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The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) Fifth Conference of States Parties (CSP5) concluded on Friday afternoon by adopting its final report. The participants broke at mid-day to spend time in informal mode negotiating a set of paragraphs related to financial matters, but were in the end able to reach agreement on that set of issues, as well as on decisions and recommendations for taking forward work related to the Treaty’s gender and gender-based violence (GBV) provisions.

Implementing the Treaty’s gender provisions

Following many months of sustained and focused discussion about gender, GBV, and the arms trade, ATT states parties adopted a package of decisions on the final day of CSP5 that will hopefully serve as a foundation to strengthen implementation of article 7(4) of the ATT, enhance gender diversity, and enhance understanding of the gendered impact of armed violence.

The president’s non-paper, which had been the basis of discussion since January, was incorporated into the final report of CSP5 as paragraph 22. The final version dropped the earlier suggestion that “a GBV question could be considered for inclusion within templates for Annual Reports during the next review of those templates.” It also reversed the ordering of paragraph 22(b)(iii). As well, continued work on article 7(4) is highlighted in the context of ongoing work on articles 6 and 7 by the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation (WGETI) in paragraph 25 of the final report.

In the course of adopting the report, South Africa suggested changing the mandate for states to “discuss their practice in interpreting the language and standards entailed in article 7(4)”, to an “encouragement” to do so. South Africa also proposed replacing “gender issues” with “gender-based violence” in the context of paragraph 22(c)(i) for cohesion with article 7(4). Despite concern from Ireland and Finland about the first of these proposals, especially given the chapeau to the paragraph already indicates these are items for consideration. However, in the interests of reaching consensus they did not block the suggested amendments and the paragraph was accepted.

Adopting these decisions is a solid outcome overall with tangible and specific points of action, some of which are embedded in the Treaty’s existing working methods, such as the Voluntary Trust Fund (VTF) and the WGETI. There are also practical suggestions, such as the development of a voluntary training guide, best practices exchanges, and discussions about relevant language and standards. If implemented, this should serve to strengthen implementation of the GBV risk assessment provision and shine a spotlight on an issue that is otherwise often overlooked and deprioritised.

The “if implemented” is important, because putting all of this into practice now requires commitment, follow-up, and focus. The use of qualifiers like “encourage” and “should” and “voluntary” does leave open some space for those with reservations on this subject to prevent progress. One of WILPF’s concerns throughout this process has been a lack of clarity about oversight and responsibility for
some of these actions, and the ensuing potential for them to fall through the cracks. We have also highlighted in statements and publications that the understanding and knowledge that accumulates within ATT conference spaces as a result of these recommendations must be channeled into policy and programming at local and national levels, so as to have real impact. This point was emphasised in particular during a Small Arms Survey side event on Thursday, in which women working in both gender and arms control in Nigeria and Burkina Faso offered their views on the local-to-global disconnect. Other disconnects have also been highlighted this week, including by states parties themselves, such as needing to better inform and educate licensing officers about the GBV risk assessment obligation, or to improve synergy with the Women, Peace and Security agenda or human rights community.

But the foundation has been laid. And as stated by WILPF at the same Small Arms Survey event, “we are not going anywhere”.

Financial considerations

This was also the message from several Latin American and African states during the consideration of the financial aspects of the CSP5 final report. Concerned about the division between developing and wealthy states parties described yesterday in this newsletter, some delegations continued to push back on the imposition of possible restrictions on their access to assistance and sponsorship.

Costa Rica and Guatemala raised concerns with a number of paragraphs in the final report that related to the application of financial rule 8.1(d), which says that various rights of states parties may be revoked if they are two or more years in financial arrears. The application of this rule comes through in the following paragraphs:

- Paragraph 23 of the final report welcomes the work of the VTF as reflected in its report. This report includes a paragraph (18) that states any project proposals received from a state that is two or more years in arrears “is unlikely to be given positive consideration by the VTF Selection Committee.”

- Paragraph 29 of the final report welcomes the report on the status of operations of the Sponsorship Programme. Paragraph 30 relatedly says that after consideration, CSP5 adopted the Draft Administrative Guidelines for the Sponsorship Programme, including the protocol to guide the selection process. These Guidelines, in Annex A, paragraph 2 of the Selection Criteria, state, “If there are insufficient funds available to sponsor all the applicants that are eligible to be selected for sponsorship following the application of the above considerations, priority will be given to applicants from States who are in compliance with their financial obligations under the ATT.”

- Paragraph 34 says that CSP5 “expresses deep concern about the unpaid contributions of States and called on States that have not done so to address their financial obligations in a prompt and timely manner. The Conference highlighted the risks that the ATT process and its essential activities, including the organization of future ATT meetings, will face if the situation is not addressed.”

Discussion on each of these paragraphs was interrelated. Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, South Africa, and to some extent Mexico raised concerns about the increasing threat of restricting or limiting states’ access to ATT resources, assistance, and possibly other rights related to voting and participation. Meanwhile, the European Union and some of its member states individually emphasised that non-payment of assessed contributions has led the ATT to a point of extreme financial difficulty, the only solution to which is for all states to fulfil their financial obligations. The counter-point to this made by several delegations is that by restricting access to the VTF or Sponsorship Programme, it will be even harder for those states in arrears to catch up—it will undermine those in government systems arguing for more support for the Treaty, and make it more difficult to implement the provisions of the Treaty itself. The representative of the Dominican Republic gave an example on this point, noting that when his country was behind on payments, the VTF selection committee was reluctant to grant it money for a project. But it is only because they did accept the project proposal that the political system in the Dominican Republic
became more supportive and understanding of the Treaty, so that it is now widely accepted throughout the government and pays its dues on time.

Fuller coverage on each of the points raised in this discussion can be found in the News in Brief section of this newsletter. But the bottom line is that many of the African and Latin American states participating in CSP5 are concerned that developing countries struggling to meet their financial obligations under the Treaty are being punished by wealthier European states that do not have any trouble in paying their contributions on time. The representative of the Dominican Republic warned, if we continue in this direction, the ATT is going to turn into a very exclusive club. Highlighting the challenges of the Conference on Disarmament, which has limited membership and has not conducted any substantive work in more than twenty years, he argued that ATT states parties seem to be rowing backwards, not forwards, in terms of implementation and universalisation of the Treaty.

Civil society was not permitted to attend the informal consultations, so we only know of the outcome of those discussions. States participating in those negotiations reached agreement on a package of amendments to the relevant paragraphs of the final report. The details of these amendment are described in the News in Brief, but essentially a compromise was reached in which language has been added to the report that says “no state shall be prejudiced by rule 8.1(d) in applying for support from the VTF or Sponsorship Programme, until CSP6 when this matter will be discussed.” So, if a state has not paid its dues, it will not face any restrictions in applying for project grants or sponsorship to meetings this year, but the discussion on this matter is going to be taken up again next year.

What does all this mean for the arms trade?

With a solution, albeit possibly a temporary one, to the question of limiting states’ access to Treaty resources, and agreement on how to take forward the gender aspects of the Treaty, CSP5 was able to conclude successfully, and within the timeframe scheduled for the meeting. In the disarmament world, this is considered to be a relatively significant victory these days. It does show that while negotiation and compromise are difficult, they are possible. States with different priorities, perspectives, and experiences can work together to reach agreement—even if none of them are fully satisfied with it.

This practice seems much more challenging when the two countries with the biggest arms trade, the biggest militaries, and the biggest nuclear arsenals are in the room. Whether it is the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons discussions on autonomous weapons, or implementation of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty’s provisions on nuclear disarmament, or consideration of pretty much every disarmament topic at the UN General Assembly First Committee, these two countries tend to throw spanners in the works more than anyone else. As an activist movement that participates in all of these forums and works with a grassroots network around the globe, WILPF is concerned with the ways in which the urgency for disarmament action in local and national contexts is often stymied by the lack of diplomatic compromise at the international level. We need governments to work together in the interest of humanity, not put their own interests of economic and military power ahead of everything else.

The adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty was a moment of celebration for people around the world who truly believed this Treaty would have a meaningful impact on their safety and security. That it would stem the flow of weapons destroying their lives and livelihoods. As delegates leave CSP5 and go back to their capitals or their missions in Geneva or New York, we hope they can reflect upon what this Treaty is for, who it is for, and work over the next year to ensure that this instrument is living up to its full potential as a treaty that saves lives.
The News in brief is not a comprehensive recording of all statements and positions but attempts to capture key points from discussions.

Consideration and adoption of the final report

Paragraph 22(a)

- Poland said that it may be difficult for states parties to balance the gender composition of their delegation immediately, because in their system more men are employed to work on arms control.

- The President assured Poland that its delegation would not be stigmatised if the transition is gradual but noted it is important to consider or nothing will change.

Paragraph 22(c)

- South Africa reiterated concerns about “overly prescriptive” language. It recommended altering the text of 22(c)(i) to “encourage discussions on” rather than “discuss”.

- South Africa also questioned if the terms “gender-based violence (GBV)” used in article 7(4) and “gender issues” in paragraph 21(c)(1) were compatible and suggested changing gender to GBV in this sub-paragraph.

- Australia recommended adding the acronym GBV to 22(c)(i).

- Ireland disagreed with South Africa, saying that the chapeau already says these are issues for the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation to consider, thus adding “encourage discussion on” to 22(c)(i) would be redundant.

- Finland supported Ireland.

- The President requested that states accept South Africa’s request for the sake of consensus. Paragraph 22(c) was adopted ad referendum with this oral amendment.

Paragraph 23

- Guatemala stated that it cannot accept use of the word “welcome” in reference to the Voluntary Trust Fund (VTF) without withdrawing paragraph 18 from the Report on the Work of the ATT Voluntary Trust Fund. It requested that “welcome” be in brackets until the withdrawal of this paragraph. Costa Rica backed this motion.

- Germany said it is not international practice to change the content of a report agreed to by the members of the relevant committee, which in this case is the selection committee of the VTF. Germany also said that it couldn’t find any sanctions listed in paragraph 18 and that the formulation here is just how the selection committee decided how to implement provisions decided at CSP4.

- Mexico voiced concern about the amount of emphasis being placed on additional sanctions. It suggested keeping the term “welcome” in the text until later discussions. Mexico also noted that there are two separate elements here: one is the work we carry out and one is the why we apply financial rules.

- Guatemala repeated its gratitude for the VTF’s work in their country but said it cannot support any report whose “intention is to deny technical assistance” to countries in need.

- Costa Rica said it cannot accept that the selection committee go beyond its mandate deciding for others to add additional measures. The document states the committee has to limit itself to applying general principles and guidance for the selection of projects.

- The discussions were put on hold in the plenary, to be taken up again in informal consultations.

Paragraph 24

- New Zealand expressed concern that the states parties were misinformed as to the
amount of funds available for outreach activities for the VTF. In its role as the incoming chair of the VTF selection committee, the New Zealand delegation requested a point of clarification on what funds are available, stating that there is only $29,000 USD available, not the previously stated $82,000 USD.

- The CSP5 President said that outreach is of course limited to the availability of funds and asked if this point would prevent New Zealand from accepting the paragraph.

- New Zealand stated that it was prepared to accept this but requested the ATT Secretariat to explain the discrepancy before the end of CSP5. The Secretariat later in the day clarified that donors are able to put conditions on their donations; in the case of Germany’s donation to the VTF outreach activities this was the case, in which part of the condition was that this would have to paid back to Germany at the conclusion of the term of office of Germany as the Chair of the Selection Committee. Therefore the balance after that happens will be $29,000 USD.

**Paragraph 27**

- Australia requested one technical edit to paragraph 27(c), changing the terms “bilateral basis” to “individual basis” for clarity. This change was approved.

**Paragraphs 29 and 30**

- Guatemala objected to use of the word “welcome” again on the grounds that the African Group, supported by multiple states including Guatemala and Costa Rica, had proposed removing paragraph 2 of the Selection Criteria from Annex A from the Draft Administrative Guidelines in the Report on the ATT Sponsorship Programme. Guatemala said this will be a problem for paragraph 30 as well and said its similar to the problem with paragraph 23.

- The President said there is a big difference with paragraph 23, because in 30 we are adopting the Guidelines; in paragraph 23 there is no need to adopt a report of the VTF. He said deletion of this part of the Selection Criteria has been discussed but no consensus has been reached.

- Mexico requested that this issue be addressed in the informal talks as it links to several other issues.

- Netherlands supported discussing the matter in informal talks, but wanted to say on the record that they believed a compromise was already reached on this issue, and if this is broken, then it will revert to its previous position in wanting paragraph 2 become a bullet point of paragraph 1 within the Draft Guidelines annexed to the Report.

- Guatemala argued that while this matter was previously discussed, the language in the report was not agreed upon.

- South Africa supported informal discussions to resolve this matter.

- The Dominican Republic offered its experience about getting more support for the ATT from its government after it was granted a project through the VTF even though at the time it was not yet caught up with its financial obligations. It also warned against the ATT becoming an exclusive club that cuts out vulnerable regions.

- Ghana referred to its suggestion from Thursday to add language that would suggest states in arrears could work with the ATT Secretariat to find a solution to unpaid financial contributions.

- The discussion on both of these paragraphs was parked for informal consultations.

**Paragraph 34**

- Costa Rica said it has the impression that the language in this paragraph refers to unpaid contributions, would like to take up Ghana’s suggestion paragraphs 29 and 30. After “prompt and timely manner” in paragraph 34, it proposed adding “encourage Secretariat to find a viable solution”. Costa Rica highlighted that states parties have not yet gone into deep enough discussions about how to help states who are still in arrears to find solutions in accordance with their circumstances.
• Ghana proposed to change “unpaid contribution” to “non-compliance with financial rule 8.1(d)”. Ghana also noted that as the ATT Secretariat is outside the UN system, clarity or guidance is needed about states should approach them to make arrangements for payment. The Management Committee could provide guidance on this.

• The United Kingdom said to be able to consider this language change it needs clarity on Ghana’s proposal, asking what non-compliance with 8.1(d) means.

• Mexico noted that paragraph 34 is different than the other financial paragraphs.

• The discussion on this paragraph was parked for informal consultations.

Paragraph 35

• Costa Rica suggested deleting the first sentence of paragraph 35(b), arguing that beginning the section with a reiteration of the importance of the Financial Rules distracted from the purpose of the paragraph, which is the reserve fund and its mechanisms.

• The President stated that he was willing to remove the sentence in question.

• Costa Rica also said that if flexibility is being indicated for the application of rule 8.4, there should be flexibility on rule 8.1(d) in order to have “holistic flexibility”.

• The President noted that the treaty would go bankrupt if states do not pay their dues.

• Mexico said that the Financial Rules are pivotal to the operational health of the treaty and should not be removed. Instead, it recommended moving the reference to Financial Rules to 35(a).

• Ghana supported the motions by Costa Rica and Mexico.

• The President, Chile, Germany, and Costa Rica agreed that moving the Financial Rules reference to the beginning of 35(a) was acceptable. This edit was adopted ad referendum.

• Ghana made a side note, saying that, under 35(a), Secretariat is allowed some flexibility in its decision-making processes and recommended the Secretariat be afforded the same flexibility when applying the Financial Rules.

Paragraph 36

• Poland agreed to the proposed period for the CSP6 in August 2020 but noted that having back-to-back meetings with other disarmament treaty bodies wouldn’t allow delegations sufficient time to prepare for CSP6.

• The President expressed sympathy with this but said the availability of venue limited the options available and that the ATT Secretariat was consulting with the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs on the dates.

• Poland also said that one preparatory meeting should be sufficient next year.

• In his response, the president highlighted the working paper from Mexico and Costa Rica on working methods was valuable and that hopefully the incoming president and the Management Committee will examine the document and provide opportunity for all to express their views.

• Paragraph 36 was adopted.

Consideration of the financial matters-related paragraphs

• Informal, closed consultations were held until 17.00 on paragraphs 23, 24, 29, 30, and 34.

• The President introduced the proposed amendments to these paragraphs as a “package” of compromises.

Paragraph 23

• In the fourth line of the paragraph, the reference to the report on the work of the VTF for the period August 2018 to August 2019 (ATT/VTF/2019/CHAIR/531/Conf.Rep) was deleted. A new sentence was added at the end of this paragraph that “takes note of its report ATT/VTF/2019/CHAIR/531/Conf.Rep and the
different views expressed thereon”.

**Paragraph 24**

- This paragraph, noting the Guidance for the VTF Project Evaluation, and welcoming the decision of the VTF undertaking outreach activities, remained unchanged to the draft report distributed in the morning.

**Paragraph 29**

- This paragraph, welcoming the report on the ATT Sponsorship Programme, remained unchanged.

**Paragraph 30**

- In this paragraph, the following wording was added after the second sentence: “Paragraph 2 on the selection criteria of Annex A of the Draft Administrative Guidelines is subject to the provisions of paragraph 36 in this report.”

**Paragraph 34**

- This paragraph, expressing deep concern about the financial situation of the Treaty, remained unchanged.

Two new paragraphs were added:

**New paragraph 35**

- “The Conference requested the Management Committee to prepare guidelines on the issue of arrangements with the Secretariat in relation to the discharge of its financial obligations [reference financial rule 8.1(d)] for consideration at CSP6.”

**New paragraph 36**

- “No state shall be prejudiced by rule 8.1(d) in applying for support from the ATT Voluntary Trust Fund (VTF) or the ATT Sponsorship Programme until CSP6, when this matter will be considered.”

**Paragraph 37**

- The old paragraph 37 became paragraph 38 due to the addition of paragraphs.

**Voluntary reserve fund**

- The President noted there were some proposals for changing the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the voluntary reserve fund as contained in the draft proposal to address problems related to financial liquidity (ATT/CSP5.MC/2019/MC/534/Conf. PropFinLiq), issued by the Management Committee. He informed that the ToRs will be issued as .Rev1 of the draft report.

- The second bullet point in the draft report was deleted.

- The forth bullet point has additional language at the end, reading, “for the current financial period.”

- In the next bullet point “but at least within 12 months,” is replaced with “but at least within the same financial period.” In the next sentence “those drawdowns,” is replaced with “The total amount of drawdowns...”. The paragraph has an addition at the end, reading, “pertaining to the costs of the ATT Secretariat.”

- The penultimate bullet point has an addition as a second sentence: “The ATT Secretariat will inform the Management Committee when the target is reached and will inform potential contributing States Parties and signatory States that the target has been reached.”

- A new bullet point was added thereafter: “In the event of termination of the activities of the Voluntary Reserve Fund, the funds shall be returned to the States Parties and signatory States who contributed to them.”

- A few minor changes were made to the last bullet point. “He,” in the last sentence, was replaced with “The Head of the Secretariat”. In the last sentence, “each” CSP was replaced with “the” CSP.

**Adoption of the report**

- The changed paragraphs, as well as the final report as a whole, were adopted.
An insightful discussion took place at the side event organised by the Parliamentary Forum on Small Arms and Light Weapons (PFSALW) and the Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations in Geneva, highlighting the importance of parliamentary action in promoting the universalisation and implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). An expert panel discussed various aspects of the topic with focus on Asia, including a gender equality perspective.

Honourable Syed Naveed Qamar, Member of Parliament from Pakistan and member of PFSALW, highlighted the importance of controlling small arms and light weapons (SALW) proliferation in order to achieve sustainable development. Given porous borders, regional instability, and conflicts, Pakistan suffers from uncontrolled, easy, and affordable access to arms. Women are exposed to SALW-related violence to a large extent and the need for continued improvement is palpable. Parliamentarians are vital to introduce relevant domestic legislation and to serve as a “watchdog” in relation to the government on their compliance with arms control legislation. In the case of non-signatory states to the ATT, such as Pakistan, parliamentarians can create parliamentary caucus groups and strive for proper dialogue with the government to address the rationale behind not committing to the Treaty.

Ms. Yoko Owatari, First Secretary of the Delegation of Japan, highlighted the dangers posed by illicit arms in the hands of terrorist groups and organised illegal groups, which undermine security, productivity, freedom of movement, and protection of communities in Asia. States that suffer from domestic conflicts—such as Philippines, Indonesia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Afghanistan—all face the risk of uncontrolled SALW transfers. The ATT is important because it is a legally binding instrument. She noted that parliamentarians have important roles in promoting universalisation of the ATT through awareness-raising and access to information.

Ms Nadee Gunaratne, Attorney at Law, WILPF Sri Lanka, described the growth of organised crime...
in the country as linked with growth in political violence. Consultations by the organisation showed that one reason women refrain from entering politics is the threat of armed violence. A Sectorial Oversight Committee and Women Caucus of the National Action Plans for UN Security Council Resolution 1325 is established to foster the understanding of the importance of the Women, Security and Peace (WPS) agenda among members of parliament and civil society. However, there is a potential for greater collaboration between parliamentarians, gender advocates, and civil society. Additionally, Sri Lanka needs to showcase possible points of WPS-related intervention in key parliamentary decision-making and oversight processes. Research and analysis on the topic are vital for parliamentary action.

Mr. Ulf Lindell, Minister Counsellor, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Department for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, emphasised the important parliamentary roles in relation to the universalisation and implementation of the ATT and also in regard to the UN Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (UNPoA) and the 2030 Agenda, in particular Sustainable Development Goal 16. For example, parliamentarians have a mandate to introduce relevant new legislation and to decide on budget allocation needed for their effective implementation. Parliamentarians can also create political will by inspiring other stakeholders to become involved. In Sweden, an Export Control Council exists to provide oversight which includes parliamentarians from all political parties that give advice to the government on certain non-routine cases.

The discussion, moderated by Ms. Karin Olofsson, Secretary General of the PFSALW, covered a wide scope including contributions from the audience. For example, concern about a general declining political interest in effective ATT implementation was raised. It was stressed that parliamentarians are key actors to sustain the political momentum and to ensure adequate budgetary resources for implementation. The need to increase coordination and collaboration between civil society and parliamentarians was highlighted. To enhance the pace of universalisation, one way forward is to exchange good practices and strategies between sub-regions.

SIDE EVENT REPORT: THE FUTURE OF ARMED DRONES IN EXPORT CONTROLS
Wim Zwijnenburg of PAX and Rachel Stohl of the Stimson Center

With recent headlines about drones being shot down or used to target civilians and critical infrastructure, the debate around drone proliferation and expanding use is more relevant than ever today. On the margins of the Fifth Conference of State Parties to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), PAX and Stimson Center continued to highlight the latest developments in the field of military drone development, production, and use in various conflicts throughout the world. In previous events the two organisations highlighted how existing use threatens to undermine existing legal principles around the use of lethal force and how the ATT is already a leading mechanism for states to undertake strict risk assessments. As more countries aim to acquire and use military drones in clandestine cross-border operations or in support of armed groups in regional armed conflicts, states must be clear of their existing obligations.

The well-attended breakfast meeting with a full room early on the morning of Thursday 29 August signaled the growing interest among states to deal with challenges around armed drones.

Wim Zwijnenburg from PAX kicked off the meeting with his presentation that outlined how the global drone market is rapidly growing with lucrative opportunities for defence industries aiming for drone production. Recent use of armed drones by various states and non-state actors in Libya, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, the Persian Gulf, Saudi
Arabia, and Turkey shows that armed forces are rapidly including military drones in their tactics, as they provide a low-cost, low-risk means to collect intelligence and strike opponents, which previously was not possible with crewed aircrafts. Developments in theatres around the world also show the line between military and civilian drones is blurring, with parts, components, and technology becoming easier to acquire. The types of military drones are also getting smaller, cheaper, have longer flight durations, range, and lethality of payload. The ease of assembling military drones from various civilian components will likely challenge existing arms export control mechanisms.

Rachel Stohl from the Stimson Center briefly reviewed why existing export control mechanisms such as the Wassenaar Arrangement and the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) are not adequate to tackle the issues outlined previously. She noted that those regimes are limited in participation and voluntary in their application. Moreover, the use of drones would not be addressed in these export focused mechanisms. Stohl outlined the how the 2016 United States-led Joint Declaration process on use and export of uncrewed aerial vehicles is being developed into a political declaration, yet this process faces serious questions around the lack of transparency and inclusiveness. There are also legitimate concerns that, in the absence of progressive language and ambitions, it will undermine existing export agreements. She underlined that there is currently no obvious multilateral forum where both use and export of armed drones can be discussed, despite repeated calls from UN special rapporteurs, civil society, and international organisations. Lastly, Stohl posed the question as to whether more controls are needed and what those might try to achieve.

For more information on proliferation see PAX’s 2018 report: https://www.paxforpeace.nl/publications/all-publications/unmanned-ambitions

and Stimson’s report on the ATT and drones https://www.stimson.org/content/arms-trade-treaty-and-drones
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