeria	Australia	USA
Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	..	-
Brazil	-	-	-	<0.5	1	-	<0.5	<0.5	-	18
Canada	-	-	<0.5	-	-	<0.5	-	2	-	-
China	-	..	-	38	-	-	-	2	-	-
France	1	5	9	6	21	29	45	2	10	5
Germany	2	1	16	2	39	2	7	-	8	9
Israel	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	2	2
Italy	<0.5	-	<0.5	1	3	1	2	<0.5	-	2
Korea, South	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Libya	-	-	..	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	<0.5	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.5	9
Poland	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.5
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Russia	82	84	2	1	-	5	-	92	-	-
South Africa	-	-	-	-	-	<0.5	-	<0.5	-	9
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	<0.5	5
Sweden	-	-	1	6	3	1	2	-	-	<0.5
Switzerland	-	4	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	12
Turkey	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukraine	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	<0.5	-	-
United Kingdom	6	3	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	28
United States	2	-	71	39	29	59	36	<0.5	80	..
Uzbekistan	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	1	<0.5	-	-	<0.5

Table 6A.4. The 10 largest suppliers of major conventional weapons and their destinations, by region, 2006–10

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 and subregion see page xxiii.

Recipient region	Supplier									
	USA	Russia	Germany	France	UK	Netherlands	China	Italy	Spain	Sweden
Africa	1	14	11	3	6	<0.5	13	7	2	17
North Africa	<0.5	14	-	2	1	-	2	2	1	-
Sub-Saharan Africa	<0.5	1	11	1	5	<0.5	11	5	1	17
Americas	7	8	9	6	33	26	8	25	31	1
South America	3	8	6	4	10	22	8	21	22	<0.5
Asia and Oceania	44	67	25	51	23	19	65	18	9	22
Central Asia	<0.5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
East and South East Asia	27	32	21	41	10	17	4	11	9	7
Oceania	9	-	3	5	-	2	-	<0.5	-	<0.5
South Asia	8	33	2	5	13	1	61	7	-	14
Europe	19	2	43	20	15	48	-	38	57	58
European Union	18	1	42	18	12	46	-	37	9	57
Middle East	28	8	11	19	22	7	14	13	<0.5	2
Other	1	<0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.5

Notes for tables 6A.3 and 6A.4: - = nil; <0.5 = between 0 and 0.5.

Source for tables 6A.3 and 6A.4: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/armstransfers/>>.