

Arms Trade Treaty Diplomatic Conference 2 - 27 July 2012 Summary Report: Plenary Session: Morning - 6 July 2012

The morning session of Thursday 6 July saw the continuation of high-level statements. The following Member States took the floor: **Algeria, the Russian Federation** (speaking on behalf of the **Collective Security Treaty Organisation**), **Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Nepal, Venezuela, Serbia, and Austria. Sweden, Uruguay, and the United States of America** refrained from speaking but submitted statements for distribution.

First, **Algeria and the Democratic Republic of Korea** posed questions concerning the organisation of the programme of work, the parallel committee meetings and consultations, and confusion in regards to which text would be used as the basis for discussion. **Venezuela** also disagreed with the style of parallel meetings and believed there to be "no brochure of work" for negotiations. In addition, **Algeria** mentioned that a glossary of terms should be added for further clarification.

After this, most states agreed that the scope of the treaty should be comprehensive, include the seven categories of weapons listed in the UN Register, and cover all conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons, and ammunition. **Uruguay** also included parts and components, equipment, and technology. In regard to the criteria, most states agreed that the treaty should include importing, exporting, transfer, trans-shipment, and brokering. **Uruguay** also mentioned re-exporting. All states appeared to align with the view that all aspects of the treaty should be "clear, concise, and implementable," as stated by the **Russian Federation**.

Concerning implementation measures, most states believed that national control mechanisms are necessary, but should remain under the sovereign control of each independent nation and not jeopardise the legitimate trade of arms of each nation. Information sharing, international cooperation, transparency was thought to aid in the establishment of an effective implementation mechanism. Assistance to help with the training and monitoring was suggested on behalf of those countries that lack sufficient means to implement the treaty obligations. In addition, the **United States of America** supports the establishment of additional criteria that "each government must consider before authorising the export of conventional arms" to ensure that even legitimate end uses are not made without deliberation.

The avoidance of a political manipulation by the largest exporters of arms and producers and suppliers of defence equipment was a concern by **Venezuela and Sweden**, which suggested that some measure of protection against arbitrary decision-making should be developed. Many states mentioned that an equal balance between the regulation of importing and exporting states is necessary.

The second part of the morning session was divided into two committees, one of them being in charge of discussing the goals and objectives of the treaty, although the general introductory discussion was extended as many delegations were concerned about the organization of work proposed by Ambassador Roberto Garcia Moritan. Indeed, the point was raised that if the rest of the negotiations are divided into two committees, small delegations may not be able to attend parallel negotiations, and hurt transparency. As of today, no definitive agreement has been reached concerning the future organization of negotiations, but delegations were reassured of the fact that substantive contributions would be made only in formal meetings, the second committee being informal and only complementing discussion. While the **Mexican** delegation said that the proposal of having two parallel committees was a completely appropriate method of work, **Algeria** expressed its view that more clarity was needed.

Concerning the issue of defining the goals and objectives of the treaty, **Pakistan** mentioned that, "there is still no clarity as to the objectives of the treaty." It proposed, along with **Egypt**, that we should have a "discussion of ideas" in order to figure out the precise goals and objectives of an ATT. The delegations of the **United Kingdom, Cuba, and Nicaragua** supported this view, while the delegate of Iran proposed a "preliminary discussion on the vision and approach of the treaty" so as to decide whether it will be "a trade agreement, a disarmament treaty, a human rights treaty, and maybe if we need to incorporate environmental concerns [?]."

However, many other delegations, especially **Norway, France, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Mexico, Zambia, and Kenya** expressed the view that the debate is not starting anew and that delegations already have a clear idea of what should be the goals and objectives of the treaty since the mandate was given in the General Assembly resolution 64/48. In this sense, the Chair's non-paper dated 3 July 2012 was repeatedly designated as an excellent basis from which to

start the process of negotiating over the final provisions of the goals and objectives. The delegation of **Sweden** proposed that it be put on screen so that the committee can work directly from this.

Since the discussion about how to organize the work and how to define the goals and objectives of the treaty ran longer than expected, the delegation of **South Sudan** mentioned that having a discussion of ideas would be “almost brainstorming” and added, to the attention of the Committee’s President, “I do not encourage you to be a dictator, but there is a need for us to decide of which way to engage.”

Finally, delegates were highly encouraged to submit their proposals by email, so that they could be compiled and serve as the basis of the committee’s work next week.