Mr. Chairman,

1. At the outset, my delegation would like to join the other delegations in commending your hard work and dedication.

2. Continuing on from the constructive discussions so far, I’d like to begin by referring to the some of the issues we discussed yesterday. Concerning the rules on decision-making, namely rules 33 and 35 on the draft rules of procedures, my delegation believes that all substantial matters should be decided upon the principle of consensus. Nonetheless, we believe that this principle should not be interpreted to grant any single state the power of veto, especially in relation to decisions on procedural matters.

3. In regard to the participation of NGOs, my delegation shares the view put forward by Norwegian colleagues that NGOs perform an important role in the issue of arms trade control, and therefore should be allowed wider participation in the deliberative process of the ATT.

4. Now I would like to turn to some substantive matters. Although we have witnessed the draft ATT beginning to take shape, there are still many dissenting views on the core issues. My delegation hopes that we can overcome these differences and reach a consensus text at the UN Diplomatic Conference in July.
5. Our objective is creating an ATT that is both substantive and effective. Indeed, the feasibility of an ATT depends on its effectiveness in controlling trade in conventional arms as well as the willingness of Member States to comply to its terms. In this connection, I would like to emphasize two principle factors which should guide our deliberations moving forward.

First, we need an ATT that can be effectively implemented. Setting the bar too high or too low causes difficulty in this regard.

Second, we need a wider range of participants. In order to attain the highest possible common international standards, the future ATT should be inclusive of major arms producers, exporters and importers.

6. In regards to scope, my delegation has already expressed its support of the so-called “7+1+1 format.” It is our view that in order for an ATT to achieve its fundamental goals, the scope of the treaty needs to be comprehensive and cover all conventional arms, SALW and ammunition. However, we are willing to support a draft that excludes ammunitions if that is the consensus.

7. My delegation has one caveat regarding technology. Due to the difficulty of defining and establishing clear standards for technology as well as complications in its effective control, my delegation believes that technology should be excluded from the scope of the Treaty. In the same light, my delegation notes identical complications regarding technology transfer, and thereby believes that technology transfer should also be removed.

8. On transhipment, my delegation would like to reiterate that we should take into account the practical implementability of the ATT and believes that strong obligations to transitting and transhipping countries may limit the practical implementation of the Treaty. It is virtually an impossible task for countries to fully monitor and control vessels that transit or tranship through their territories, and any attempt to that task would cause only overwhelming administrative complications.
9. On the reporting mechanism, my delegation believes that we should take into account the particular concerns of countries regarding the duty of reporting those activities covered by the ATT, in relation to their national security interests. Thus, it is our view that the reporting should be voluntary, and that the ATT stipulates basic elements that are to be included in the report. In regard to items other than those basic elements, my delegation believes that States Parties to the Treaty should enjoy discretion in the details they wish to report.

I will save other matters, including on the draft report, for a later statement.

I thank you.
**Creation of Secretariat**

8. A strong verification mechanism would greatly facilitate achievement of the goals of an ATT. One option is an implementation support secretariat that could assist with constant monitoring and serve as a verification mechanism. In this vein, the current Wassenaar implementation practice will give us useful food for thought.

9. We support the creation of a dedicated implementing body inside the UN. Such a body should play a supporting role, for instance through the provision of expert assistance, the facility of information exchange or the provision of secretarial support in ATT meetings. The secretariat could be indirectly tasked with verifying implementation of the treaty by regularly disclosing data and implementation reports submitted by the States.

**Ratification and Entry into Force**

10. On the subject of ratification, entry into force can be conditional both on a set numbers of states ratifying the Treaty, and on ratification by particular types of states (for example major arms exporters).

**Other: Feasibility**

11. We already have many regulatory instruments, mechanisms, and guidelines on arms transfer controls at the local, regional, and internationals levels. As such, it will be imperative to churn out the highest common international standard for the transfers of conventional arms and against their diversion to illicit uses. In doing so, the ATT should not lower national or regional standards on arms transfers. Indeed, its effectiveness can even be enhanced in some critical aspects.

Mr. Chairman,

17. Let me once again offer our firm support for full codification of the ATT by the target date. My delegation can assure you of our constructive participation in the deliberation process in this session and beyond.
Thank you.