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Elaborated by WILPF Australia

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

Australian defence and security spending is typically separated by Defence1 and Intelligence Services2.

In the 2013-14 Budget, the Australian Government has allocated $113.1 billion to Defence over the Forward Estimates, with the Budget growing from $25.3 billion in 2013-14 to $30.7 billion in 2016-17. Detailed budgeting includes details for equipment and weapons procurement, operations, investments, defence bases etc. This information is made publically available and is subject to parliamentary scrutiny3.

Australian Intelligence Services have expanded significantly, and public intelligence services have experienced a budget increase of between 101% (Department of Defence) to 404% (Office of National Assessments)4. Intelligence agencies are required to provide public budget statements and are accountable to parliament. In practice, Intelligence Services operate with a high degree of secrecy and regularly refuse to disclose information on the grounds of “operational matters”.

---


2 The Australian Intelligence Services include: the Office of National Assessments, the Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation, The Australian Secret Intelligence Services and the Defence Intelligence and Security Group – composed of the Defence Intelligence Organisation, the Australian Defence Signals Directorate and the Australian Geospatial-Intelligence Organisation.


Contracts with Private Intelligence and Military contractors entered into by federal and state government bodies are regularly withheld on “Commercial in Confidence” and are not open to public scrutiny.

2. *What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?*

Australia is not known to possess weapons of mass destruction, and is signatory to a number of international conventions on prohibiting the use and development of WMD’s. Australia is strategically dependent upon the umbrella of the United States’ military and nuclear arsenal.

Thus, Australian defence and intelligence secrecy tends to shroud the extent of U.S cooperation, and U.S bases on Australian soil. For ‘declared’ U.S bases and operations of Australian soil, the Australian government refuses to disclose detailed information on the nature of operations, including the extent to which operations on Australian soil are involved in the U.S drone wars. “National security” is routinely cited with regards to U.S lead or joint operations.

3. *What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?*

Australia has a high degree of fiscal oversight. The budget undergoes a 12-month cycle and is publically announced in May each year. This occurs with a high level of media and civil society participation. The pre-budget submission process allows all stakeholders to make formal submissions to the budget.

The Australian Constitution enshrines the principle of parliamentary control over the expenditure of the Executive, and the budget must be approved by the Parliament.

Spending is scrutinized in the Senate Estimates process, whereby department and agency heads are held to account for spending.

However, it is common for Defence and Intelligence agencies to cite “operational matters” as reasons for refusal to disclose information in this process. For instance, Lieutenant General Angus Campbell, head of Operation Sovereign Borders (a joint civil-military program of removing asylum seekers from Australian maritime borders) has refused to answer questions in Senate Estimates on these grounds. The policy has a high level of public interest, and it’s quasi-military structure has encouraged “national security” to trump public scrutiny.
4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

There are formal channels to make submissions on defence budget processes but these are largely an exercise in futility. There is seldom any evidence that the views of civil society are taken into account, particularly at the policy making level which ultimately dictates what defence expenditure will be. Accountability on all expenditure, including operations, is done through all the same channels as any other government department, with the exception that, as mentioned in the answer to Q3, ‘operational matters’ can be used as the reason for not providing information.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

The Australian government and opposition are both habituated to making little comment on defence and intelligence expenditures, including where commissions of audit and strategic reviews have revealed significant waste.

The Australian media and civil society offer a gauge of public support or opposition to defence and intelligence spending. Large military acquisitions and waste tend to be accompanied by a high level of public and media interest, and are negatively perceived by the general public.

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

Australia’s military expenditure had gradually been dropping since the 1950s but began rising in the mid-1990s “in order to maintain capability levels”. It is ranked 13th in the world for military expenditure (this includes NATO and the EU). Australia’s military expenditure in 2012 (under the previous Labor Government) was $26.1 billion – 1.7% of GDP and represented a cut of $5.5 billion on the previous year. The new Liberal Government elected in 2013 has announced its intention to raise it to 2% of GDP within the decade.

The Defence budget comprises 75% of Australia’s national security spending with the rest spent on aid, the federal police and intelligence agencies. Unfortunately, it would take considerable time and resources to obtain a breakdown of these.
7. **By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Defence</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Public Order</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Social Security and Welfare</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>19,394</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>35,709</td>
<td>51,525</td>
<td>109,133</td>
<td>118,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?**

For funding that exceeds that appropriated, the department or agency must request additional estimates, and provide a detailed report of spending. Additional estimates require parliamentary approval and are subject to senate estimates committee enquiries.

9. **What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?**

Australian defence spending has decreased over the past decade, and the official position of government is to increase defence spending. Civil society has the ability to contribute to defence white papers and other strategic government documents, however defence spending reduction typically occurs during periods of fiscal austerity, not for larger development objectives.

10. **What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?**

Australia has no strategy in this regard, and as stated above the official stance is to increase defence spending and capabilities. The 2011 Independent Review of the Australian Intelligence Community found that the rapid growth of the intelligence sector was an overall productive investment.

---

5 Includes ASIO, ASIS and ONA only and does not include capital expenditures. Source: ASPI Australian Defence Almanac 2011–2012

6 See: Independent Review of the Australian Intelligence Community  
11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Australia has commitments to spending in the following military operations:

- Afghanistan (Operation SLIPPER) - $1.3 billion to fund operations in Afghanistan and the Middle East over the 2013-14 Budget and Forward Estimates period.
- Timor-Leste (Operation ASTUTE) - the Government has allocated $5.4 million in the 2013-14 Budget for the remediation of equipment returned to Australia.
- Solomon Islands (Operation ANODE) - The Government has allocated $11.4 million in support of Defence’s role in Operation ANODE, the RAMSI, over the 2013-14 Budget and Forward Estimates period.
- Operation RESOLUTE - the Government has allocated $9.9 million in support of Operation RESOLUTE.
- Support to the 2014 G20 Summit - the Government has also agreed to ADF support for Australia’s hosting of the Group of 20 (G20) in 2014. The Government has allocated $7.1 million in support of the 2014 G20 Summit.

This spending is subject to standard parliament approval and senate oversight.

-----

---

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

The level of information provided to the population is low. According to the Colombian legislation citizens should have access to information about military spending, but in praxis the information is still limited and not opportune. (SIPRI)

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

According to Transparency International, Colombia has moderate transparency in the level of national military expenditures. This means that there is a mechanism for regulations and overview of military spending but that the regulations are not fully implemented and not compliantly independent.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

The electorate has very little influence on the budget priorities.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

No.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

Answer not available.
6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

The level of military spending in Colombia for the year 2012 was according to SIPRI database 12.146 million US dollars. Which is calculated to be 3.3 share of the GDP. Colombia had, according to CSIS, the fastest growth of military spending in the region during the year of 2012, with a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 12.6% – approximately $4 billion. However it is not clear whether this number includes all spending related to military activity.

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

The public spending on education in Colombia during the calendar year 2012 reached a level of 4.4 of the GDP. According to WHO for the year 2011 the total expenditure on health was 6.1 percent of the national GDP. Per capita this gives a total expenditure of (Intl $) 618.

Research and development expenditure was according to the World Bank 0.18 % of the GDP.

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

Answer not available.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Since there are peace negotiations in Colombia in this very moment and there are presidential elections in May, peace is a high priority. Although there is still a very military based approach on security.

---

8 http://csis.org/files/publication/130211_latinamericandefensespendingtrends_0.pdf
10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Answer not available

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Answer not available.
1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

According to SIPRI, military expenditures in 2012 are 2849 000 Euros, 3856 000 USD, 1.5% of the GDP.

Netra⁹ is a Finnish service to the Finnish citizens, state administration and media. It is a reporting service provided by the State Treasury to openly report about performance, personnel information and expenditures of the Finnish state. In the first phase you have access to monthly information in the state central bookkeeping system, as well as to a collection of official documents concerning economic and operational planning and follow-up. You are also offered some other key information about the Finnish state, e.g. its budget.

The Government Strategy Document serves the implementation and monitoring of the Government Programme. The strategy document consists of policy programmes, other intersectoral Government policies plus annual plans and measures for the implementation of the Government Programme. The concrete impact objectives of each policy programme, and any other project, are determined in the strategy document.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

According to the Act on the Openness of Government Activities: “official documents shall be in the public domain, unless specifically otherwise provided in this Act or another Act. Unless specifically otherwise provided, the following official documents shall be secret: Documents concerning military intelligence, the supply, formations, locations or operations of the armed forces, the inventions, facilities, installations and systems used in the armed defence of the country or other defence, the other matters significant to the defence of the country, as well as defensive preparations, unless it is obvious that access will not violate or compromise the interests of defence”.

⁹ www.netra.fi
3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

In Finland the Parliament has complete budgetary autonomy. Decision-making powers in the constitution are very strong and complete and there are no limitations in amending the budget, but in practice these powers are used very restrictively:
The spending limits (approved by the Government) are the ceiling for the expenditure. The budget is based on the spending limits.
After the parliamentary election the Government approves the spending limits for the next four years. It is submitted to the Parliament as a report.
Spending limits are the object of a political agreement and (in theory) changeable whenever Government/Parliament wants to add expenditure.
In practice Government/Parliament has never exceeded the spending limits
Every spring the Government approves new spending limits and the changes are mainly technical (changes in cost and price levels).

The Finance Committee holds a key position: it coordinates the whole budget process in Parliament and draws up the report on the budget.
Sectoral committees can make recommendations to the Finance Committee.
The Audit Committee oversees the management of government finances and compliance of the budget.
In addition to committees there are no other parliamentary budget institutions.

The Government submits its budget proposal to Parliament in the middle of September.

The Finance Committee has 21 members and 19 deputy members.
The committee is divided into eight sub-committees which have 11 members each.
Each of the sub-committees handles the part of the budget that is in its own sector.
The sub-committees work along the same lines as committees. They hear experts and conduct a final debate to decide how the Government’s proposal should be changed. The Finance Committee also submits a report at the beginning of December.

After the committee stage the budget proposal returns to the plenary session, where the Finance Committee’s report serves as the basis for discussion.
Parliament handles the budget in a single reading. This includes a thorough debate on each sector and votes on Members initiatives. Handling the budget in plenary session takes several days and includes hundreds of votes.
Most of the plenary session approves the Finance Committee’s report without changes.

In connection with the budget proposal the Government submits a number of budget bills. These are bills whose content determines the level of spending in one or more parts of the budget.
Budget bills are referred to the appropriate committees. The Finance Committee handles only the tax laws. A large portion of expenditure is finalized when the budget bills are approved by Parliament after the committee stage.

In the 1990s the Parliament’s budget power started to weaken. Budget is nowadays less specific, net budgeting means that income and expenditure are no longer budgeted separately. A sizeable part of state economy has been shifted outside the budget economy, many state agencies have been turned into business enterprises etc. While the budget power of Parliament has weakened their monitoring authority has increased. The State Audit Office was moved from the Ministry of Finance to be an independent body in connection of Parliament in 2001. The Audit Committee started its work in 2007. It is noteworthy that the Government’s reporting to Parliament has improved.

4. **Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?**

Answer not available.

5. **Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?**

Export of Defence Material

Export and transit of defence material is allowed only with an authorization (export licence) granted by the Government, or by the Ministry of Defence (Act on the Export and Transit of Defence Materiel). Granting an export licence is preceded by an overall assessment of a licence application (downloadable here) by the Advisory working Group for Export of Defence Materiel chaired by the Ministry of Defence. The license is granted case-specifically. Authorization will not be granted if it jeopardizes Finland’s security or is in contradiction with Finland’s foreign policy. National legislation regulating export, transit and brokerage of defence materiel: **Act on the Export and Transit of Defence Materiel (242/1990)**, **Decree on the export and transit of defence materiel (108/1997)**. The Government has drawn up the General Guidelines for export and transit of defence materiel to clarify the foreign and security policy as well as procedural aspects of defence materiel export. In addition, the Ministry of Defence has on its decision defined and specified defence materiel, technology and know-how. In addition, Finland applies the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports.
6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

See the table below.

Central government budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance sheet</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget proposal</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2013–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and other levies</td>
<td>37 321</td>
<td>39 923</td>
<td>40 057</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– on income and property</td>
<td>11 521</td>
<td>12 610</td>
<td>12 328</td>
<td>-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– on turnover</td>
<td>16 619</td>
<td>17 657</td>
<td>17 880</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– excise duties</td>
<td>6 448</td>
<td>6 711</td>
<td>6 975</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– other taxes</td>
<td>2 609</td>
<td>2 793</td>
<td>2 715</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– other levies</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous revenues</td>
<td>6 065</td>
<td>4 936</td>
<td>4 742</td>
<td>-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income, income from sale of shares and profits entered as income</td>
<td>1 925</td>
<td>1 922</td>
<td>1 995</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans, net</td>
<td>5 126</td>
<td>7 754</td>
<td>7 126</td>
<td>-628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 437</td>
<td>54 536</td>
<td>53 920</td>
<td>-615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of the Republic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>1 284</td>
<td>1 303</td>
<td>1 294</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td>1 293</td>
<td>1 317</td>
<td>1 264</td>
<td>-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>2 804</td>
<td>2 876</td>
<td>2 751</td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>17 415</td>
<td>16 982</td>
<td>16 947</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education and Culture</td>
<td>6 541</td>
<td>6 656</td>
<td>6 597</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>2 678</td>
<td>2 723</td>
<td>2 657</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transport and Communications</td>
<td>2 401</td>
<td>2 964</td>
<td>2 968</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Employment and the Economy</td>
<td>3 765</td>
<td>3 842</td>
<td>3 376</td>
<td>-466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs and Health</td>
<td>11 990</td>
<td>12 593</td>
<td>12 810</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents on State debt</td>
<td>1 864</td>
<td>1 866</td>
<td>1 814</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 446</td>
<td>54 536</td>
<td>53 920</td>
<td>-615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Excl. supplementary budget

---

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

According to “Statistics Finland, National Accounts 2011”, the relevant budgets are:

- Education: 12.1%
- Health care: 14.8%
- Social security incl. statutory employee pensions: 44.9%
- Recreation, culture and religion: 2.3%
- Environmental protection, housing and community amenities: 1.5%
- Infrastructure and subsidies to economic development: 9.1%
- Defence: 2.8%
- Public order and safety: 2.8%
- General public services and interest expenses: 3.7%

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

See answer 3.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Answer not available.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Answer not available.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Participation in international crisis management is an important element in Finland’s active foreign, security and defence policy. Finland takes part in international crisis management activities led by the UN, the OSCE, the EU and Nato.

According to the Act on Military Crisis Management, Finland may participate in military crisis management authorized by the UN or the OSCE, and support or
protect humanitarian assistance operations with military resources. The Act on Military Crisis Management will not be applied to peace enforcement operations.

Participation in a new operation always requires a separate national decision. The President of the Republic makes the decision on the proposal by the Government. Before the proposal is put forward the Government must hear the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament. If the authorization to use force in a crisis management operation were more extensive than that of a traditional crisis management operation, the Government would have to hear the entire Parliament by submitting a report to it.
France

Elaborated by WILPF France

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

Please see the table below for a comparison of the expenditures of the various ministries (missions) in France. For example, only 1.30 Billion has been spent on health care (santé) in 2014, whilst 29.62 Billion has been spent on defence. Investment in education is higher though at 46.27 Billion.

Les missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 MISSIONS</th>
<th>LFI 2013 structure 2014</th>
<th>2014 (Avec PFA)</th>
<th>2014 (hors PFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action extérieure de l’État</td>
<td>2,83</td>
<td>2,80</td>
<td>2,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration générale et territoriale de l’État</td>
<td>1,98</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>2,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, alimentation, forêt et affaires rurales</td>
<td>3,10</td>
<td>2,94</td>
<td>2,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aide publique au développement</td>
<td>3,10</td>
<td>2,92</td>
<td>2,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anciens combattants, mémoire et liens avec la nation</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td>2,95</td>
<td>2,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil et contrôle de l’État</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2,44</td>
<td>2,38</td>
<td>2,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Défense</td>
<td>30,12</td>
<td>31,12</td>
<td>29,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction de l’action du Gouvernement</td>
<td>1,15</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>1,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologie, développement et aménagement durables</td>
<td>7,70</td>
<td>9,10</td>
<td>7,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Économie</td>
<td>1,80</td>
<td>3,41</td>
<td>1,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Égalité des territoires, logement et ville</td>
<td>7,75</td>
<td>7,64</td>
<td>7,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagements financiers de l’État*</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>0,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enseignement scolaire</td>
<td>45,69</td>
<td>46,42</td>
<td>46,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestion des finances publiques et des ressources humaines</td>
<td>8,85</td>
<td>8,72</td>
<td>8,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration, aînée et intégration</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>6,28</td>
<td>6,29</td>
<td>6,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Médias, livre et industries culturelles</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outre-mer</td>
<td>1,99</td>
<td>2,01</td>
<td>2,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politique des territoires</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouvoirs publics</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td>0,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recherche et enseignement supérieur</td>
<td>25,65</td>
<td>31,11</td>
<td>25,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Régimes sociaux et de retraite</td>
<td>6,54</td>
<td>6,53</td>
<td>6,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations avec les collectivités territoriales</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>2,59</td>
<td>2,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santé</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>1,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sécurités</td>
<td>12,07</td>
<td>12,19</td>
<td>12,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarité, insertion et égalité des chances</td>
<td>13,18</td>
<td>13,61</td>
<td>13,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports, jeunesse et vie associative</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travail et emploi</td>
<td>10,12</td>
<td>10,95</td>
<td>10,80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hors charge de la dette, dotations au Mécanisme européen de stabilité et à la Banque européenne d’Investissement
Italy

Elaborated by WILPF Italy

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

In Italy, public debate about military spending is not very comforting. This is due to the lack of information about military expenditures provided to the population at large. Mass media coverage on this subject has also been traditionally poor.

With the deepening of the economic crisis, and the serious repercussions on people – mainly loss of jobs – the topic of public money spent in the military sector has become more popular. For sure, this increased focus on military spending has not come from the political establishment but from the civil society.

The Italian Disarmament Network conducted some very successful campaigns to raise awareness among the citizens on the topic of government investments in the military sector by revealing investments and commitments for long-term acquisition of weaponry systems. Before these campaigns (mainly focused on the Euro-Fighters F-35), the info that the population could rely on was the one contained in official documents on governments’ websites. These documents are not reader-friendly and are circulated mainly to a narrow, specialized audience.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

In Transparency International’s rank, Italy is a country that shows moderate levels of transparency.

Acquisitions of weaponry systems are often reported in budgets different from the defence one (such as development, research...), so the real costs for procurement are difficult to find out. In recent years, an important number of such cases of misleading practices have been exposed by media and civil society.

Furthermore, although citizens should be entitled by law to access data on military expenditures, the reality is much more complicated. Communications’ channels linking Parliament (and Political institutions in general) with society at large are really poor, showing a little amount of data available. This does not
necessarily mean that the lack of information is due to classified files and data; rather, even not classified data is often difficult to find or not available online.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

The national institution entitled to check the public expenditures is the Corte dei Conti. As established by the Constitution, it is one of the organisms supporting the Government. It has a highly articulated structure and many different functions. As for many other organisms in the Italian system, it is difficult to track its activity. Every year, it publishes a report, which is the only means of control on public expenditure (including the military budget). In recent years, many international institutions, such as OSCO, recommended the adoption of measures to increase transparency in public spending. Following these international recommendations, some proposals were made in order to increase budgetary transparency standards, but in fact, not a single significant measure has been adopted to ensure budget and fiscal transparency.

Moreover, the electorate does not participate in establishing the budget priorities. The lack of effort to actively involve the citizens in the decisions about resource allocation has resulted in recent years in a widespread disillusionment in the political system overall. Although some parts of the population have been recently active and mobilized about the allocation of public resources, an overwhelming feeling of helplessness in contributing to establish the government’s budgetary priorities is dominant among the population.

This state of affairs is confirmed by the report “Open Budgetary Survey – 2012” released by International Budget Partnership, according to which, ‘Italy needs to improve the accessibility and understanding of budgetary data, enabling citizens to get more information and be more involved in decision making’.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

Not at all. Civil society organizations monitoring these activities have been calling for a more dynamic engagement with governments. These calls mainly remained unheard.
5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

Opinion polls in Italy are mainly sponsored by political parties on one side and the national institute for statistics on the other. Politically funded opinion polls always report contrasting data on the very same topic. The official institute tries to ask different questions, so as not to take a side in the dispute. Anyway, opinion polls rarely deal with military-related topics.

Opinion polls on telephonic surveillance became popular some years ago, but that was mainly a consequence of a huge scandal in the mismanagement of surveillance on communications. Part of the Parliament wanted to promote a law on prohibition of recording and use the private conversations in court. But this was a highly politically motivated debate, as the scandal involved many high-level politicians.

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

It is noteworthy that the main spending preview in the Parliament Legge di stabilità e bilancio for 2014 entails cuts for all social investments, but no significant reduction in the defence spending has been made.

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

Budget for education and cultural activities is 8%; Welfare 40%; Health Care 14%

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

There are no measures against over-spending. Many have been proposed, none have been adopted. If an MP asks the government, through a parliamentary interrogation, about over-spending, then there will be a report from the government about why and how the overspending happened. If some MP is not convinced then there may be a special commission (either made ad hoc or one among the many already existing) to examine the case and look for possible illicit activities. Rarely these commissions (made up of members of the parliament) accuse or report negatively about other members of the parliament.
9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Italy has some serious issues with planning. Establishing long-term foreign policy priorities is no exception. As of today, there is neither a serious national security strategy, nor a public debate on that. However, it is clear that Italy still relies on traditional paradigms of security. This is shown by its reluctance in giving up the national reliability on the nuclear umbrella and other deterrence-based approaches.

Civil society is very active but unfortunately it often remains unheard. This unsupportive approach to civil society’s requests is mirrored in the very poor budget allocated to international cooperation and development. Traditionally low, it has even been halved in 2010 as a result of rationalization of available resources.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

No strategies are in place.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Commitments with the NATO alliance demand from each member country to allocate the 2% GDP for defence and security. Officially Italy is not reaching the required threshold (Government data on shares of the budget spent is 0.9). Civil society esteem 3% as a more likely percentage. (as said before, there are many hidden costs of real spending due to misleading categorization of public spending)
Lebanon
Elaborated by WILPF Lebanon

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

Lebanon is a democratic country and its elected parliament, and cabinet. However, since the year 2005, the electorate did not agree on many critical issues, among them is the budget. So since then, all the information mentioned in the question is provided for the public in the ministry’s websites. As for production of weapons and military bases in foreign countries, Lebanon does not have these.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

Lebanon does not produce nor hold any kind of weapons of mass destruction.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

The repercussion of the war in Syria resulted in instability, weak governments, and lack of quorum in the parliament. So the paralyzed Lebanese government is using the 2005 budget as a base for expenditure instead of creating a new budget with a vision on necessary priorities.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

No. Due to the serious escalation of sectarian and political tension, civil society and non-governmental organizations’ attention is focused on security and socio-economic issues rather than military expenditure.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

Not applicable: No production of such weapons.
6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence,” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Bank Indicators - Lebanon - Defense &amp; Arms Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armes imports (constant 1990 US dollar) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces personnel; total in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces personnel (% of total labor force) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (current LCU) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (% of GDP) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (% of central government expenditure) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms exports (constant 1990 US dollar) in Lebanon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of military expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

See the table below in USD

| Ministry of National Defense | 1,193,267,000 |
| Ministry of Economy and Trade | 37,524,333 |
| Ministry of Industry | 5,281,333 |
| Ministry of Agriculture | 66,760,151 |
| Ministry of Interior and Municipalities | 724,108,581 |
| Ministry of Energy and Water | 580,771,000 |
| Ministry of Displaced | 5,504,080 |
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Emigrants | 105,996,760 |
| Ministry of Youth and Sports | 14,537,667 |
| Ministry of Justice | 61,150,931 |
| Ministry of Information | 28,566,333 |
| Ministry of Environment | 8,401,000 |
| Ministry of Post and Telecommunications | 7,047,000 |
| Ministry of Culture | 23,705,333 |
| Ministry of Public Health | 366,319,873 |
| Ministry of Finance | 195,711,345 |
| Ministry of Tourism | 18,462,667 |
| Ministry of Labor | 349,104,667 |
| Ministry of Social Affairs | 133,515,000 |
| Ministry of Education and Higher Education | 993,155,667 |
8. **What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?**

Since 2005, the military as well as other civil service employees have not received any raise in their salaries due to the economic, political crisis as well as the large deficiency in the budget.

9. **What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?**

No such strategies exist due to these facts:

- The government as well as NGOs are preoccupied with the Syrian refugee problems.
- There is a sharp division among the Lebanese on priorities and other political issues.
- The burden of the refugees (about one forth of the population) threatens the country’s fragile stability; stability and security are the priority for civil society.

10. **What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?**

Once peace is maintained in Lebanon, and the neighboring crisis comes to an end, then civil society as well as human rights institutes can resume their role in participating and helping in shaping strategies concerning the budget priorities.

11. **Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?**

No.
Nepal
Elaborated by WILPF Nepal

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defense, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

The expenditures on national defense are present in the budget but there are no further details provided.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

No, these are all not public.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

The electorate has very little influence on the budget priorities.

Answer not available.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

No

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

There are no debates on such subjects. Nepal neither produces weapons of mass destruction nor does it stockpile any.
6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

The total budget of Nepal in 2013 is 517.24 billion USD. In comparison to the previous budget, the budget amount for national defence has increased. Currently, the total budget for national defence is 27.57 billion.

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

Answer not available.

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

No such situation has occurred until now.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Since our budget is always balanced, such things other than military are talked in public and in the parliament generally.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

We do not have any military industries until now. We have few workshops to manufacture ammunition only. All debates in public and parliament are concentrated on such non-military subjects.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Nepal is not a party to any military block in the world.

*****
Norway
Elaborated by WILPF Norway

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

General information on the military budget and priorities can be obtained from the web pages of the Ministry of defense. Apart from a public debate around major investments, like the recent decision on the procurement of bomber planes, there is little discussion on the general level and role of military expenditures. Military research, national defense and anti-terrorism are discussed in general terms only.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

This is hard to answer, as one does not know what one does not know. Laws on transparency are working as far as matters are not classified.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

The budget priorities are determined by the Parliament and the Government. The budget is made public before it is decided upon.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

Yes, to some degree, but they consult the NGOs that are in close vicinity of their line of services, e.g. veteran association, voluntary mobilization groups. The content of larger investments can cause heavy debate, as the new Joint Strike Fighter planes, widely debated in the media and also in the parliament but the decision was made in (advance in) favor of our close relation to US and its industry.
5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

No

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

3.4 % of the national budget of 2012 is devoted to military expenses. Military spending per capita is among the highest in Europe

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?


8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

The military is likely to get the funding they need if they have exceeded the budget and the money has been used for conflicts and war that Norwegian soldiers are engaged in. It always creates some temporary media “storms” but arguments of security are always played out efficiently and successfully by the government, which causes the majority of the parliament to vote for any excess.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

There are no signs whatsoever that Norway are starting to reorient budgets towards other areas. On the contrary, our recently appointed SG in NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, just reassured NATO in public through the media that Norway would increase their military expenditures. Civil society must be active in pushing this issue to create an opinion and first of all awareness in these matters that are almost absent in the press.
10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Norway is a member of NATO and has no plans for recycling the workforce away from military industries. The production of weapons per capita in Norway is high and increasing. The civil society and human rights institutions should take this up for debate on a broader scale.

Some NGOs do raise the issues of an increased weapon production and an increased militarization, but they are not widely taken into account.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

Norway is a member of NATO and opposition to NATO is not welcome. NATO now wants their member countries to increase their military budgets. As far as we have found there is no defined target of a fixed percentage.
Spain

Elaborated by WILPF Spain and de Pere Ortega, of Centre d' Estudis per a la Pau JM Delàs

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

The Spanish State, as many others, does not correctly provide information on military expenditures. This is due to the fact that many military expenses are distributed in various ministries and not only in the Ministry of Defence. For example, the cost of social pensions for the military, loans for military, the expense in international military organisms (NATO, UN disarmament agreements), the military R+D, the expenditure of paramilitaries. It does provide information on numbers of army forces, but it does not on military bases internally and externally. It does not inform on the Information Agency, the National Centre of Intelligence of Spain, of which nothing is made public. Nothing is known on the fight against terrorism and on private security companies.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

The military expense in Spain is public and is accessed through the Presupuestos Generales del Estado, so in this sense there are no restrictions in the information. Spain does not own mass destruction weapons so there is no information on this.

The only restriction is about arms trade. There is a restrictive law that is not sufficiently transparent, because it does not oblige to inform on the kind of arms that are exported, nor on the exporting company. It only calls for information on the country of destination, but not even if the buyer is a state or a private company.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

There is transparency in the budgetary information and it is accessible for political parties, press and civil entities.
4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

No, the government has never adopted a proactive attitude towards providing information on military expenditure.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

There are no opinion polls on military expenditure. There are polls regarding the Armed Force’s acceptance by the citizens.

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

See the table below that determines military expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministries</th>
<th>2,008</th>
<th>2,009</th>
<th>2,010</th>
<th>2,011</th>
<th>2,012</th>
<th>2,013</th>
<th>2,014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>7,751</td>
<td>7,329</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>4,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>4,434</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Research</td>
<td>7,677</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>5,562</td>
<td>5,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td><strong>10,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,154</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,913</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,776</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

See the table for a comparison.
8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

None. Political opposition parties and civil society have no influence on this, despite the fact that every year in Spain military expenditure exceeds the initial Budget approved in the Congress.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

The Spanish government has no policy regarding this. There are NGOs that launch campaigns concerning this and try to change government policies, but for now they are unsuccessful.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

There is no conversion strategy of military industries or of military investigation. Civil society is very weak on this because it clashes with trade unions’ reluctance to conversion plans of military industries.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

There is no regional agreement (of the EU) that calls for a certain expenditure in regards to the GDP. There is a NATO recommendation that suggests that states should spend around 2% of their national GDP.
España

Respuestas elaboradas por WILPF España con la colaboración de Pere Ortega, del Centre d’Estudis per a la Pau JM Delàs

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

El Estado español, como otros muchos estados, no informa correctamente del gasto militar. Esto es debido a que muchos gastos militares se encuentran repartidos por otros Ministerios y no solo en el Ministerio de Defensa. Por ejemplo: el gasto de las pensiones sociales de los militares; las mutuas militares; el gasto en organismos militares internacionales (NATO, acuerdos desarme ONU); el R+D militar; el gasto de los paramilitares.

Sí informa bien de los efectivos de las fuerzas armadas. Pero en cambio no lo hace sobre las bases militares en el interior y en el exterior. Tampoco sobre la Agencia de Información, Centro de Inteligencia Nacional en España, del que se desconoce absolutamente todo. Tampoco sobre la lucha anti-terrorista y las compañías de seguridad privada.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

El gasto militar en España es público y se tiene acceso a través de los Presupuestos Generales del Estado y en ese sentido no hay restricciones en la información. España no posee armas de destrucción masiva y por tanto no hay información clasificada sobre este punto.

La única restricción que existe es respecto al comercio de armas. Existe una Ley restrictiva que no es suficientemente transparente, pues no obliga a informar del tipo de armas que se exportan, ni tampoco de la empresa exportadora, solo informa del país de destino, pero tampoco si el comprador es el Estado o una empresa privada.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

Sí que hay transparencia en la información presupuestaria y es de acceso tanto para los partidos políticos, prensa y entidades civiles.
4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

No, el Gobierno español nunca ha adoptado una actitud proactiva respecto a dar información sobre el gasto militar.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

No hay sondeos de opinión sobre el gasto militar. Sí los hay sobre la aceptación de las Fuerzas Armadas por la ciudadanía.

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

Véase la Tabla aquí abajo.

| Ministerios de Gasto de distintos ministerios y años (en millones de euros) |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                          | 2,008          | 2,009          | 2,010          | 2,011          | 2,012          | 2,013          | 2,014          |
| Fomento del Trabajo      | 7,684          | 7,584          | 7,751          | 7,329          | 5,765          | 3,772          | 4,073          |
| Sanidad                  | 4,434          | 4,623          | 4,635          | 4,264          | 3,976          | 3,856          | 3,840          |
| Educación                | 2,933          | 2,988          | 3,092          | 2,843          | 2,220          | 1,945          | 2,150          |
| Cultura                  | 1,220          | 1,284          | 1,199          | 1,104          | 942            | 722            | 716            |
| Investigación Civil      | 7,677          | 8,203          | 8,088          | 7,576          | 5,629          | 5,562          | 5,633          |
| Ministerio Defensa       | **10,091**     | **9,726**      | **9,154**      | **8,560**      | **7,411**      | **6,913**      | **6,776**      |

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

En la Tabla puede verse esa comparación.

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

Ninguno. Ni los partidos políticos de la oposición ni la sociedad civil inciden en ese punto, a pesar de que cada año el gasto militar en España excede en mucho al inicial aprobado en el Congreso de Diputados.
9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

El Gobierno español no tiene ninguna política en ese sentido. Sí que hay organizaciones civiles (ONG) que lanzan campañas en ese sentido e intentan cambiar las políticas del Gobierno pero de momento sin ningún éxito.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Tampoco existe ninguna estrategia de conversión de las industrias militares o de la investigación militar. La sociedad civil es muy débil en ese sentido pues choca con la negativa de los sindicatos a hacer planes de conversión de las empresas militares.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

No existe ningún acuerdo regional (de la UE) que obligue a un determinado gasto militar respecto del PIB. Sí existe la recomendación de la NATO de que los estados miembros gasten en torno al 2% del PIB nacional.
UK
Elaborated by WILPF UK

1. What is the level of information provided to the population at large on military expenditures, including Army, Navy and Air Force contingents, military research, the production and stockpiling of weapons, maintaining domestic military bases and military bases in foreign countries, national defence, intelligence and surveillance, anti-terrorism, involvement in armed conflicts, private military and security companies, etc.?

The United Kingdom spends $60.8 on defence information on spending is available in the proceedings of UK Parliament ‘Hansard’ and on a variety of Government websites. However, recently the UK Government did not tell the Scottish Government about leaks from the nuclear reactor at Dounreay.

2. What is the level of secrecy that accompanies military expenditures, including concerning weapons of mass destruction? What safeguards exist to prevent abuse and waste, especially when the crucial information is “classified” and not subject to public debate?

Answer not available.

3. What measures are in place to ensure budget and fiscal transparency, and to what extent can the electorate participate in establishing budget priorities?

Fiscal Transparency is available in ‘Hansard’ and on government websites.

4. Does the government pro-actively seek to inform the public and to obtain input from civil society and non-governmental organizations concerning military expenditures?

The public is informed about parliamentary spending on defence via reports in national press, T.V and Radio news coverage and via ‘Hansard’ The government does not consult NGOs and civil society about military spending. However, organisations such as Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and Campaign Against the Arms trade and ourselves regularly inform the government of our views.

5. Are official or unofficial opinion polling on military expenditures and public referenda on aspects of the military budget conducted, e.g. concerning the continued production and/or testing of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, concerning measures of “surveillance” of communications, telephone and internet?

CND regularly carries out opinion polls. Scotland on Sunday (Scottish quality Sunday paper) has conducted polls on the basing of the UK Nuclear Submarines in Scotland . In the past Stop the War (Campaign group) has
conducted polls about UK’s involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. The government appears to take very little notice of what civil society thinks. However, public pressure and demonstrations and letters to Members of Parliament did affect the UK government when it voted not to get involved in the conflict in Syria (Sept. 2013)

6. What is the actual level of all military-related expenditures in real terms, and what actual percentage of national budgets (not percentage of GNP) does this represent, regardless of whether the expenditures are separately assigned to the “defence” budget, the “intelligence” budget, the “anti-terrorism” budget, the “research” budget?

The data is available from this website and is very detailed. UK defence spending is 2.5% of GDP and 5.71% of national spending

7. By comparison, what is the percentage of national budgets devoted to education and health care, medical research, the administration of justice, road safety, infrastructures, etc.?

Health 15.9%, Education 12%
The website below gives very detailed coverage of UK expenditure.

8. What level of accountability exists when military expenses exceed the budget approved by Parliament?

Answer not available.

9. What strategies, if any, exist to reorient budget priorities away from military expenditures and into the promotion of all human rights, the protection of the environment, climate change, clean water, sustainable energy, medicine and other peace-time industries as well as to achieve the millennium development goals and the post 2015 development agenda? To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

There is no strategy in the UK to divert spending away from military spending.

Campaign groups on all these strategies exist in the UK and some of the groups have a parliamentary liaison person to work closely with parliament. For example: NGOs participate in the UK submission to Commission on the Status of Women. In Scotland there are Cross party working groups on many issues where civil society organisations working on these issues are invited to join and are encouraged to actively participate in the groups work. Scottish WILPF were


12 http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn43.pdf
asked to provide a member to join the Cross party working group on Domestic Violence. UK Westminster Parliament Cross Party working groups membership is restricted to Members of Parliament only.

10. What strategies, if any, exist to recycle the workforce away from military industries into peace-time industries, conservation, medical research, renewable energy sources, maintenance of infrastructures. To what extent can civil society and human rights institutions participate in shaping these strategies?

Currently there is no official policy on recycling the work force away from the military. There has been a lot of coverage in the UK press about how badly many leaving the armed services are treated when they leave. Lack of re-training, showing them how their skills can be utilised in civil society. There is a lack of skilled engineers in the UK and no link appears to be being made between engineers leaving the military to be re-skilled to work in the alternative energy sector.

Civil Society groups have been raising these issues and have received some publicity. However, the UK government to date has appeared to have taken little notice.

11. Are there regional agreements in force (e.g. military alliances) that commit the State to devote a certain percentage of its budget to military expenses? If so, what percentage and how is it enforced?

UK as a member of NATO has to commit a minimum of 2% GDP to defence spending.

As a member of NATO the UK is currently involved in Afghanistan and has Drones based in the UK. More details on the website below here [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_67655.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_67655.htm).