

## **Arms Trade Treaty Diplomatic Conference 2 - 27 July 2012 Summary Report: Plenary Session: Morning – 10 July 2012**

During the morning session of July 10th the general debate continued with delegations making public statements. **Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Congo, Gabon, Ghana, India, Iran, Montenegro, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania**, all these delegations took the floor to express their views and comments about the current ATT negotiations process.

All the delegations expressed the wish to achieve a robust, comprehensive and implementable Treaty following on a transparent and open negotiation process. India reminded that the final outcome of the ATT should be based on consensus. Most delegation insisted that the potential Treaty should complement efficiently the already existing corpus of instruments on conventional weapons (PoA, ITI, Fire Arms Protocol) and **Benin, Colombia, India, Montenegro, Peru and Sierra Leone** emphasized clearly that the Treaty should be legally-binding to achieve its objectives. A great majority of delegations agreed that the purpose of the Treaty is to regulate the legal trade in conventional arms and prevent, combat and eradicate the illegal trafficking of such weapons as well as their diversion to the illicit market.

Almost all delegations insisted on the sovereign right of states to individual and collective defense and their subsequent rights to manufacture, acquire, import and export conventional arms to ensure their national security needs and participate in UN peacemaking missions. Most delegation re-affirmed their views that the Treaty should have provisions on the political independence of states (**Algeria, Bangladesh, Philippines**), the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs (**Iran**), the principle of equality of states and the right to self-determination (**Bangladesh, Iran**) and the refrain of the use of threat of the use of force (**Algeria, Bangladesh**). **Algeria, India, Iran, Peru and Sierra Leone** called on striking a fair balance between the obligations and rights of both weapons exporter and importer countries. **Algeria, Congo and India** emphasized that conventional weapons transfers should be made from state to state and that non-state actor should be excluded from such activities. **Iran** opposed the inclusion of a reference to "embargoes".

Almost all delegations agreed that the scope of the Treaty should be broad and inclusive and include the 7 categories of weapons from the UN Register, plus SALW, ammunitions, technology-related equipment as well as parts and components. **The United Republic of Tanzania and Sierra Leone** referred to the SALW as "the real weapons of mass destruction" in the current world, particularly in the African continent. **Ghana** stated clearly that if SALW and ammunitions were not to be included in the Treaty, the purpose of the ATT, ensuring the safety of people, could not be achieved. **Algeria and Iran** opposed the inclusion of ammunitions, technology, parts and components. **Iran** opposed as well the inclusion of SALW and missiles. All the delegations agreed that the activities covered by the potential ATT should be import, export, transit, transshipment. **Iran** opposed the inclusion of transfer of equipment for potential civilian use in the Treaty. **Iran** insisted that any transfer to people under foreign occupation should be outside the scope of the ATT.

All the delegations emphasized that the Treaty should make references to the UN Charter and the obligations of states under international law, particularly International Human Rights Law, Humanitarian Law and International Criminal Law. Both **Algeria and Iran** opposed the later reference. **Sierra Leone** particularly insisted on the inclusion of a provision on "gender-based violence". **Ghana** referred to the "rights of minority". **Gabon** referred to the situation of "child soldiers" Both **Ghana and Gabon** referred to "sexual violence" committed on women and asked for some reference in the treaty. The **Philippines** evoked the particular case of "corruption" and "money laundering".

Finally most delegation underscored the importance of implementation mechanisms, particularly national reporting (**Colombia and Montenegro** wish to see national reporting mandatory), national mechanism of control and exchange of information between states. Delegations emphasized as well the utmost importance of international assistance (legal, technical and human logistics), particularly for developing states that lack the necessary resources, and international cooperation, particularly at the regional level. **Colombia, Papua New Guinea and Tanzania** underscored the role that the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) could play in building confidence among States Parties in the future.

Right after the plenary segment of the session, Committee 2 discussed in an open meeting international cooperation and assistance. Different delegations took the floor and expressed their opinions.

**Pakistan** proposed to develop more quality and agreement in the implementation of the treaty.

Australia mentioned that it gave 1 million dollar in order to fund the treaty in areas like capacity, expertise or training.

**Malaysia, Samoa, Ecuador, Norway, Ireland, Spain, Cote d'Ivoire, Switzerland, Palau, Germany, and Sweden** all mentioned the importance of horizontal, mutual and international cooperation.

**Samoa, Ecuador, Ireland**, all put emphasis on technical assistance whereas **Trinidad and Tobago and Malaysia, Germany** as well as **Ireland** wanted a legal, judicial assistance.

**Norway, Cote d'Ivoire, Trinidad and Tobago, Nigeria, Cuba, Singapore, the Democratic Republic of Korea, Germany, the United States**, all insisted that assistance should be made on a voluntary basis, and the treaty should take into consideration the sovereignty of states.

**Trinidad and Tobago and Switzerland** spoke about the important role that could be play by NGO's in such a treaty.

Some countries wanted clarification on modification in the language; **Norway, Ecuador, Switzerland** believed that cooperation and assistance should be included while **Kenya** believe they should be separated. To finish, **Russian Federation** needed clarification on the definition of "Implementation"?