Thank you Madam Chair,

Control Arms sees value in the continued division of this Working Group’s priority areas of work among the subgroups and welcome the progress that has been made so far in exploring issues relating to the implementation of Articles 5, 6 & 7 and 11.

As we noted in our previous intervention in the sub-working group on Article 11, we support the continuation of work on Article 11 in accordance with the multi-year work plan. We also believe there is much work still to be done to support the implementation of Articles 6 and 7.

Over the past two years, the sub-working group on Article 5 has made excellent progress towards mapping out challenges that States Parties have had in establishing and maintaining a national control system and developing a national control list. We agree with other delegations that the Basic Guide to Establishing a National Control System developed by this sub-working group will serve as a valuable resource for governmental officials, contributing to the strengthening of the Treaty’s general implementation. Control Arms considers that this provides a strong foundation on which we can begin the examination of other operative aspects of the ATT. Therefore, going forward, we support the proposal that Article 9 becomes a priority area for this Working Group, and that a medium-term work plan is developed, while maintaining flexibility to address issues in more or less detail, depending on the wishes of the group.

Given that arms in transit are particularly susceptible to diversion, a joined-up analysis of Articles 9 and 11 would help to address common challenges and interlinkages between the application of these articles. We therefore suggest that consideration is given to hosting combined sessions of the relevant working groups in order to explore synergies and common understandings.

We would also propose that in the period following CSP5, the sub-working group on Articles 6 & 7 select a number of priority areas for consideration, with a focus on substantive exchanges - as called for by the delegations of Belgium and Switzerland. For example, we believe it would be beneficial to facilitate a wider understanding of how different states have implemented and comply with Article 6.2. It would be useful to gain an understanding of the international and regional agreements individual States Parties must consider as part of their arms transfers decision-making processes.

In addition, specific aspects of Article 7 could also be explored. For example, there could be an examination of how States Parties conduct a practical assessment of the risk that an arms export could be used to commit or facilitate a serious violation of International Humanitarian Law; while consideration could also be given to how States Parties operationalize criteria relating to transnational organized crime and terrorism.