



# THE ARMS TRADE TREATY: CHALLENGES FOR THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATES PARTIES

SIBYLLE BAUER, PAUL BEIJER AND MARK BROMLEY

## I. Introduction

The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) is the first international legally binding agreement to establish standards for regulating the trade in conventional arms and preventing the illicit trade in weapons.<sup>1</sup> The United Nations negotiating process that led to the ATT began in 2006 and ended in April 2013, when the UN General Assembly adopted the text of the treaty.<sup>2</sup> The process was supported by a coalition that brought together predominantly arms exporting states with states that primarily import arms or act as transit states. Support came from an uncommonly broad geographical range of countries.<sup>3</sup> The process brought together UN member states, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and arms industry representatives. It benefited from the input of NGOs and government officials with experience from both the arms control field (where the focus is on banning or regulating particular categories of weapon) and the export controls field (where the focus is on standards for controlling international arms transfers).<sup>4</sup>

Under the ATT, states parties are obliged to block arms exports if they contravene their international obligations or would be used in the commission of genocide or other war crimes. States parties are also obliged to assess, among other things, the risk that arms exports would undermine peace and security or could be used to violate international humanitarian law or international human rights law. States parties will also submit initial reports on their implementation of the treaty, detailing their transfer control systems, and annual reports on their arms exports and imports, detailing the

<sup>1</sup> The full text of the Arms Trade Treaty and other treaties discussed in this paper can be found at United Nations Treaty Collection, <<http://treaties.un.org/Pages/CTCTreaties.aspx?id=26>>. The UN Firearms Protocol is also legally binding but only covers controls on the trade in firearms. The ATT covers controls on the trade in all conventional arms covered by the UN Register of Conventional Arms, with central provisions applying also to ammunition and components.

<sup>2</sup> On the background to the UN process see Holtom, P. and Bromley, M., 'Arms trade treaty negotiations', *SIPRI Yearbook 2013: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2013), pp. 423–31.

<sup>3</sup> See Holtom, P., Bromley, M., Wezeman, P. D. and Wezeman, S. T., 'Developments in arms transfers, 2012', *SIPRI Yearbook 2013: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2013), pp. 243–63.

<sup>4</sup> See Bromley, M., Cooper, N. and Holtom, P., 'The UN Arms Trade Treaty: arms export controls, the human security agenda and the lessons of history', *International Affairs*, vol. 88, no. 5 (Sep. 2012), pp. 1040–44.

## SUMMARY

● Before the end of 2014 at least 50 states will have ratified the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), triggering its entry into force. States and NGOs can then turn their attention to the serious matter of developing effective mechanisms of treaty implementation. While the ATT provides a loose framework for what these mechanisms will look like, many details remain undefined. Key decisions include agreeing the structure, tasks and funding modalities of the ATT Secretariat and templates for national reporting. Formal decisions on these issues can be taken during the first Conference of States Parties (CSP1), which must be held within a year of the treaty entering into force. However, serious discussions can—and should—begin well in advance. This paper outlines the various options for key aspects of ATT implementation and draws relevant lessons from existing arms control and export control instruments.



nature of their arms transfers. In order for the ATT to fulfil its potential of bringing greater responsibility and transparency to the international arms trade, states parties and other ATT stakeholders will need to give thought to the mechanisms needed to enable effective treaty implementation and to facilitate universalization. While the treaty lays out a basic framework for implementation, many key decisions can only be taken after it enters into force.

The First Conference of States Parties (CSP1) must be held within a year of the treaty entering into force. A number of issues will need to be considered before CSP1, and some crucial decisions will need to be taken by it. This paper outlines the various options that are currently on the table and also draws relevant lessons from existing arms control and export control instruments.

## II. The current state of play in the ATT process

Article 22 of the ATT stipulates that the treaty will enter into force 90 days after the 50th state deposits its instrument of ratification. As of 1 September 2014, 44 states had ratified the ATT, and 118 states had signed it.<sup>5</sup> More than 20 states have indicated that they are close to ratification, suggesting that the treaty is likely to enter into force by the end of 2014.

Under Article 17 of the ATT, CSP1 has to take place within one year of the treaty's entry into force. States parties will need to decide the date for the conference, and the period April to September 2015 has been identified as the likely time frame. However, the date that is chosen will need to take into account the timing of other related meetings, including the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, scheduled for late April or early May 2015. Other factors that will influence the timing of CSP1 are the desire to maintain the current momentum of the ATT process, the need to allow sufficient time to prepare for a successful meeting and the desire to give as many states as possible the chance to ratify the treaty before the meeting takes place. Mexico's offer to host CSP1 has met with general acceptance.<sup>6</sup>

Article 17.1 of the ATT states that—pending the creation of the ATT Secretariat—a 'provisional Secretariat' shall convene CSP1, and Article 18 entails that this provisional Secretariat shall 'be responsible for the administrative functions covered under this Treaty', pending the outcome of CSP1. The treaty provides no guidance as to how a decision to constitute a provisional Secretariat should be taken or its format and location. Mexico has been mentioned as a possible candidate, as has the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) in Geneva. Others have advocated a shared solution whereby a group of states would take on the responsibilities associated with the provisional Secretariat.

A series of preparatory meetings will be hosted by different states during 2014 and early 2015 to help prepare for CSP1. Meeting invitations will be extended to those governments that have signed or ratified the ATT and

### ***A number of issues will need to be considered before the First Conference of States Parties***

<sup>5</sup> For current information on the ATT see UN Office for Disarmament, <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/ATT/>>.

<sup>6</sup> Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Mexico welcomes the first anniversary of the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty', Press Release 131, 3 Apr. 2014, <<http://www.sre.gob.mx/en/index.php/archived-press-releases/2445-mexico-welcomes-the-first-anniversary-of-the-un-arms-trade-treaty>>.



NGOs that have played a role in promoting it. Although formal decisions will be the prerogative of states that have ratified the ATT, the importance of including signatories in the process cannot be overstated; taking the views of signatories that have yet to ratify the treaty into account regarding long-term operational decisions will improve the prospects for a successful treaty. The precise number of preparatory meetings has yet to be decided, but at least three meetings seem likely. Mexico will host the first preparatory meeting in Mexico City on 8–9 September 2014. Germany, Switzerland, and Trinidad and Tobago have offered to hold subsequent preparatory meetings. Germany has offered to host a meeting in late November, and Switzerland has stated that it would prefer to host the final meeting before CSP1. Mexico has offered to provide a common chair for all of the preparatory meetings in order to ensure continuity and focus. This offer also appears to have been generally accepted.

*Creating a Secretariat that has broad support among states parties will be crucial for the long-term health of the treaty*

A long list of issues could potentially be addressed at CSP1. Article 17 of the ATT describes a number of questions to be treated at future CSPs. However, according to the treaty, only one of these must be addressed during CSP1: adoption by consensus of the rules of procedure for the CSP. Beyond this explicitly mandated task, it will be important for CSP1 to establish the location, role and financing of the Secretariat. Creating an effective Secretariat that has broad support among states parties will be crucial for the long-term health of the treaty. Other important issues include agreeing on the financing of meetings and work under the treaty, and templates for national reporting.

Building common ground on these issues before CSP1 takes place will be necessary in order to ensure the success of the conference. Lessons learned from other treaties indicate that delaying important decisions could be detrimental. For example, the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) entered into force in 2010, but states are still trying to agree a funding model for the treaty's implementation support unit (ISU).<sup>7</sup> Experience from the ATT negotiations and other international processes indicates that states are often unwilling, or unable, to firm up their positions until a final decision is imminent. Given the number of issues that CSP1 ideally should resolve, the preparatory process will be challenging and will require serious groundwork at the regional and national level.

The following four sections describe some of the difficult issues mentioned above: rules of procedure for the CSP; the location, staffing and tasks of the Secretariat; funding modalities; and reporting templates.

## Rules of procedure

Article 17 of the ATT states that the 'Conference of States Parties shall adopt by consensus its rules of procedure at its first session'. Debates about rules of procedure and the meaning of the term 'by consensus' were recurring themes throughout the ATT negotiating process. At the start of the process, states agreed that results would be adopted 'by consensus', although the pre-

<sup>7</sup> 'Non-paper submitted by the coordinators on general status and operation of the Convention on the subject of resource mobilization for the financing of the future ISU', Convention on Cluster Munitions, Jan. 2014, <<http://www.clusterconvention.org/files/2014/01/Non-paper-financing-of-ISU-Coordinators-on-General-Status-and-Operation-of-the-Convention.pdf>>.



cise meaning of the term was never defined. During the treaty's negotiation states that opposed a strong and robust ATT sought to use the consensus requirement to weaken its text or to block particular discussions, as has also happened at the Conference on Disarmament.<sup>8</sup> However, these efforts were successfully overcome by the chairmanship of Roberto García Moritán and his successor, Peter Woolcott. Both Chairs managed to keep all negotiating parties engaged without allowing any state to use the consensus requirement to block discussions. At the final negotiating conference in March 2013 Iran, North Korea and Syria were able to veto the adoption of the ATT text. However, the process of negotiation had generated a high level of support for the text, such that it was subsequently adopted by an overwhelming majority in the UN General Assembly.<sup>9</sup> CSP1 faces the challenge of developing permanent rules of procedure that embody the balance that emerged during the negotiating process.

On the one hand, CSP1 will only be attended by states that have signed or ratified the ATT, so agreeing the rules of procedure should be less contentious than the negotiating process. On the other hand, while some states may strongly support majority voting on key issues, others may be wary of adopting such a procedure as it could give potential future participants—such as China, India and Russia—a reason to stay outside the treaty. The ATT specifies a decision-making process for only one situation: the adoption of amendments to the text of the treaty. Article 20.3 states that the parties shall make 'every effort to achieve consensus on each amendment'. However, if these efforts fail, amendments can be adopted by a three-quarters majority vote. This rule establishes a middle ground for adopting amendments. It takes into account lessons learned from other treaties, in particular from the landmine and cluster munitions treaties, where amendments are adopted by a two-thirds majority, and the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, where amendments can be blocked by a single negative vote.<sup>10</sup> It represents a model for general rules of procedure that would safeguard the balance that was achieved during the negotiating process.

***The ATT specifies a decision-making process for only one situation: the adoption of amendments to the text of the treaty***

<sup>8</sup> Acheson, R., 'The failure of consensus', Arms Trade Treaty Monitor, no. 6.10, 29 Mar. 2013, <<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/att/monitor/ATTMonitor6.10.pdf>>, pp.1–2.

<sup>9</sup> The resolution to adopt the treaty was recorded by a vote of 154 in favour, 3 against and 23 abstentions. 'Following lengthy process which began in the 1990s, General Assembly today passes Arms Trade Treaty', UNODA Update, 2 Apr. 2013, <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/update/20130402/>>.

<sup>10</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (APM Convention), opened for signature 3–4 Dec. 1997, entered into force 1 Mar. 1999; Convention on Cluster Munitions, opened for signature 3 Dec. 2008, entered into force 1 Aug. 2010; and Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), opened for signature 24 Sep. 1996, not in force.



## **The Secretariat: where, who, what and how**

### *Location of the Secretariat*

The treaty does not specify a location for the Secretariat or any potential links with existing structures such as the UNODA. Offers to host the permanent Secretariat have been made by Austria, Switzerland, and Trinidad and Tobago. Additionally, Finland and Sweden have proposed candidates for Head of Secretariat. The UNODA has also been mentioned as a potential host, but this suggestion has been met with resistance from a number of signatories, which argue that only states party to the treaty—rather than the whole UN membership—should govern the Secretariat, and no formal proposal has resulted.

Regardless of the Secretariat's location, maintaining a close working relationship with the UN is both practical and efficacious. For example, through its provision of both administrative services and support for treaty-related events, the UN system could help the ATT Secretariat avoid duplicating already existing administrative infrastructure. The utility of maintaining a relationship between the UN and ATT is further evidenced by the need for a future ATT Secretariat to work in concert with other UN instruments, such as the 2001 UN Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (POA) and UN Security Council Resolution 1540.<sup>11</sup> A stand-alone secretariat with UNODA administrative support has been the model used for the support units associated with the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC).<sup>12</sup>

In their efforts to identify a location that supports the effective and independent function of the ATT Secretariat, states should keep in mind a number of factors. These could include:

- (a) the support that is offered by the prospective host country, such as premises or administrative infrastructure;
- (b) the possibilities for exploiting synergies with existing UN secretariat services;
- (c) the local availability of expertise, such as diplomatic, research and NGO expertise on ATT-related issues;
- (d) the logistical environment, such as flight connections, as well as the availability of translation and interpretation services;
- (e) the operational efficiency from the perspective of states parties, such as possible back-to-back scheduling with other ATT-relevant meetings and conferences in the arms control, disarmament and small arms areas;
- (f) the ease of intersessional contact between Secretariat staff and representatives from states parties; and

<sup>11</sup> United Nations, Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, A/CONF.192/15, 20 July 2001; and UN Security Council Resolution 1540, 28 Apr. 2004.

<sup>12</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, opened for signature 10 Apr. 1972, entered into force 26 Mar. 1975; Biological Weapons Convention, Implementation Support Unit, <[http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/\(httpPages\)/16C37624830EDAE5C12572BC0044DFC1?OpenDocument](http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/(httpPages)/16C37624830EDAE5C12572BC0044DFC1?OpenDocument)>; and Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, opened for signature 13 Jan. 1993, entered into force 29 Apr. 1997.



(g) the symbolism of the location (e.g. whether the country is affected by the illicit arms trade or is a significant arms producer, whether the city is a 'UN Capital' and so on).

#### *Staffing and tasks of the permanent secretariat*

Article 17 of the ATT mandates the CSP to 'consider and decide the tasks and budget of the Secretariat'. Article 18 lists a number of tasks the Secretariat will need to perform and provides further guidance on its composition, stating that it 'shall be adequately staffed' in order to perform its responsibilities but 'within a minimized structure'. The treaty text reflects a compromise achieved during negotiations, whereby the Secretariat would start small but that no obstacles should exist to adding further tasks on the basis of practical experience and with due regard to the financial consequences.

The underlying issue is whether to have a more 'active' or a more 'passive' Secretariat, such as with regard to one of the responsibilities assigned under Article 18: receiving and distributing states parties' reports on treaty implementation and annual reports on arms exports and imports. Here, the Secretariat could confine itself to a 'letter box' role, receiving and distributing reports without scrutinizing their content. This has been the approach of the UNODA in relation to states' reports on their implementation of the POA.<sup>13</sup> Alternatively, the Secretariat could actively engage in the reporting process by analysing states parties' input, querying possible inconsistencies or generating background text using open-source material. This has been the approach of the 1540 Committee in relation to states' reports on their systems for controlling transfers of dual-use goods and technologies.<sup>14</sup> The latter option would lead to more informative and accurate reporting, but these gains would need to be set against the resource implications and possible sensitivities about ceding too much initiative to the Secretariat.

A similar choice between an active or passive Secretariat will need to be made with regard to matching offers and requests for implementation assistance. Experience from existing instruments indicates that the Secretariat would need to play an active role in identifying states' needs and connecting them with providers of assistance if its efforts are to have a real impact.<sup>15</sup> This is particularly important given the ATT's focus on improving states' transfer control systems, a field where a large number of outreach and assistance programmes already exist.<sup>16</sup> In order to be effective, the Secretariat will need to think creatively and constructively about how its efforts to match requests with offers can take into account these ongoing activities and at the same time avoid unduly long response times. Another issue related to implementation assistance is whether the Secretariat's matching efforts should also extend to presumptive states parties since, as signatories, they may have legal systems that require them to complete changes to their national

<sup>13</sup> UN Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Implementation Support System (POA: ISS), <<http://www.poa-iss.org/PoA/PoA.aspx>>.

<sup>14</sup> UN 1540 Committee, <<http://www.un.org/en/sc/1540/index.shtml>>.

<sup>15</sup> Bauer, S., 'Arms trade control capacity building: lessons from dual-use trade controls', SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, no. 2013/2, Mar. 2013, <[http://books.sipri.org/product\\_info?c\\_product\\_id=454](http://books.sipri.org/product_info?c_product_id=454)>.

<sup>16</sup> Holtom, P. and Bromley, M., 'Implementing an Arms Trade Treaty: mapping assistance to strengthen arms transfer controls', SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security no. 2012/2, July 2012, <[http://books.sipri.org/product\\_info?c\\_product\\_id=447](http://books.sipri.org/product_info?c_product_id=447)>.



systems before ratification. CSP1 should, at a minimum, reach conclusions regarding the location of the Secretariat, its head and its budget, to enable the setting up and start of practical work in support of states parties' efforts.

### **Funding modalities**

Article 17 of the ATT provides that the CSP 'shall adopt financial rules for itself as well as governing the funding of any subsidiary bodies it may establish as well as financial provisions governing the functioning of the Secretariat'. It also foresees that at 'each ordinary session, it shall adopt a budget for the financial period until the next ordinary session'.

Given the current international financial climate, the issue of funding is likely to be divisive. Options currently on the table for funding the ATT Secretariat and other activities under the treaty include voluntary contributions, assessed contributions by states parties or a hybrid model combining both approaches. Many states are unwilling to take on the long-term financial responsibility associated with assessed contributions, while others stress the need to avoid the instability that could result from reliance on voluntary contributions.

A range of options exists for hybrid models of funding. For example, assessed contributions could be limited to the fixed costs of the Secretariat, while the cost of CSPs could be funded by participants, and additional tasks and events could be funded through voluntary contributions. When discussing the possibility of assessed contributions, it will be important for states to understand the practical implications by looking at the costs of funding existing bodies comparable to a future ATT Secretariat. One existing Secretariat employs roughly 15 staff members, manages a volume of work that is larger than that foreseen in the ATT according to Article 18, has a smaller number of participating states than the minimum number set for entry into force of the ATT and is fully funded by assessed contributions using an adapted UN scale. The annual assessed contribution by the smallest states to this Secretariat is less than €2700. With a larger number of states sharing the burden, annual costs for smaller states to support the running of the ATT Secretariat via a system of assessed contributions could be even lower.

The cost of CSPs could be reduced by utilizing UN conference facilities and related services. Determining how such support would be financed (i.e. through the regular UN budget or otherwise) remains unclear. Furthermore, it is not known whether or not a General Assembly resolution requesting or deciding this is a prerequisite for such a support function. The pertinence of using UN facilities and services to support CSPs depends on determining where these meetings will be held. Some states advocate alternating between different geographical regions, while others argue for holding all CSPs in 'UN capitals' in order to minimize travel costs. The ongoing discussion about how to finance the CCM ISU has also generated various ideas about hybrid funding models that could be relevant to the ATT.<sup>17</sup>

Other related funding considerations that have been raised are the need to diversify the source of contributions and the possibility of a sponsorship programme that seeks to ensure full representation of states parties at CSPs.

<sup>17</sup> 'Non-paper submitted by the Coordinators' (note 7).



## Reporting templates

### *Templates for reporting on treaty implementation*

Under Article 13 of the ATT, each state party is obliged to provide the Secretariat with a report detailing ‘measures undertaken in order to implement this Treaty, including national laws, national control lists and other regulations and administrative measures’. The report must be provided within a year of the treaty’s entry into force for the state party, with later updates provided for any new measures ‘when appropriate’. The information contained in these reports will be crucial for assessing the level of implementation of the ATT. The reports also have the potential to promote good practices in the field of arms transfer controls by providing information on states’ national systems. In order to reach their full potential, states’ reports on treaty implementation will need to be comparable, something that would be greatly facilitated by the adoption of an agreed reporting template.

The ATT covers a wide range of issues and—in the absence of an agreed template—states’ reports may vary significantly in structure and content. Reports to the POA differed widely until a standardized reporting format was adopted, and the treaties on landmines and cluster munitions have also benefited from agreed templates for reporting on national implementation.<sup>18</sup> During the preparatory phase, states parties and signatories could set up a working group tasked with developing templates both for the one-off report on treaty implementation and for the annual report on arms transfers (see below). These could then be proposed at CSP1 for adoption.

In developing the template on treaty implementation, the working group could draw on the questionnaire developed by the Arms Trade Treaty-Baseline Assessment Project (ATT-BAP).<sup>19</sup> The questionnaire is aimed at helping states to assess whether or not they are in a position to sign and ratify the ATT and to identify areas where implementation assistance may be required. As such, it provides a solid basis for developing an agreed template for reporting on ATT implementation.

Consideration should be given to making these initial reports public as part of the effort to match needs and offers for implementation assistance. Public reporting is neither explicitly mandated in the ATT, nor is it explicitly ruled out. The early stages of treaty implementation provide an opportunity for setting a precedent in favour of public reporting. States can influence this process by making their own reports public at the time they are submitted to the ATT Secretariat.

### *Templates for reporting on arms transfers*

Article 13 of the ATT obliges each state party to provide the Secretariat, by the end of May each year, with ‘a report for the preceding calendar year concerning authorized or actual exports and imports of conventional arms’. These reports will be important for assessing international flows of arms and the effects of the ATT, as well as for helping the ATT achieve its goal of promoting ‘transparency and responsible action by states parties in the

<sup>18</sup> Holtom, P. and Bromley, M., *Implementing an Arms Trade Treaty: Lessons on Reporting and Monitoring from Existing Mechanisms*, SIPRI Policy Paper no. 28 (SIPRI: Stockholm, July 2011), <[http://books.sipri.org/product\\_info?c\\_product\\_id=426](http://books.sipri.org/product_info?c_product_id=426)>.

<sup>19</sup> Arms Trade Treaty-Baseline Assessment Project (ATT-BAP), <<http://www.armstrade.info>>.





international trade in conventional arms'. As with the reports on treaty implementation, the quality of these submissions would benefit from early adoption of agreed reporting templates.

In developing such templates, states will need to think about the future relationship between the ATT and the UN Register of Conventional Arms (UNROCA). Article 13 notes that ATT reports on arms transfers *may* contain the same information submitted to UNROCA. Some have suggested using UNROCA as the ATT reporting mechanism or replacing it with an ATT reporting mechanism. However, given the differences between the two instruments, this would be problematic. UNROCA is a universal instrument to which all states are requested to submit reports, while the ATT is only binding on states parties.<sup>20</sup> In addition, states are only 'invited' to submit reports on transfers of small arms and light weapons (SALW) to UNROCA, while this will be obligatory for ATT reporting. Additionally, UNROCA invites states to report on arms acquisitions from national production and military holdings, elements that are not part of ATT reporting.

Although the ATT has raised the profile of arms transfer issues, UNROCA has seen a fall in reporting levels in recent years. Only 58 states submitted reports in 2013, down from 126 in 2002. Against this background, states should be looking for ways to strengthen UNROCA and boost arms-transfers transparency via ATT reporting while ensuring that states are not unnecessarily burdened with additional work. One option would be to keep the ATT and UNROCA intact as separate instruments but to adopt an ATT reporting template that is based on the UNROCA template and contains additional—ATT-specific—components. These components could include requiring reports on SALW (which is mandated by the treaty) and having the reporting state specify whether the information provided refers to authorized or actual exports and imports. In this way, compiling the ATT and UNROCA reports would not impose an additional burden on states, since the contents of the first would form the basis for the second. When designing templates, attention should be given to retaining the possibility for states to voluntarily report more than the minimum required.

***National reports will be important for helping the ATT achieve its goal of promoting 'transparency and responsible action by states parties in the international trade in conventional arms'***

### III. Conclusions

States and NGOs that support the ATT process clearly have their work cut out between now and the end of CSPI if they are to ensure that the treaty is given the best possible chance of producing the desired effects on the international arms trade. In addressing each of the difficult issues on the table, it will be important to keep in mind the need to maintain the dynamism that characterized the ATT negotiating process. The ATT is nearly unique in terms of the broad spectrum of states that supported the process. It brought together states and NGOs from the fields of arms control and export controls. It also brought together predominantly arms-exporting states and predominantly arms-importing or -transiting states, and a broad geographi-

<sup>20</sup> UN Register of Conventional Arms, <<http://www.un-register.org/HeavyWeapons/Index.aspx>>.



cal range of states. All of these constituencies have a contribution to make to the success of the ATT, and all have a stake in a successful outcome. When deciding where to locate the Secretariat, what roles it should have and how to finance it, as well as rules of procedure for future CSPs and templates for national reporting, taking the views of all of these constituencies on board will be crucial.

### Abbreviations

ATT	Arms Trade Treaty
ATT-BAP	Arms Trade Treaty-Baseline Assessment Project
BWC	Biological Weapons Convention
CCM	Convention on Cluster Munitions
CSP	Conference of states parties
CSPs	Conferences of states parties
CSP1	First Conference of States Parties
CWC	Chemical Weapons Convention
ISU	Implementation support unit
NGO	Non-governmental organization
POA	United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects
SALW	Small arms and light weapons
UNODA	United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs
UNROCA	United Nations Register of Conventional Arms



## RECENT SIPRI PUBLICATIONS ON THE ARMS TRADE

### **Trends in international arms transfers, 2013**

Siemon T. Wezeman and Pieter D. Wezeman  
SIPRI Fact Sheet  
March 2014

### **China's Exports of Small Arms and Light Weapons**

Mark Bromley, Mathieu Duchâtel and Paul Holtom  
SIPRI Policy Paper no. 38  
October 2013

### **Arms trade control capacity building: lessons from dual-use trade controls**

SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security no. 2013/2  
Sibylle Bauer  
March 2013

### **Transfers of small arms and light weapons to fragile states: strengthening oversight and control**

SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security no. 2013/1  
Mark Bromley, Lawrence Dermody, Hugh Griffiths, Paul Holtom and Michael Jenks  
January 2013

### **Measuring international arms transfers**

Paul Holtom, Mark Bromley and Verena Simmel  
SIPRI Fact Sheet  
December 2012

### **Implementing an arms trade treaty: mapping assistance to strengthen arms transfer controls**

SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security no. 2012/2  
Paul Holtom and Mark Bromley  
July 2012

All SIPRI publications are available to buy or download at [www.sipri.org/publications](http://www.sipri.org/publications)

**SIPRI** is an independent international institute dedicated to research into conflict, armaments, arms control and disarmament. Established in 1966, SIPRI provides data, analysis and recommendations, based on open sources, to policymakers, researchers, media and the interested public.

## GOVERNING BOARD

Sven-Olof Petersson, Chairman  
(Sweden)  
Dr Dewi Fortuna Anwar  
(Indonesia)  
Dr Vladimir Baranovsky  
(Russia)  
Ambassador Lakhdar Brahimi  
(Algeria)  
Jayantha Dhanapala  
(Sri Lanka)  
Ambassador Wolfgang  
Ischinger (Germany)  
Professor Mary Kaldor (United  
Kingdom)  
The Director

## DIRECTOR

Dr Ian Anthony (United  
Kingdom)



## STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Signalistgatan 9  
SE-169 70 Solna, Sweden  
Telephone: +46 8 655 97 00  
Fax: +46 8 655 97 33  
Email: sipri@sipri.org  
Internet: www.sipri.org

SIPRI INSIGHTS ON PEACE AND SECURITY NO. 2014/2

# THE ARMS TRADE TREATY: CHALLENGES FOR THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATES PARTIES

SIBYLLE BAUER, PAUL BEIJER AND MARK BROMLEY

## CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. The current state of play in the ATT process	2
Rules of procedure	3
The Secretariat: where, who, what and how	5
Funding modalities	7
Reporting templates	8
III. Conclusions	9

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Dr Sibylle Bauer** (Germany) is Director of the SIPRI Dual-use and Arms Trade Control Programme. Since 2005 she has designed and implemented capacity-building activities in Europe and South East Asia, with a focus on legal and enforcement issues related to the enhancement of transit, brokering and export controls.

**Paul Beijer** (Sweden) is a career foreign service official. He is currently Ambassador at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm and is responsible for Sweden's participation in the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty process, first as lead negotiator from 2010–13 and then as responsible for Sweden's ratification and the continued process. He has 10 years' working experience in Sweden's export control system.

**Mark Bromley** (United Kingdom) is Co-Director of the SIPRI Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme, where his work focuses on national, regional and international efforts to regulate the international arms trade.