



Arms Trade Treaty
4th Conference of States Parties
Tokyo, 20-24 August 2018
Agenda Point 5: Treaty Implementation

**General Remarks concerning Treaty
Implementation**

Mr. Chair

In our view, the discussions in the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation and its sub-groups between CSP3 and CSP4 have been a positive experience. The two meetings permitted valuable discussions on different practices and experiences in implementing the Treaty. These discussions were also helpful to understand the different challenges States Parties are facing in implementing the ATT and to identify some of the priorities that need to be addressed in the coming years.

The working group also developed first concrete outcomes and reference documents that assist States in implementing their core obligations under the ATT. We welcome the fact that work in this area has become very practical in nature.

With regard to the Sub-Group on Articles 6 and 7, we welcome the documents submitted to the CSP for validation/consideration. As stated in the Chair's report, it is important that these texts are not simply endorsed by the CSP but remain living documents that are reviewed and updated as appropriate.

While work on Articles 6 and 7 in the preparation of CSP4 has been productive, it also underlined the interest to continue this discussion and to further clarify different aspects relating to their implementation. Going forward, we see value in not only shedding more light on aspects that were discussed this year (for instance, gender based violence) but also on other practical aspects that are important for the effective implementation of these articles at the heart of the ATT. In particular, we believe that we should pay close attention to paragraph 3 of article 6 or paragraphs 1 to 3 of article 7.

Concerning work on Article 11, we agree that it should continue to be a thematic focus for the WGETI beyond CSP4. We also believe that leveraging the knowledge and expertise of civil society and academia as well as industry is particularly useful in taking our efforts on diversion forward. A lot of research has been undertaken in this area and the practical, first hand knowledge of these actors constitutes an important contribution to the Working Group's discussions. In that regard, we also welcome the documents submitted as annex to the report coming from the sub-working group on article 11.

Regarding Article 5, we think that a welcome pack with the basic documents would indeed be very useful. This could offer a practical toolbox and the information contained therein should be as concise and relevant to the practical implementation of Article 5 as possible. We hope that it will be possible to take these two documents forward based on the proposed list of contents.

In our opinion, the sub-working group on Article 5 is the appropriate place to exchange information on national systems and best practices. Such exchanges are especially important for States Parties that are still implementing national control systems and face similar challenges. With the same consideration in mind, it could also be beneficial to exchange experiences in the implementation of VTF projects.

Regarding methods of work, Switzerland believes that two sessions sufficiently distant in time to enable reflection to go forward and the development of concrete outcomes to be a sound approach. With regard to the duration of the WGETI sessions, we would welcome 2 full days but should keep, as a minimum, the time currently allocated to it.

We also believe it is important to nominate the WGETI chair as early as possible. This would allow us to rapidly establish the work plan for the coming cycle. Also, it would enable us to come well prepared to the first meeting of the working group. Furthermore, as there may be overlaps between different working groups and sub-working groups, we also see a need for careful coordination with a view to ensure that discussions and presentations correspond clearly to the work the Working Group or the sub-working groups focus on.

Lastly, we welcome the documents put forward by the Working Group. They provide a solid basis for further work. As I have already underlined, it would be useful to consider them as "living documents", as proposed by the Chair. We also welcome their posting on the ATT-Website.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.