

Arms Trade Treaty Diplomatic Conference 2 - 27 July 2012 Summary Report: Plenary Session: Morning - 9 July 2012

At this morning session, the Russian Federation, ECOWAS, the delegation of New Zealand on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum, Germany, Ireland, China, Senegal, Indonesia, Belarus, Syria, Pakistan, Vietnam, Niger, Cote d'Ivoire, the Republic of Korea, the Czech Republic, Italy, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Iraq, Morocco, and Iceland took the floor. The general debate is scheduled to end tomorrow morning.

The **Russian Federation** stated that a fundamental problem exists with the work expected to be completed at this conference due to the wide range of concerns that have been expressed so far. Success will only be possible "if the correct algorithm is found"

As for the types of arms that should be covered by the treaty, the **ECOWAS** supported the broadest possible range and highlighted that the scope proposed in the Chair's paper currently excludes Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). In addition, **New Zealand on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum** stated that it does not support the proposal that arms for civilian use (hunting, sports) should be excluded. **Senegal** was in favor of including only the seven categories listed in the UN Register and small arms and light weapons. The delegation of **Indonesia** aligned its position with the statement presented by Myanmar on behalf of ASEAN; **Niger** aligned its position with the statement presented by Nigeria on behalf of the African Group; **Cote d'Ivoire** aligned with the statement presented by ECOWAS and CARICOM; the **Czech Republic, Germany, and Italy** joined the European Union's statement, the later specifying that in its view sport and hunting weapons do not pertain to the scope of the treaty.

China stated that the scope of the ATT should cover "as a priority those conventional arms that have been clearly defined internationally and accepted universally". Expanding on this, **China** said "it could be unhelpful to introduce too many debatable items and transaction activities into the scope in order to achieve an ATT as early as possible." For the delegation of **Vietnam** the ATT's scope "must be reasonable and proper" and cover only the seven categories of the UN Register and small arms and light weapons since "inclusion of ammunitions, parts and components and technology would make the implementation process too complicated and inconsistent, creating unnecessary burdens for national developments."

Regarding the specific activities listed in the scope, **Vietnam did not favor** the inclusion of technological transfers, research and development and manufacturing under foreign license. **Morocco** highlighted that the provisions should allow for future updating.

Iraq expressed the view that states should be allowed reservations if the provisions of the treaty are not flexible to national interests. The delegation of **Ireland** also specified that the treaty should be open for signature to relevant regional and international organizations given the role they play and could play in future regulation of arms transfers.

Syria asked these specific questions: What are the rights of importing states? How the issue of stockpiling and existing military alliances will be addressed? What are the guaranties of action by exporting states?

Iceland made reference to gender based violence and asked that specific gender based criteria be incorporated in the treaty.

Concerning implementation, the delegations mentioned the establishment of national control systems, an implementation support unit, support for capacity-building efforts in states lacking the administration or infrastructure for implementation, transparency, and reporting. **New Zealand** (on behalf of the **Pacific Islands Forum**) noted that small island States would be at particular risk to fulfill treaty implementation. **Russia** stated that national control systems should be "developed independently by states based on maximum standards decided upon in the conference." In regard to reporting, **New Zealand** emphasized the need to avoid measures that would cause 'reporting fatigue'. **Germany** noted that national control systems should "seek comprehensive measures and end user certification", and **Iceland** mentioned a national licensing. Further, **Italy** stated that "sanctions against those that violate national law" should be included within a national control system.

International cooperation, information sharing, transparency, and accountability were thought to be crucial to establish national regulatory capacities. International assistance from more experienced countries to less developed countries through awareness and border control knowledge was encouraged. **Democratic People's Republic of Korea** believed

that specific attention should be paid to “hot spots and conflict areas” when implementing treaty provisions. **Indonesia** stated that an unbiased advisory group should be created as “a confidence-building mechanism not a sanction-endorsing one.” Finally, **China** noted that an “all-inclusive approach without concern for differing situations would be equally irresponsible to doing nothing.”

Finally, the delegations who took the floor this morning expressed diverging points of view concerning entry into force of the treaty: some proposed that the same process as previous international conventions be followed, others mentioned a specific number of ratifications by state parties and finally an approach based on consensus was mentioned.

At the end of the morning session, Chairman Moritán addressed some organizational issues surrounding the next two weeks program of work. Realizing the constraints faced by smaller States delegations and in regard to the urgency of time, the Chairman proposed that the following two weeks consist of 50% consecutive meetings and 50% parallel meetings. After several questions or affirmations from many States, (including **Algeria, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, India, Spain, the European Union, Venezuela, the Russian Federation, and Iran**) the Chairman called for the program of work to be adopted, with no states voicing disapproval at that time.

The questions centered on the holding of parallel meetings, the importance of defining the goals and objectives of the treaty, and division of certain topics. Further, **Cuba** suggested no parallel meetings during the last week. **Cuba** and **Iran** both believed that the preamble/principles should be discussed separately. **India** then stated that the issue of ‘Scope’ needed more consideration. **Russia** believed ‘Implementation’ should be divided into ‘National Implementation’ and ‘implementation between states on the international level’. Finally, **Iran** stated the difficulties encountered because one of its key delegates was unable to attend the conference due to visa issue. Iran stressed that it would not be able to attend parallel meetings during the last week if its delegate was still unable to attend.