Thank you, Mr. President.

Control Arms welcomes the idea of a Universalization Toolkit and Welcome Pack, and we note that these documents aim to answer a series of important questions about the Arms Trade Treaty, its benefits, and the importance of the Treaty’s universalization. However, although the documents represent an admirable effort to present concise and comprehensive answers to common questions about the Treaty, we do feel they would benefit from some amendment.

We have a few comments first regarding the structure.

We note what Mr. Dladla said about the Toolkit and Welcome Pack being two separate documents intended for separate target audiences. However, they in fact overlap substantially. We think the documents would be stronger if they were merged into a single document based on the longer Welcome Pack, perhaps preceded by a pared down Toolkit in the form of an Executive Summary.

In their introduction of the Treaty, the documents do not mention or make reference to the actual object and purpose of the Treaty as laid out in Article 1.

By not fully addressing the Treaty’s purposes of reducing human suffering, contributing to international and regional peace, security, and stability, and promoting cooperation, transparency, and responsible action by States Parties, the Toolkit and Welcome Pack do not get at the heart of the Treaty and the primary motivations behind its negotiation and ratification. Only by fully addressing the Treaty’s object and purpose can the Toolkit and Welcome Pack properly frame and introduce the Arms Trade Treaty.

In addition, the structure of the documents appears inconsistent with the headings agreed on in “Annex B” to last year’s report from the Working Group on Treaty Universalization.

As you have noted, Annex B listed a number of questions and themes the Toolkit would ideally address, and this was approved by CSP4. The documents do address many important questions relevant to the Treaty and its implementation, but among the questions from Annex B not appearing in the Toolkit and Welcome Pack are:

- Why is the universalization of the ATT important?
- What are the reasons States give for not joining the Treaty?
- What difference is the Treaty making in the global arms trade?
- What role do civil society organizations play in Treaty implementation?
Though we understand that it was not feasible to answer these questions in this iteration of the documents, we do encourage the inclusion of these questions in future versions.

In addition, we have a few comments on how the documents discuss the Treaty’s relevance to armed conflict, illicit transfers, and non-state activity.

We note that the ATT’s provisions apply equally when the importing state is a party to an international or non-international armed conflict, as well as when the importing state is not party to any conflicts. The Toolkit and Welcome Pack, however, repeatedly refer to the Treaty’s provisions and the benefits of those provisions specifically in the context of armed conflict. The Treaty applies in all circumstances, and its benefits accrue both during and outside of armed conflict; we therefore feel the documents would be stronger with greater acknowledgement of the benefits of the Treaty both in war and in peace, and would avoid inadvertently suggesting a more limited scope.

Similarly, the Arms Trade Treaty regulates licit transfers of weapons and instructs States Parties to reject licit weapons transfers to legitimate state actors when certain conditions are met or there is a risk of certain negative outcomes and harms. The Toolkit and Welcome Pack, however, have a significant focus on the illicit transfers of weapons and the use of those weapons by criminal organizations or non-state actors. This is, of course, a widely appreciated aspect of the Treaty, and Control Arms certainly welcomes unreservedly efforts to reduce the availability of arms for harmful purposes by non-state actors and criminal organizations, and to reduce the prevalence of unexpected or illicit end use of exported weapons. However, the application of the Treaty is much wider than this, and we recommend some rebalancing of the Toolkit and Welcome Pack to better reflect the primary aims and objectives of the Treaty.

We have some detailed comments and suggestions that we would like to submit to the co-chairs in writing, which we hope will be a constructive contribution to the Toolkit and Welcome Pack.

Thank you, Mr. President.