



31 March 2021

Issued by the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting

Original: English

WORKING GROUP ON TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING
INTRODUCTORY PAPER FOR MEETING OF 28-29 APRIL 2021

Introduction and mandate for the WGTR CSP6-CSP7

1. During [the Sixth Conference of States Parties \(CSP6\) of the Arms Trade Treaty \(ATT\)](#), held on 17-21 August 2020 through written procedure due to developments regarding COVID-19, States Parties dealt with a number of recommendations of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting (WGTR) that resulted from the WGTR's discussions during its meeting of 06 February 2020 and the remote consultations following the cancellation of the April ATT working group meetings, and they endorsed a number of standing agenda items and recurring and specific tasks for the WGTR for the period between CSP6 and CSP7.
2. Following the WGTR recommendations in [the WGTR Co-Chairs' report to CSP6](#), States Parties:
 - a. *Endorsed the standing agenda-items and the recurring and specific tasks for the WGTR in the period between CSP6 and CSP7, as included in Annex A of the WGTR Co-Chair's report to CSP6;*
 - b. *Established the Diversion Information Exchange Forum (DIEF) as a sui generis body for informal voluntary exchanges between States Parties and signatory States concerning concrete cases of suspected or detected diversion and for sharing concrete, operational diversion-related information, and as a mechanism that facilitates States Parties in the implementation of article 11, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 and article 15 of the Treaty, complementing bilateral exchanges;*
 - c. *Adopted the Terms of Reference of the DIEF as included in Annex A of the WGTR Co-Chairs' report to States Parties and signatories on the Informal Meeting on Diversion Informational Exchange;*
 - d. *Mandated the CSP7 President to organize the first formal meeting of the DIEF within the timeframe and budget allocated for ATT meetings in 2021, and in line with its Terms of Reference; and*
 - e. *Decided to review the usefulness of the DIEF at CSP8.*
3. The standing agenda items that States Parties instructed the WGTR to deal with as a minimum are the following:
 - a. *State of play of compliance with reporting obligations;*
 - b. *Challenges concerning reporting;*
 - c. *Substantive reporting and transparency issues;*
 - d. *Organizational means for information exchange;*
 - e. *IT platform: reporting and transparency functionalities; and*
 - f. *WGTR mandate in the period between CSP7 and CSP8.*

4. Under each of these standing agenda items States Parties charged the WGTR with both recurrent tasks and specific tasks for the period between CSP6 and CSP7:
- a. *With regard to the **state of play of compliance with reporting obligations**, at every meeting the WGTR will review the status of reporting, thereby focusing on the progress that has been made in comparison to the previous status updates.*
 - b. *With regard to **challenges concerning reporting**, the WGTR will as a minimum:*
 - i. *encourage participants of States Parties that are in non-compliance with their ATT reporting obligations to share their challenges to submitting timely and accurate initial and annual reports;*
 - ii. *monitor the implementation of the project of voluntary practical bilateral and regional assistance with reporting (peer-to-peer);*
 - iii. *give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss other means to support States Parties in addressing their reporting challenges;*
 - iv. *encourage participants to report on initiatives taken to implement the document entitled "Outreach strategy on reporting", adopted at CSP4;*
 - v. *give participants the opportunity to discuss submitted proposals for alterations or additional questions and answers for the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation, adopted at CSP3; and*
 - vi. *work towards finalizing discussions on the draft proposed amendments to both the Initial and Annual Reporting templates, included in annexes B and C to the Co-Chairs' report to CSP6, taking into account the comments of States Parties and other stakeholders that are inserted in the Co-Chairs' report and its annexes.*
 - c. *With regard to **substantive reporting and transparency issues**, the WGTR will as a minimum:*
 - i. *give participants the opportunity to raise and discuss substantive issues about the reporting obligations that could benefit from consideration by the WGTR;*
 - ii. *monitor and coordinate further work on the project to facilitate the identification of the conventional arms in Article 2 (1) of the Treaty in the "Harmonized System" (HS) of the World Customs Organization (WCO);*
 - iii. *exchange practices, challenges and limitations concerning the public availability of annual and initial reports; and*
 - iv. *exchange practices, challenges and limitations concerning the aggregation of data in annual reports.*
 - d. *With regard to **organizational means for information exchange**, the WGTR will as a minimum:*
 - i. *give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss structured mechanisms, processes or formats facilitating the information exchanges that are required or encouraged by the Treaty, both on the policy level, as well as on the operational level;*
 - ii. *monitor the implementation of the three-tier approach to sharing information on diversion, adopted at CSP4.*
 - e. *With regard to the **reporting and transparency functionalities of the IT platform**, the WGTR will as a minimum:*
 - i. *give participants the opportunity to flag any problems or inconveniences concerning the IT platform;*
 - ii. *give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss improvements to the IT platform to enhance transparency and facilitate the implementation of the reporting and information exchange obligations of the Treaty, including proposals to harness*

information from the initial and annual reports in a manner that allows follow-up on these reports;

- iii. monitor and assess the use of the online reporting functionality and the information exchange platform on the ATT website; and*
- iv. discuss the requirements, including budgetary requirements, for the development of a functionality that makes the information in annual reports available in a searchable database that allows for queries and extracting data.*

- f. With regard to the **WGTR mandate in the period between CSP7 and CSP8**, the WGTR will review the relevance of the aforementioned standing agenda items and recurrent tasks in the light of the state of play of ATT transparency and reporting, with a view to preparing a proposal for consideration by CSP7.*

5. The Co-Chairs have prepared this introductory paper to unpack the tasks of the WGTR for discussions in the period between CSP6 and CSP7, and to allow WGTR participants to prepare efficiently for the WGTR meeting, which will take place under a virtual format on 28-29 April 2021, as indicated in the CSP7 President's letter of 16 March 2021. The paper explains the background of the given tasks, summarizes past proposals and discussions, sets out elements for discussion and puts a number of proposals for consideration to WGTR participants. This should ensure a structured and effective discussion during the meeting.

6. In light of the reduced time allocated to the meeting due to the exceptional and unprecedented (virtual) format of the meeting, caused by the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Co-Chairs have adapted the agenda in order to ensure that enough time is allocated for those topics that either may require a decision by CSP7 or are necessary to discuss though they may not lead to a decision by CSP7. Some of the topics that are omitted from the agenda for the 28-29 April 2021 can be addressed in writing during further remote consultations, or be postponed to CSP8.

7. As the paper includes several calls to WGTR participants to submit their own proposals on certain topics, the Co-Chairs encourage participants to submit any proposals in writing, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat, or via the information exchange platform, ahead of the meeting.

Agenda item 1: State of play of compliance with reporting obligations

Recurring task: The WGTR will review the status of reporting, thereby focusing on the progress that has been made in comparison to the previous status updates.

8. Reviewing the status of reporting traditionally happens through a presentation by the ATT Secretariat. As an actual presentation was not possible with a CSP6 through written procedure, the ATT Secretariat provided this overview as Annex D of the WGTR Co-Chairs' report to CSP6. This overview demonstrated a concerning continuous downward trend in compliance with the annual reporting obligation, as only 46% of States Parties that were due to submit their annual report had actually done so by 3 July, 2020. A significant number of those States opted again not to make their report publicly available. In their report to CSP6, the Co-Chairs also noted that 24% of States Parties still had to submit their initial report to the Treaty.

9. **During the 28-29 April 2021 meeting, the ATT Secretariat will give a general overview of the reporting status and of the progress that has been made in comparison to the previous status update.**

Agenda item 2: Challenges concerning reporting

[Recurring task 1: The WGTR will encourage participants of States Parties that are in non-compliance with their ATT reporting obligations to share their challenges to submitting timely and accurate initial and annual reports.](#)

10. This recurring task is traditionally included in the WGTR mandate to offer States Parties a continuous platform to share problems and difficulties as well as solutions and good practices, in the organization and fulfillment of their reporting obligations. In that respect, in previous meetings some States Parties shared their difficulties in establishing effective procedures for information gathering and reporting, whilst other States Parties presented how they dealt with such challenges in their control system. **The Co-Chairs therefore invite States Parties that have not yet complied with all their reporting obligations to share the obstacles that have kept them from reporting, during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting.**

11. The Co-Chairs remind States Parties about the comprehensive assistance tools that the CSP already recommended and endorsed, namely:

- The document "[National-Level Measures to Facilitate Compliance with International Reporting Obligations and Commitments](#)" – offering guidance on the organization of reporting duties;
- The document "[Reporting Authorized or Actual Exports and Imports of Conventional Arms: Questions & Answers](#)" - providing guidance in the form of questions and answers to facilitate the preparation of the mandatory annual report; and
- The "[Outreach strategy on reporting](#)" (under which all States and other ATT stakeholders will be asked to brief the WGTR about any initiative undertaken to promote and enhance compliance with the reporting duties of the Treaty).

12. The Co-Chairs also point out that States Parties that struggle to comply with their reporting obligations can opt for applying for implementation assistance to the Voluntary Trust Fund.

13. Besides, States Parties can take part in the project of voluntary practical bilateral and regional assistance with reporting (peer-to-peer), which was conceived as an auxiliary instrument to assist States Parties that have specific questions on reporting.

[Recurring task 2: The WGTR will monitor the implementation of the project of voluntary practical bilateral and regional assistance with reporting \(peer-to-peer\).](#)

14. The project of voluntary practical bilateral and regional assistance with reporting (peer-to-peer) was supported by States Parties at CSP5. The first step in the project was a meet & greet event, which took place on 06 February 2020, among delegates of States that expressed interest either in offering or in receiving assistance on reporting issues. The reactions of participants in the event were positive and revealed their willingness to continue these peer-to-peer exchanges.

15. During the 06 February 2020 meeting of WGTR, it was decided that the follow-up of this project would remain in the hands of the ATT Secretariat. As no further meetings or meaningful follow-up have been possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the ATT Secretariat will take further action when face-to-face engagement is possible. Accordingly, **the Co-Chairs suggest to postpone this topic for the CSP8 cycle.**

[Recurring task 3: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss other means to support States Parties in addressing their reporting challenges.](#)

16. As mentioned previously, compliance with the ATT's annual reporting requirement is on a downward trajectory and the reporting rates reached a minimum low for the 2019 reporting cycle. While the challenges faced by governments due to the global COVID-19 pandemic might have caused delays in reporting, this negative trend threatens to undermine the treaty's objective of transparency and confidence building in the global arms trade. This stresses the importance that the WGTR, while continuing to implement existing measures, develop new ones to address this situation.

17. **In light of the reduced time allocated to the 28-29 April 2021 meeting, and given that currently there is no specific proposal under discussion, the Co-Chairs propose to postpone the discussion of this agenda item for the CSP8 cycle. ATT stakeholders are invited to submit any proposals they may have, in writing, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat or via the information exchange platform during the current CSP7 cycle.**

Recurring task 4: The WGTR will encourage participants to report on initiatives taken to implement the document entitled "Outreach Strategy on Reporting".

18. Continued downturn trends in reporting confirm the relevance to increase efforts in implementing the "[Outreach strategy on reporting](#)" adopted at CSP4, which includes several recommendations and calls on all ATT stakeholders to pay attention to reporting issues in their work on implementing and helping to implement the Treaty.

19. As mandated by the CSP5, the President of CSP6 engaged with those States Parties that are in arrears with their reporting obligations on a bilateral basis, and called on all relevant stakeholders to advocate for reporting in line with the outreach strategy on reporting. The ATT Secretariat observed responses to individualized letters sent out by the President of CSP6, and the intention of the Co-Chairs was to brief WGTR participants on the outcome of these efforts during CSP6. The written format decided for the CSP6 prevented such a briefing in CSP6, therefore the Co-Chairs decided to include the details of the CSP6 President's outreach in this introductory paper.

20. In March 2020, the President of CSP6 sent individualized letters to a total of 38 States Parties reminding them of their obligation to submit ATT reports under Article 13 as follows:

- a. Letters were sent to two (2) States Parties that were due to have submitted their Initial Reports but had not yet done so;
- b. Letters were sent to 15 States Parties that were due to have submitted one or more Annual Reports but had not yet done so; and
- c. Letters were sent to 21 States Parties that were due to have submitted their Initial Report and one or more Annual Reports but had not yet done so.

21. Since the CSP6 President's personalized reminder letters were sent in March 2020, of the States Parties contacted, three (3) submitted their Initial Reports, and one submitted its outstanding Annual Report.

22. With respect to the CSP7 cycle, the CSP7 President has also undertaken outreach with respect to those States Parties that are in arrears with their reporting obligations. In March 2021, the President of CSP7 sent individualized letters to a total of 48 States Parties reminding them of their obligation to submit ATT reports under Article 13 as follows:

- a. Letters were sent to five (5) States Parties that were due to have submitted their Initial Reports but had not yet done so;
- b. Letters were sent to 23 States Parties that were due to have submitted one or more Annual Reports but had not yet done so; and

- c. Letters were sent to 20 States Parties that were due to have submitted their Initial Report and one or more Annual Reports but had not yet done so.

23. The ATT Secretariat will monitor the responses to individualized letters sent out by the President of CSP7, and the Co-Chairs will brief WGTR participants on the outcome of these efforts during CSP8.

24. The Co-Chairs have encouraged the beneficiaries of VTF funded projects related to improving reporting capacities to share with the WGTR their experience and lessons learned. This led to a State Party sharing its successful experience in this field at the first meeting of the WGTR in February 2020, which is why the Co-Chairs have continued consultations with beneficiaries of these projects. **The Co-Chairs therefore encourage beneficiaries of VTF funded projects related to reporting to share their experience and achievements in this area during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting.**

25. **Afterwards, the Co-Chairs will call on States Parties, civil society and regional organizations to brief WGTR participants about any information sessions or promotional events on reporting that they have held, and about any other initiative focused on enhancing compliance with the reporting duties.**

Recurring task 5: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to discuss submitted proposals for alterations or additional questions and answers for the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation, adopted at CSP3

26. The ['FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation](#) was endorsed by States Parties at CSP3 and updated at CSP5, when States Parties endorsed a number of amendments that were necessary to reflect the introduction of the online reporting tool.

27. The document itself requires that proposals for alterations and additional questions and answers be considered in the WGTR. In that respect, such proposals need to be submitted well in advance of the WGTR meeting in order to allow adequate time for WGTR participants to examine the proposals. **The Co-Chairs consequently invite WGTR participants to submit any proposals for alterations and additional questions, in writing, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat, or via the information exchange platform, at the latest ten days before the 28-29 April 2021 meeting. The Co-Chairs will brief the WGTR participants to the meeting if specific suggestions are received, and will invite the proponents to present their contributions.**

Specific task 6: The WGTR will work towards finalizing discussions on the draft proposed amendments to both the Initial and Annual Reporting templates, included in annexes B and C to the Co-Chairs' report to CSP6, taking into account the comments of States Parties and other stakeholders that are inserted in the Co-Chairs' report and its annexes

28. Taking into consideration growing indications by States Parties and other ATT stakeholders of the complexity of the templates, and the introduction of the online reporting tool for which the templates form the basis, during the preparatory process of CSP5 participants shared a number of comments and suggestions on the templates. The Co-Chairs provided an inventory of all the comments and suggestions as a basis for renewed discussions on the templates beyond CSP5, which was made available as [Annex A to the Co-Chairs' report to CSP5](#).

29. As some States Parties were cautious to amend the templates, and some even advocated against any change, the mandate for the WGTR for the CSP6 cycle was specified to clarify that the working group should consider those adjustments to the templates deemed necessary to address uncertainties and inconsistencies, or to ensure compatibility with the online reporting tool and the proposed public

searchable database. The Co-Chairs emphasized that a discussion on adjustments for these purposes is important, for at least two reasons. First, as indicated in the way forward section of the Co-Chairs' report to CSP5, "*the working group's focus on addressing the low reporting rate should not mean that important issues concerning the quality and transparency of reports are left untouched*". In that respect, it is clear that uncertainties and inconsistencies in the reporting templates in particular affect the quality of reporting and need to be addressed. Second, adjustments to ensure compatibility with the online reporting tool and the proposed public searchable database are not optional if we want to ensure that the templates strictly correspond to the online reporting tool and if we want to move forward with the development of the public searchable database.

30. During the 06 February 2020 meeting of WGTR, the discussion was informed by three presentations: one by the Co-Chairs on the referred inventory of comments and suggestions, one by the ATT Secretariat on a [preliminary document identifying areas of the reporting templates to be considered for adjustment](#) and one that took place during a side event, in which the Stimson Arms Trade Treaty-Baseline Assessment project (ATT-BAP) presented their report "[The ATT Reporting Templates: Challenges and Recommendations](#)". The Co-Chairs also linked the discussion on the templates with a topic that was included under agenda item 3 on substantive reporting and transparency issues, namely the comparability of data in annual reports.

31. Following the presentations by the Co-Chairs and the Secretariat, very few participants intervened, but those that did expressed support for adjustments that take away ambiguous language and enhance the user friendliness of the templates.

32. In this light, the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat prepared draft proposed updates to the Initial Reporting template (Annex B to WGTR Co-Chairs draft report to CSP6) and draft proposed updates to the Annual Reporting template (Annex C to WGTR Co-Chairs draft report to CSP6) which were reviewed by participants under remote consultations during the intersessional period leading up to CSP6. The comments and suggestions received were included in the documents that were presented in the [WGTR Co-Chairs draft report to CSP6](#). No draft decisions on the proposed updates of the reporting templates were contemplated at the CSP6 because the Co-Chairs considered that it would be difficult to achieve consensus on the proposed updates through the written procedure of CSP6 and that a meaningful outcome would benefit from face-to-face discussions to facilitate live drafting and fine tuning of the adjustments under consideration. The Co-Chairs consider it important that the WGTR aims to finalize the discussions on the draft proposed adjustments during the current cycle.

33. **Against this background, during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting the Co-Chairs will invite participants to discuss on the referred draft proposed updates to the reporting templates with a view to reaching a common understanding about these. To inform and encourage the discussion on the subject, the Co-Chairs, with the support of the ATT Secretariat, prepared two explanatory notes on the rationale of the proposed adjustments to the initial and annual reporting templates, which are included as Annex A and Annex B to this introductory paper, respectively.**

Agenda item 3: Substantive reporting and transparency issues

[Recurring task 1: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to raise and discuss substantive issues about the reporting obligations that could benefit from consideration by the WGTR](#)

34. This is a recurring task to allow WGTR participants to raise any issue on the substance of any of the obligations in article 13 of the Treaty. In light of the reduced time allocated to the meeting of 28-29 April 2021 meeting, the Co-Chairs propose to postpone the discussion of this agenda item for the CSP8

cycle. **All participants are invited to raise any substantive issue they want to see discussed in the WGTR other than those already on the agenda, in writing, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat or via the information exchange platform during the current CSP7 cycle.**

Recurring task 2: The WGTR will monitor and coordinate further work on the project to facilitate the identification of the conventional arms in Article 2 (1) of the Treaty in the “Harmonized System”(HS) of the World Customs Organization (WCO)

35. This project dates back to the 31 May 2018 WGTR meeting, when a briefing by a representative of the World Customs Organization (WCO) informed that except for SALW, most of the conventional arms covered under Article 2 (1) of the ATT are not classified by specific customs codes that would allow identification of those conventional arms in the Harmonized System (HS). As this was found regrettable from the perspective of not only reporting and record-keeping, but also enforcing arms transfer controls, participants unanimously agreed that, where absent, introducing specific customs codes for the conventional arms covered under Article 2 (1) of the ATT could be beneficial. The briefing demonstrated that amendments concerning conventional arms would not be controversial and that conventional arms would also lend themselves well to specific codes. It would be recommendable to work towards the 2027 review, which would require finalized amendments by 2024. The amendments to the HS should be submitted by Member States through their customs administrations, thus States Parties are strongly encouraged to discuss the issue with their national customs administrations and to share their feedback with WGTR participants.

36. Since the briefing, the project has been on the agenda of every WGTR meeting but no concrete steps had been taken. In this light, the Belgian Co-Chair of WGTR at the time in the CSP6 cycle, committed to draft a concept note on the topic and, when available, he would share this with those States Parties that have shown interest in the matter. **As the Co-Chairs have been advised that this work is still under development and that the said document will be presented to the WGTR after its finalization, the Co-Chairs propose to address this agenda item in further remote consultations or be postponed to the CSP8 cycle, depending on its progress.**

Specific task 3: The WGTR will exchange practices, challenges and limitations concerning the public availability of annual and initial reports

37. The number of States Parties that choose to make their reports available to States Parties only has increased year by year. Besides, the Co-Chairs note that some of these experienced in submitting public ATT annual reports gradually shifted to limiting their availability to States Parties only. Several States Parties and stakeholders have expressed concern about this trend, which the Co-Chairs consider legitimate in light of the Treaty’s purpose in Article 1 of promoting transparency.

38. As the rationale for private reporting remains unclear and the subject has not been debated before in the WGTR, a discussion on this subject would facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the reasons why States Parties choose this option.

39. The Co-Chairs highlight that this topic is not included in the mandate to discuss whether or not making the reports publicly available is a Treaty obligation, as the reporting templates and the FAQ-style guidance document on the annual reporting obligation clearly state that this is a decision for each State Party to make. The sole intention of this discussion is to allow ATT stakeholders to understand the challenges, limitations and/or preferences of States Parties that choose not to make their reports public, without questioning their right to do so.

40. One reason may be that this section in the reporting template is confusing (and an effort to remedy that confusion is under discussion). Another reason could be that States Parties may choose not to publish their reports due to sensitive commercial information or economic or security considerations. The Co-Chairs indicate that such concerns do not necessarily need to lead to having the full report available only to other States Parties.

41. In any case, the Co-Chairs encourage States Parties to access the [reporting section on the ATT website](#) to check if their reports were published in accordance with their preferences and to signal any discrepancies or changes in preference to the ATT Secretariat.

42. **Given that this is the first time that this topic is included specifically in the mandate of the WGTR, during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting the Co-Chairs will invite States Parties and other stakeholders to share practices, challenges and limitations concerning the public availability of the annual and initial reports.**

Specific task 4: The WGTR will exchange practices, challenges and limitations concerning the aggregation of data in annual reports

43. The Co-Chairs emphasize that this topic is not included in the mandate to discuss whether or not disaggregation of data is a treaty obligation, as this was discussed when the templates were initially adopted, but to have an exchange on States' practices and challenges on this particular topic. The Co-Chairs do point out that the FAQ-style guidance document on the annual reporting obligation, in questions 22 & 23 indicate expressly that States Parties should consider disaggregating their information by category of conventional arms on which they are reporting, as well as by country of origin or destination, and then strongly encourages States Parties to do so per country. The disaggregation of data is even more valuable in light of the discussion about the development of a searchable online database, as aggregated data would complicate comparability.

44. **During the 28-29 April 2021 meeting, the Co-Chairs will invite UNIDIR to give a presentation to help set the scene for the discussion of this topic and will invite States Parties and other stakeholders to share practices, challenges and limitations concerning the aggregation of data in annual reports.**

Agenda item 4: Organizational means for information exchange

Recurring task 1: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss structured mechanisms, processes or formats facilitating the information exchanges that are required or encouraged by the Treaty, both on the policy level, as well as on the operational level

45. This is a recurring task to allow WGTR participants to propose and discuss any instrument that could strengthen, promote or expedite the information exchanges that the Treaty requires or encourages States Parties to undertake in articles 7 (6), 8 (1), 11 (3), 11 (5), 13 (2), 15 (2-4) and 15 (7).

46. The Co-Chairs remind ATT stakeholders that during the preparatory process of CSP6, the WGTR focused on two mechanisms, namely the information exchange platform in the restricted area of the ATT website and the Diversion Information Exchange Forum among States Parties and signatory States.

47. Concerning the information exchange platform, during the 06 February 2020 meeting of the WGTR the Co-Chairs suggested that the platform could be used as a tool in the preparation for meetings of the ATT working groups and for intersessional work, as well as for any exchanging or sharing of information that is required or encouraged by the Treaty including, but not limited to, information sharing on diversion, as part of the three-tier approach (referenced in the following agenda item). While such

proposals were well received by the participants, some pointed out the need of support from the ATT Secretariat to make States Parties and Signatories aware of announcements on the platform, and others questioned the security of the IT system.

48. In the remote consultations that followed the February 2020 meeting the Co-Chairs discussed the use of the platform for the proposed substantive purposes with the ATT Secretariat and the Chair of the WGETI and encouraged them to request input on pending issues from States Parties and signatory States by posting “announcements” on the platform. The Co-Chairs posted announcements on the platform requesting input and comments on several working documents ahead of the CSP6. Only a couple of States Parties responded to this request by uploading their feedback in the IT platform.

49. Given that the number of users that have requested access to the information exchange platform remains quite limited, the Co-Chairs strongly encourage States Parties and signatory States to [register online](#) for access to the restricted area of the ATT website and for access to the IT platform.

50. The Co-Chairs recall that exchanges via the information exchange portal are one of the predefined tiers in the three-tier approach to sharing information on diversion that was endorsed by States Parties at CSP4, next to discussions in the WGETI and the Diversion Information Exchange Forum adopted by the CSP6.

51. **The Co-Chairs invite WGTR participants to propose and discuss other structured mechanisms, processes or formats facilitating the information exchanges that are required or encouraged by the Treaty, both on the policy level, as well as on the operational level. The Co-Chairs welcome any written proposals, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat or via the information exchange platform, as well as oral proposals during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting.**

[Recurring task 2: The WGTR will monitor the implementation of the three-tier approach to sharing information on diversion, adopted at CSP4](#)

52. With the adoption of the Diversion Information Exchange Forum and its Terms of Reference in CSP6, a relevant step was taken in the fulfillment of one of the pillars of the three-tier approach to sharing information on diversion. It is expected that the broad support provided to the Forum will be reflected in active participation and constructive exchanges that will help address the problem of arms diversion. The mandate of the WGTR still includes the task to monitor the implementation of the three-tier approach to sharing information on diversion because the said approach was instituted by the WGTR and the group has a role in monitoring the usefulness and value of the initiatives that are taken in the context of the three-tier approach, including the DIEF.

53. As the CSP6 mandated the President of CSP7 to organize the first formal meeting of the DIEF within the timeframe and budget allocated for ATT meetings in 2021, **the Co-Chairs will invite the Chair of the Forum to provide an update on general formal arrangements of the meeting. WGTR will follow-up developments related to the DIEF after the first formal meeting of the Forum.**

Agenda item 5: Reporting and transparency functionalities of the IT platform

[Recurring task 1: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to flag any problems or inconveniences concerning the IT platform](#)

54. The area of the ATT website that is restricted to States Parties includes the information exchange platform and the online reporting functionality. States Parties have had the opportunity to experience

online reporting for two years already, to submit their reports about their exports and imports in 2018 and 2019. Also, the information exchange platform is fully operational. During the 06 February 2020 meeting the ATT Secretariat provided very comprehensive and clear [instructions on the use of the platform](#) and the WGTR Co-Chairs posted announcements on which States Parties had the opportunity to comment. **In this context, during the 28-29 April 2021 meeting the Co-Chairs will invite State Parties to flag any problems or inconveniences they have experienced in using the IT platform.**

Recurring task 2: The WGTR will give participants the opportunity to propose and discuss improvements to the IT platform to enhance transparency and facilitate the implementation of the reporting and information exchange obligations of the Treaty, including proposals to harness information from the initial and annual reports in a manner that allows follow-up on these reports

51. This is a recurring task to allow WGTR participants to suggest any changes or improvements to the IT platform in general – including the online reporting tool and the information exchange platform – based on their use. In light of the reduced time allocated to the meeting of 28-29 April 2021 meeting, the Co-Chairs propose to postpone the discussion of this agenda item for the CSP8 cycle. **All participants are invited to provide suggestions and comments, in writing, via e-mail to the Co-Chairs and the ATT Secretariat or via the information exchange platform itself, during the CSP7 cycle.**

Recurring task 3: The WGTR will monitor and assess the use of the online reporting functionality and the information exchange platform on the ATT website

52. During the meeting of 06 February 2020, the ATT Secretariat briefed the WGTR about the use of the online reporting tool located in the restricted area of the ATT webpage and presented instructions on the use of the information exchange platform. The Secretariat reported that only 12 States Parties used the online reporting tool to submit their annual report. In light of the limited use of the said online reporting tool, the Co-Chairs encouraged States Parties and signatory States to: 1) [register online](#) for access to the restricted area of the ATT website; 2) consider using the online reporting tool for submitting the annual reports; and 3) engage in the discussions on the announcements posted on the information exchange platform.

53. **During the 28-29 April 2021 meeting, the Co-Chairs will invite the ATT Secretariat to update participants on the number of users of the IT platform, and the number of reports submitted through the online reporting tool. In the interests of time, this information will be included in the ATT Secretariat's general overview on the Status of Reporting (under agenda item 1).**

Specific task 4: The WGTR will discuss the requirement, including budgetary requirements, for the development of a functionality that makes the information in annual reports available in a searchable database that allows for queries and extracting data

54. Conventional arms covered by the Treaty have an indispensable role in the preservation of security, freedom and peace, provided they are used in accordance with the principles and criteria enshrined in the Treaty. States Parties must ensure that they are traded and used in a responsible and accountable way, and prevent their diversion to unauthorized users or for unauthorized end-uses. Accountability for arms export decisions can only take place when authorities are transparent. The development of a searchable online database that allows for queries and extracting data will be a

substantial step in increasing transparency, which is one of the primary purposes of the Treaty. While it will provide information that can already be found in States Parties annual reports, it will better inform the public on the global arms trade in a user-friendly manner.

55. In this regard, the Co-Chairs recall the overwhelming consensus among participants of the WGTR's 08 March 2018 meeting that the information generated through the annual reports should be available in a searchable database.

56. The Co-Chairs also point out that any progress in the development of the searchable database also requires decisions on other WGTR issues, such as the reporting templates, and on more general issues, such as the IT budget. In this regard, the Co-Chairs consider that a long-term approach is needed to ensure that careful consideration is given to States Parties' expectations and needs with respect to a 'searchable online database', and to assess the cost-benefit of investing in such an instrument. It is important that States Parties firstly discuss and decide on the parameters and features of such a database, and only afterwards a cost-benefit analysis could be possible.

57. **In that respect, the Co-Chairs have requested the ATT Secretariat to prepare a background paper outlining questions that could be put to States Parties to ascertain what they want and expect from a searchable online database and present it to the 28-29 April 2021 meeting, and will invite participants to provide initial comments to the said approach as well as to the background paper. The paper is included as Annex C to this introductory document.**

Agenda item 6: WGTR mandate in the period between CSP7 and CSP8

Recurring task: the WGTR will prepare a proposal for consideration by CSP7, which will include as a minimum the standing agenda items and the recurrent tasks outlined above.

58. **The Co-Chairs will present a draft proposal for the mandate of the WGTR in the period between CSP7 and CSP8 during the remote consultations that will follow the 28-29 April 2021 meeting.**

ANNEX A. CO-CHAIRS' EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE INITIAL REPORTING TEMPLATE



31 March 2021

Issued by: the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting

Original: English

**ATT WORKING GROUP ON TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING
CO-CHAIRS' EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE INITIAL REPORTING TEMPLATE**

The following table provides an explanation of the adjustments proposed by the Co-chairs of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting (WGTR) to the revised Initial Reporting template, as contained in Annex B of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP6 ([ATT/CSP6.WGTR/2020/CHAIR/607/Conf.Rep](#)). The text of the adjusted Initial Reporting template is presented in the first column, with all draft proposed adjustments appearing in track changes. An explanation for each of the draft proposed adjustments is provided in the second column, parallel to where the draft proposed adjustment appears in the revised Initial Reporting template.

Revised Initial Report	Explanation for adjustment
<p align="center">THE ARMS TRADE TREATY</p> <p align="center">REPORTING TEMPLATE</p> <p align="center">INITIAL REPORT ON MEASURES UNDERTAKEN TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 13(1)</p>	

This template is intended for use by States Parties to the Arms Trade Treaty when preparing their initial report in accordance with the Treaty's Article 13(1).

Article 13(1) requires States Parties to *“report to the Secretariat on any new measures undertaken to implement the Treaty, where appropriate”* and thus does not limit information-giving only to measures related to binding obligations in the Treaty. However, in terms of national implementation, binding obligations have a special significance. To highlight this, the template distinguishes between two types of information: (A) information which relates to binding obligations under the Treaty, and (B) information which relates to provisions in the Treaty which are estimated to be binding to a lesser degree, or non-binding. Where the template touches upon information related to the (B) type of provisions in the Treaty, the rows are shaded to make this distinction clear.

The shading does not indicate that certain information is purely voluntary, its purpose is to facilitate the use of this template as a diagnostic tool for assessing at the national level the need for implementation work to fulfil requirements of the Treaty. The un-shaded items are necessary to implement, the shaded items represent desirable features of a national control system - which under certain circumstances may also be necessary to implement.

The division of obligations into binding and non-binding has been undertaken - solely for the purpose of this Template - on the basis of a strict observance of the qualifiers included in the text of the Treaty. Thus,

- if a provision in the text is prefaced with “shall” only, it is considered binding and information on that topic should be provided in the initial report.
- if a provision in the text has qualifiers, such as “shall...subject to its national laws”, or “shall...pursuant to national law”, or “shall....consistent with national law”, or “shall....where necessary/appropriate”, then a binding obligation is deemed to exist if certain pre-requisites are fulfilled. In this case, information on the topic should be provided in the initial report. If the pre-requisites are not fulfilled, the provision is deemed to be non-binding. In this case information need not be provided unless measures have in fact been taken in the national context to comply with such a provision.
- if States Parties are only encouraged to take, or invited to consider taking, certain actions, the provision is deemed non-binding. This category also includes qualifiers such as “may include...” or actions to be

initiated “by mutual consent” with another State Party. Information should be provided if measures have been taken in the national context that fulfil this type of provision.

On a voluntary basis, more information may always be provided.

Please note that Article 13.1 also requires States Parties to “*report to the Secretariat on any new measures undertaken in order to implement this Treaty, when appropriate*”. This template may be used to supply such updates as well. Only changes need then be indicated either by highlighting, tracking or marking up changes made in each section OR providing a summary description of the updates made in Annex A.

Explanation 1 (Cover page): This adjustment indicates to States Parties *how* they can distinguish new, updated information in their revised Initial Report from the original information submitted. This will help anyone who reads the revised/updated report to know what new measures have been undertaken by the reporting State Party to implement the Treaty.

Why? This change is proposed because some States Parties that have submitted revised or updated Initial Reports have not indicated what information is new, thus making it difficult to identify new measures that have been implemented (without comparing the revised report with the original report, either manually or electronically, which can be time consuming). This addition responds to the observation that ‘there is not a single indication of the update requirement, nor a process or template to do so’ made in paragraph 10 of the WGTR Co-chairs’ inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs’ Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).

GOVERNMENT OF _____

INITIAL REPORT ON MEASURES UNDERTAKEN TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS ARTICLE 13(1)

DATE OF ~~SUBMISSION~~REPORT _____

This Initial Report ~~is available only to States Parties~~ may be made publicly available

Yes

No

Explanation 2 (Date of report): The word ‘Submission’ has been replaced with ‘Report’ because often the date indicated in the ‘Date of Submission’ field is not the actual date the State Party submitted the report to the ATT Secretariat. In practice, it generally reflects the date that the report was finalised by the State Party, or the date it was ‘signed off’ by the responsible Government entity. But sometimes there is a delay between the date of finalisation or ‘sign off’ and the actual date of submission to the ATT Secretariat. Accordingly, this date can be misleading if taken as an indication of the date of submission. The ATT Secretariat records the actual date of submission in a database as the date that the ATT Secretariat *received* the Initial Report (via email, post or through the online reporting tool). Often the date of (actual) submission recorded by the ATT Secretariat does not match the ‘Date of Submission’ indicated in the Initial Report.

Explanation 3 (Cover page): Two changes have been introduced here.

1) The phrase ‘is available only to States Parties’ has been replaced with ‘may be made publicly available’. **Why?** Because the phrase ‘is available only to States Parties’ has been

<p>This Report contains only updates to a previously submitted initial report dated _____ <i>(If you tick this box, please highlight or track the changes made to each section OR provide a brief summary of your updates in Annex A)</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>misinterpreted by some States Parties and has caused some confusion. In some instances, it has led some States to tick the box because they have understood that if they do not tick the box, the report will not be available to <i>anyone</i>, even States Parties. The intention is to make it clear that if a State Party ticks 'yes' to this statement, the report will be made available to <i>everyone</i>. And if they tick 'no', the report will only be available to States Parties.</p> <p>2) The single tick box with no indication of 'yes' or 'no' has been replaced with two tick boxes, one marked 'yes' and one marked 'no'. Why? The use of a single tick box with no indication of 'yes' or 'no' seems to have caused some confusion in the past. Some States Parties put a cross <i>outside</i> the box as a way of indicating 'no' (on the assumption that if they tick inside it means 'yes'). This led their reports to be made available only to States Parties, erroneously. The use of a 'yes' box and a 'no' box should make it easier for States to indicate whether they agree with the statement or not.</p> <p><u>Explanation 4 (Cover page):</u> A guidance note or request has been added to this section that asks the reporting State to indicate where the updated information is in their Initial Report, if they are providing a report that contains updates. It repeats the suggestions made in the introductory text (see 'Explanation 1') for <i>how</i> to indicate updates.</p>
---	--------------------------	--

1. NATIONAL CONTROL SYSTEM AND LIST**1.1 GENERAL OVERVIEW****A. Overview of legislation and ordinances governing the national control system [Article 5(2)]**

(Please list below. If the national control system is governed in whole or part by other means than legislation or ordinances, please indicate these also)

B. The national control system includes the following:

		Yes	No
i)	a national control list [Article 5(2)] competent national authorities (further specified below) [Article 5(5)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	a control list [Article 5(2)] competent national authorities [Article 5(5)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	one or more national points of contact to exchange information on ATT implementation [Article 5(6)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If 'Yes' to any of the items above, please consider providing further information. If 'No' to any of the items above, please ~~provide background below~~explain in more detail.

Explanation 5 (Section 1.1 Heading): A numbered heading '1.1 General Overview' has been inserted to give information on what this section relates to and to help users navigate around the report.

Explanation 6 (Section 1.B): Three changes have been introduced here:

- 1) The three elements of Article 5 (national control list, competent national authorities and national points of contact) have been placed in the order that they appear in Article 5 (with the reference to national control list appearing in Article 5(2) before the reference to competent national authorities in Article 5(5)).
- 2) The phrase in original subparagraph (i) - 'further specified below' – has been deleted because it is not needed.
- 3) The field requesting additional information has been changed as follows: a) The original text only requested additional background information if the reporting State answered 'no' to any element (in an effort to obtain information on why a State Party does not have one or elements of its national control system in place). Now States Parties are encouraged, but not

<p>C. Additional voluntary information about the national control system</p> <p>(Please elaborate below - for instance regarding inter-agency coordination structures, training systems for relevant officials, transparency and accountability mechanisms, outreach to private actors such as industry, or any ongoing / planned review or change of the national control system or parts thereof)</p>			
<p>1.2 NATIONAL CONTROL LIST</p>			
<p>D. The national control list covers the following arms:</p>		Yes	No
i)	Battle tanks [Article 2(1)(a)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Armored combat vehicles [Article 2(1)(b)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Large-caliber artillery systems [Article 2(1)(c)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Combat aircraft [Article 2(1)(d)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v)	Attack helicopters [Article 2(1)(e)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

required, to give additional information if they respond 'yes' to any element. This is designed to encourage States Parties to give more detail of their national control systems to help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.

b) The phrase 'provide background below' has been replaced with 'explain in more detail'.

Explanation 7 (Section 1.2 – Heading): A numbered heading '1.2 National Control List' has been inserted to give information on what this section relates to and to help users navigate around the report.

Explanation 8 (Section 1.D): Three changes have been introduced here:

1) The word 'arms' has been inserted in the 1st subheading for clarity/to distinguish it from 'items' referred to in the following section.

2) The word 'items' has been inserted in the 2nd subheading for clarity/to distinguish it from 'arms' referred to in the above section.

vi)	Warships [Article 2(1)(f)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vii)	Missiles and missile launchers [Article 2(1)(g)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
viii)	Small arms and light weapons [Article 2(1)(h)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The national control list also includes the following <u>items</u>, in order to enable the application of Articles 3 and 4:		Yes	No
ix)	Ammunition/Munitions for the conventional arms covered in Article 2(1) [for the application of Article 3]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
x)	Parts and components in a form that provides the capability to assemble the conventional arms covered in Article 2(1) [for the application of Article 4]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>If 'Yes' to any of the items above, please consider providing further information. If 'No' to any of the items above, please <u>explain in more detail</u> provide background below</u>			
<u>E. Does your State maintain a national control list for the following types of transfers? [Articles 2(2) & 5(2)]:</u>			
i)	<u>Export</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	<u>Import</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	<u>Transit or trans-shipment</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3) The field requesting additional information has been changed as follows:

a) The original text only requested additional background information if the reporting State answered 'no' to any element (in an effort to obtain information on why a State Party does not have one or elements of its national control system in place). Now States Parties are encouraged, but not required, to give additional information if they respond 'yes' to any element. This is designed to encourage States Parties to give more detail of their national control systems to help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.

b) The phrase 'provide background below' has been replaced with 'explain in more detail'.

Explanation 9 (Sections 1.E and 1.F): Some States Parties that have submitted an Initial Report indicate that they have more than one control list, depending on the nature of the transfer (e.g. some States Parties have an Export Control List and a separate Import Control List). These new sections (1.E and 1.F) have been added in an effort to obtain more information on whether States Parties regulate different types of transfers and whether they have more than one control list, as well as to make it easier for States Parties to respond to this question by

v)	Brokering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>F. Does the same control list apply to all these types of transfers (or do you maintain different lists for different types of transfers)? (If 'No', please explain)</p>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The national control list has been provided to the Secretariat of the Treaty [Article 5.4] (If 'No', please elaborate further below)</p>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>F. Arms for recreational, cultural, historical and sporting purposes are included in the national control list [Article 2(1)(h) & Preamble, 13th para]</p>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If 'No', please provide further information below, for instance whether a separate set of controls are applied to these types of arms</p>			
<p>G. Additional categories not listed under Section A1.D are included in the national control list [Article 5(3)] (If 'Yes', please specify below <u>what the additional categories are</u>)</p>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

implicitly acknowledging they may have more than one control list.

Explanation 10 (Original Section 1.E): The question as to whether a State Party has provided its national control list to the ATT Secretariat has been deleted because: a) it is a question of fact that can be objectively realised (i.e. the ATT Secretariat has records of which States have submitted their national control lists and which have not); and b) some States Parties have answered this question incorrectly in their Initial Reports (i.e. indicating they *have* submitted their national control list when in fact there is no record of them having done so).

Explanation 11 (Section 1.H): The phrase 'what the additional categories are' has been added to make it clear(er) what information this section is asking for.

III. Control list definitions are supplemented by more detailed definitions not in the control list itself Are items on the national control list defined? [Article 5(3)] (If 'Yes', please provide further information below) if yes, which definition(s) or descriptions do you use? (e.g. Wassenaar, United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, National definitions, etc.)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
i) United Nations Register of Conventional Arms [Article 5(3)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Wassenaar Arrangement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) EU Common Military List	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) National definitions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. The national control list is publicly available [Article 5(4)] (If 'Yes', please provide information below as to how your control list is made publicly available - if available on the open internet please provide the hyperlink. <u>If 'No', please explain</u>)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 12 (Section 1.I): Two changes have been introduced here.

1) The statement has been converted into a question and has been simplified to make it clear(er). In addition, the original wording of this question was phrased in such a way that it *assumed* the reporting State Party had definitions of the items in its national control list without directly asking whether definitions existed.

2) The phrase 'please provide more information below' has been replaced with a list of options the user can choose from in an effort to a) encourage the user to provide more information by making it easier to answer the question; and b) make the information provided by States Parties under this section more comparable.

Explanation 13 (Section 1.J): The phrase 'If 'No', please explain' has been added to this section to encourage the user to explain why its national control list is not publicly available. The publication of a State Party's national control list is 'encouraged' under the Treaty, not mandatory, and hence this section appears in the shaded/non-binding section of the reporting template and States Parties are not required to complete this section. Nevertheless, it gives the opportunity to a State Party that may wish to explain its reasons for non-publication – and indeed may wish to receive assistance in this regard – to volunteer this information.

J. Additional voluntary information about the national control system (please elaborate below – for instance regarding inter-agency coordination structures, training systems for relevant officials, transparency and accountability mechanisms, outreach to private actors such as industry, or any ongoing / planned review or change of the national control system or parts thereof)			
1.3 NATIONAL POINT(S) OF CONTACT			
C. The national point(s) of contact has (have) been notified to the Secretariat of the Treaty [Article 5(6)] (if 'No', please clarify below)		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
K. The contact details of the national point(s) of contact are as follows [Article 5(6)]:			
Name:		Mr. <input type="checkbox"/>	Mrs. <input type="checkbox"/>
Position/Job:			
Ministry:			
Agency/Department:			

Explanation 14 (Original Section 1.J): The section requesting additional voluntary information about the national control system has been moved to section C, above as part of the separation of this entire section into subsections on the national control system, the national control list, and the national point of contact.

Explanation 15 (Section 1.3 - Heading): A numbered heading '1.3 National Point(s) of Contact' has been inserted to give information on what this section relates to and to help users navigate around the report.

Explanation 16 (Section 1.K): The question as to whether a State Party has notified the ATT Secretariat of its National Point of Contact (former Section 1.C) has been deleted because: a) it is a question of fact that can be objectively realised (i.e. the ATT Secretariat has records of which States have submitted their national points of contact and which have not); and b) States Parties have answered this question incorrectly in some instances (i.e. indicating they *have* submitted details of their national points of contact when in fact there is no record of them having done so).

Email address (individual and/or institutional) :	
Telephone no.:	
Address:	

The question has been replaced with appropriate fields that give the user the opportunity to provide details of the State Party's National Point of Contact in its Initial Report.

2. PROHIBITIONS

A. The national control system prohibits authorization of transfers as defined by Article 2(2), of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) and items covered under Articles 3 and 4, <u>if: in the circumstances specified in Articles 6(1) to 6(3)</u> <i>(if 'No' in any respect, please elaborate below)</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
i)	<u>the transfer would violate its obligations under measures adopted by the United Nations Security Council acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular arms embargoes [Article 6(1)]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	<u>the transfer would violate its relevant international obligations under international agreements to which it is a Party, in particular those relating to the transfer of, or illicit trafficking in, conventional arms [Article 6(2)]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	<u>the State Party has knowledge at the time of authorization that the arms or items would be used in the commission of genocide, crimes against humanity, grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, attacks directed against civilian objects or civilians protected as such, or other war crimes as defined by international agreements to which it is a Party [Article 6(3)]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 17 (Section 2.A): In this section, the phrase 'in the circumstances specified in Articles 6(1) to 6(3)' has been replaced with details of the circumstances specified in Articles 6(1) to 6(3) to avoid the user having to refer back to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) in order to answer the question and make it easier to respond accurately.

<u>(If 'Yes', please consider providing further information. If 'No' in any respect, please elaborate below)</u>		
D. Guidelines exist for the assessment of whether a sanctions decision is applicable or not to an individual case <u>(If 'No' in any respect, please elaborate below)</u>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>B. Which international agreements that you are a Party to do you consider to which the country is a Party, and which are considered relevant for the application of Article 6(2)? <u>(Please list below. Please be advised that the ATT Secretariat maintains a non exhaustive list of examples of the international agreements other States Parties have reported 'are relevant' to Article 6(2) in their Initial Reports. The list is available at [insert link##]. States Parties are welcome to consult the list when preparing their answer to this question.)</u></p>		

In addition, the State Party is given an opportunity to provide additional information.

Explanation 18 (Original Section 2.D): This question was moved and reformulated as a question (see D below). The WGTR Co-chairs felt it would be useful to have a general question on guidelines concerning Articles 6 and 7, but for practical reasons (i.e. because the sections on prohibitions and exports are split in the reporting template), it was deemed more appropriate to have two questions regarding the existence of guidelines in the respective sections on prohibitions and exports (see section 3(J) below).

Explanation 19 (Sections 2.B and 2.C): Three changes have been introduced here.

1) The statement has been rephrased as a question to the reporting State Party and now asks which international agreements are *you* a Party to rather than *the country*. This is consistent with phrasing throughout the reporting template, which addresses the user in the second person not the third person.

<p>C. Which international agreements to which the country isare you a Party to and do you consider and which are considered relevant for defining ‘war crimes’ in the context the application of Article 6(3)</p> <p>(Please list below. Please be advised that the ATT Secretariat maintains a non exhaustive list of examples of the international agreements other States Parties have reported ‘are relevant’ to Article 6(3) in their Initial Reports. The list is available at [insert link##]. States Parties are welcome to consult the list when preparing their answer to this question.)</p>	<p>2) The question now indicates it is up to the State Party to identify which international agreements it thinks are relevant to Article 6(3). So instead of asking about international agreements ‘which are considered relevant’ for defining ‘war crimes’, the question asks the user which international agreements ‘do you consider’ relevant.</p> <p>3) States Parties have been given the option to refer to consult a non-exhaustive, non-binding list of examples of the international agreements that other States Parties have reported are ‘relevant’ to Article 6(3) in their Initial Reports. This non-binding, non-prescriptive list will be made available online. The list has not been annexed to the reporting template because it may be subject to amendment and expansion as new Initial Reports are submitted by States Parties listing new or different international agreements.</p> <p><i>Explanation 20 (Section 2.E):</i> States Parties are invited to provide information on their national interpretation of or approach to key concepts in Article 6 as an example of the</p>	
<p>D. Do you have guidelines on the application of the prohibitions to an individual case?</p> <p>(If ‘Yes’, please provide further information)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>E. Additional voluntary information relevant to prohibitions under Article 6</p> <p>(Please elaborate below - for instance, if prohibitions are applied to a wider range of products than defined in Articles 2(1), 3 and 4; the national interpretation of key concepts in Article 6)</p>		

3. EXPORTS			
A. The national control system includes the following:		Yes	No
i)	an authorization or licensing system for arms exports [Article 5(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	export assessment criteria [Article 7]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	a risk assessment procedure [Article 7]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If 'No' to any of the items above, please <u>explain in more detail</u> provide background below			
B. National legislation includes a definition of export [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 7]		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>(If 'Yes', please specify. If 'No', please explain.)</i>			
C. National export controls apply to <u>all</u> the conventional arms covered under Article 2(1), and the items covered under Articles 3 and 4		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>(If 'No', please provide further information below)</i>			

additional voluntary information relevant to prohibitions under Article 6 that they may wish to include in their Initial Report.

Explanation 21 (Section 3.A): The phrase 'provide background below' has been replaced with 'explain in more detail'.

Explanation 22 (Section 3.B): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has a definition of 'export' in its national legislation. Details of whether and how States define the types of transfer identified in Article 2(2) (export, import, transit, trans-shipment and brokering) in their national legislation will help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.

Explanation 23 (Section 3.C): The word 'all' has been added to align with the language of Article 2(1).

<p>D. The competent national authority(-ies) for the control of exports [Article 5(5)] (Please specify <u>the Ministry, Government Agency or Department</u> below)</p>		
<p>E. The national risk assessment procedure includes all the criteria described in Article 7(1)(a) and (b), and Article 7(4) (If 'Yes', please consider providing further information. If 'No' in any respect, please elaborate below)</p>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>F. If a risk is identified, does the State ever considers whether there are The national risk assessment procedure includes the consideration of risk mitigation measures that could be undertaken to mitigate identified risks [Article 7(2)] (If 'Yes' please elaborate below, including an indication of give examples when mitigation measures are considered and of the types of risk mitigation measures that are most often used)</p>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 24 (Section 3.D): The wording 'the Ministry, Government Agency or Department' has been added to help prompt the reporting State Party to specify the entity(-ies) involved in the competent national authority.

Explanation 25 (Section 3.E): The original text only requested additional background information if the reporting State answered 'no' to this section (in an effort to obtain information on why a State Party does not include all the criteria described in Articles 7(1)(a) and (b) and Article 7(4) in its national risk assessment procedure. Now States Parties are encouraged, but not required, to give additional information if they respond 'yes' to this section. This is designed to encourage States Parties to give more detail of their national risk assessment procedure to help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area

Explanation 26 (Section 3.F): The original text has been rephrased as a question (and a question mark needs to be inserted).

In addition, the phrase 'please elaborate below, including an indication of types' has been simplified to 'please give examples'. The phrase 'when mitigation measures are

			<p>considered’ has been included to encourage States Parties to give examples of situations when they consider undertaking measures to mitigate risks in order to identify national practices in this regard.</p> <p>Explanation 27 (Section 3.G): The original text only requested additional background information if the reporting State answered ‘no’ to this section (in an effort to obtain information on why a State Party does <u>not</u> ensure all export authorizations are detailed and issued prior to export). Now States Parties are encouraged, but not required, to give additional information if they respond ‘yes’ to this section. This is designed to encourage States Parties to give more detail of their export authorization procedure to help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area</p>
<p>3.G. The national control system includes measures to ensure that all export authorizations are detailed and issued prior to export [Article 7(5)]</p> <p>(If ‘Yes’, please consider providing further information. If ‘No’, please provide further information below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>3.H. The national control system allows appropriate information about an export authorization to be made available, upon request, to the importing State Party and/or to the transit or trans-shipment States Parties [Article 7(6)]</p> <p>(If ‘No’ please elaborate below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>3.I. The national control system allows exports of controlled equipment without a licence or under simplified procedure under certain circumstances [for instance temporary exports or exports to trusted partners]</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

(If 'Yes' please provide further information below)		
J. Do you have guidelines on the application of the export assessment requirements to an individual case? (If 'Yes', please provide further information)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
K. The national risk assessment procedure includes other criteria <u>not</u> mentioned in the articles cited in 3.D above (If 'Yes' please specify below)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
L. Measures to exercise control over exports are applicable also to other categories of conventional arms than those covered in Articles 2(1), 3 and 4 [Article 5(3)] (If 'Yes', please elaborate below)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
M. An export authorization can be reassessed if new relevant information becomes available [Article 7(7)] (If 'Yes', please provide further information below. Are there also legal provisions for suspension or withdrawal of a license?)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 28 (Section 3.J): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has guidelines on how to apply its export assessment requirements to an export. This is similar to the question in 2(D) above as to whether a State has guidelines on the application of prohibitions to a particular case. Such guidelines could help other States Parties in developing the national systems and conducting export assessments, and will help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area

Explanation 29 (Section 3.M): The sub-question 'Are there also legal provisions for suspension or withdrawal of a license' has been placed as a separate question (see N below) because this is an important consideration in determining whether a State Party can fulfil the obligation under Article 7(7) to reassess an authorization that has been granted, if it 'becomes aware of

<p>11. There are legal provisions for suspension or withdrawal of a license? [Article 7(7)]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please elaborate under which circumstances.[For example, such a provision might exist with respect to arms embargoes but not otherwise] If 'No', please explain.)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>new relevant information'. In addition, the suggestion to disaggregate questions was noted in the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).</p>
<p>12. Information / documentation included in an application for an export authorization</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>13. Apart from the competent national authority, the following ministries or government authorities may be involved in the decision-making process for an export authorization [Article 5(5)]</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>14. The national control system provides information requested of it by allows a State of final destination to request information concerning pending or actual export authorizations pertaining to it [Article 8(3)]</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Explanation 30 (Section 3.Q): This section has been amended to clarify that the national control system does not just 'allow' an importing State to request information, but responds to the request for information.</p>

(If 'No', please elaborate below)			<p>Explanation 31 (Section 3.R): The phrase 'the national interpretation of key concepts in Article 7' has been added as an example of the type of additional voluntary information States Parties may like to include. Why? This was included as an example of an omission included in the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).</p> <p>Explanation 32 (Section 4.A): This section has been amended to make it clearer that it relates to Article 6(1) to 6(3), which stipulate that 'A State Party shall not authorize any transfer...'. The relationship to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) was indicated in the original version through the inclusion of a reference to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) in square brackets at the end of the section. This has now been made more explicit.</p> <p>Explanation 33 (Section 4.B): The wording 'the Ministry, Government Agency or Department' has been added to help</p>
<p>OR. Additional voluntary information relevant to national export controls</p> <p>(Please specify below - for instance: on the control of re-exports, or further detail on national measures indicated in 3A-D and F; the national interpretation of key concepts in Article 7)</p>			
4. IMPORTS			
<p>A. The national control system includes measures that allow the regulation to prevent, where necessary, of imports of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) [ref Article 8(2)], as well as items covered under Articles 3 and 4 in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6. [ref Articles 6(1) to 6(3)]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please provide further information below on the nature of control measures and confirm whether they apply to all items in the national control list. If 'No', please elaborate below)</p>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
If 'Yes', please also answer the following question			
B. The competent national authority(-ies) for the regulation of imports [Article 5(5)]			

<p>(Please specify <u>the Ministry, Government Agency or Department</u> below)</p>		
<p>C. National legislation includes a definition of import [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 8] (If 'Yes', please specify. If 'No', please explain.)</p>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>D. The national control system allows <u>the State to provide for the provision</u>, pursuant to national law and upon request, <u>of appropriate and relevant information to assist another State Party that is conducting an export assessment by a potential exporting State Party</u> [Article 8(1)] (If 'No', please elaborate below)</p>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>E. Imports of conventional arms subject to <u>control regulation</u> are, under specific circumstances, permitted without <u>regulation-specific authorization</u> or under simplified procedure</p>		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

prompt the reporting State Party to specify the entity(-ies) involved in the competent national authority.

Explanation 34 (Section 4.C): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has a definition of 'import' in its national legislation. Details of whether and how States define the types of transfer identified in Article 2(2) (export, import, transit, trans-shipment and brokering) in their national legislation will help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.

Explanation 35 (Section 4.D): The wording in this section has been rephrased to more closely reflect the wording used in Article 8(1) of the Treaty.

Explanation 36 (Section 4.E): This section is designed to elicit voluntary information regarding whether a reporting State has a simplified procedure for the import of arms under specific circumstances (such as temporary imports for sports shooting, testing or exhibition). It has been reworded to more closely

<p>(If 'Yes' please provide further information below)</p>			<p>reflect the wording in Article 8 (which mentions 'regulation' rather than 'control') and to make it clearer what information is being sought. [It also seeks to avoid the tautology: imports of arms subject to regulation/control are sometimes permitted without regulation/control.]</p>
<p>E. Measures to regulate imports are applicable also to other categories of conventional arms than those covered in Article 2(1) [Article 5(3)]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please elaborate below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>F. Apart from the competent national authority, the following ministries or government authorities may be involved in the decision-making process for an import authorization (when such an authorization is required) [Article 5(5)]</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>G. Information / documentation required for an import authorization</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>H. Additional voluntary information relevant to national import controls</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			

5. TRANSIT & TRANS-SHIPMENT

A. The national control system includes measures ~~that allow the regulation to prevent, where necessary and feasible, of the~~ transit of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) [ref Article 9], as well as items covered under Articles 3 and 4 ~~in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6.~~ [ref Articles 6(1) to 6(3)]

(If 'Yes', please provide further information below on the nature of control measures and confirm whether they apply to all items in the national control list. If 'No', please elaborate below)

Yes No

B. The national control system includes measures ~~that allow the regulation to prevent, where necessary and feasible, of the~~ trans-shipment of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) [ref Article 9], as well as items covered under Articles 3 and 4 ~~in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6.~~ [ref Articles 6(1) to 6(3)]

(If 'Yes', please provide further information below on the nature of control measures and confirm whether they apply to all items in the national control list. If 'No', please elaborate below)

Yes No

C. National legislation includes a definition of transit [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 9]

(If 'Yes', please specify. If 'No', please explain.)

Yes No

Explanation 37 (Section 5.A): This section has been amended to make it clearer that it relates to Article 6(1) to 6(3), which stipulate that 'A State Party shall not authorize any transfer...'. The relationship to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) was indicated in the original version through the inclusion of a reference to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) in square brackets at the end of the section. This has now been made more explicit.

Explanation 38 (Section 5.B): This section has been amended to make it clearer that it relates to Article 6(1) to 6(3), which stipulate that 'A State Party shall not authorize any transfer...'. The relationship to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) was indicated in the original version through the inclusion of a reference to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) in square brackets at the end of the section. This has now been made more explicit.

Explanation 39 (Section 5.C): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has a definition of 'transit' in its national legislation. Details of whether and how States define the types of transfer identified in Article 2(2) (export, import, transit, trans-shipment and brokering) in their national legislation will help build a

			<p>compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.</p> <p>Explanation 40 (Section 5.D): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has a definition of 'trans-shipment' in its national legislation. Details of whether and how States define the types of transfer identified in Article 2(2) (export, import, transit, trans-shipment and brokering) in their national legislation will help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area.</p> <p>Explanation 41 (Section 5.E): The wording in this section has been rephrased to more closely reflect the language used in Article 9 ('Each State Party shall take appropriate measures to regulate...'.)</p>	
<p>D. National legislation includes a definition of trans-shipment [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 9]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please specify. If 'No', please explain.)</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>C. Control measures for the regulation of transit and/or trans-shipment cover :</p> <p>(If 'Yes' to (ii) or (iii), please indicate in the free text field how enforcement is conceived - systematic control or only when information is available?)</p>		<p>Yes</p>		<p>No</p>
<p>i)</p>	<p>Transit / trans-shipment through land territory (including internal waters)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>ii)</p>	<p>Transit / trans-shipment through territorial waters</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>iii)</p>	<p>Transit / trans-shipment through national air space</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	

<p>F. Does your State only apply control measures to prevent transit and trans-shipment other than in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6?</p> <p><i>(If 'Yes', please specify the other control measures that your States applies to transit and trans-shipment.)</i></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>G. The competent national authority(-ies) for the regulation of transit and trans-shipment [Article 5(5)]</p> <p><i>(Please specify below)</i></p>		
<p>H. Transit / trans-shipment of controlled equipment is permitted without regulation a specific authorization or under simplified procedure under certain circumstances (for instance in a free trade area)</p> <p><i>(If 'Yes' please provide further information below)</i></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>I. National control of transit and/or trans-shipment goes beyond the fulfillment of obligations under Article 6 of the Treaty</p> <p><i>(If 'Yes', please specify the additional scope of control and indicate whether the additional control applies to all items in the national control list)</i></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Explanation 42 (Section 5.F): This question was moved and reformulated as a question (see deleted F below). The aim is to determine if the reporting State has implemented measures to regulate transit and trans-shipment beyond Article 6.

Explanation 43 (Section 5.H): The word 'regulation' has been replaced with 'a specific authorization'. [

<p>16. Measures to regulate transit and/or trans-shipment are applicable also to other categories of conventional arms than those covered in Article 2(1) [Article 5(3)]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please elaborate below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>14. Apart from the competent national authority, the following ministries or government authorities may be involved in the decision-making process for a transit or trans-shipment authorization (when such an authorization is required) [Article 5(5)]</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>13. Information / documentation required in an application for a transit / trans-shipment authorization</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p>12. Additional voluntary information relevant to national transit / trans-shipment controls</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			

6. BROKERING

<p>A. The national control system includes measures <u>to prevent the that allow the regulation, pursuant to national laws, of brokering of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) [ref Article 10], as well as items covered under Articles 3 and 4 in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6. [ref Articles 6(1) to 6(3)]</u></p> <p>(If 'Yes', please provide further information below on the nature of control measures and confirm that they apply to all items in the national control list. If 'No', please elaborate below)</p>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If 'Yes', please also answer the following question</p>			
<p>B. The measures to regulate brokering include:</p>		Yes	No
i)	<u>Requiring brokers to register before engaging in brokering [Article 10]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i)	<u>Requiring brokers to obtain written authorization before engaging in brokering [Article 10]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	<u>Other (please specify)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>C. National legislation includes a definition of brokering [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 10]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please specify. If 'No', please explain.)</p>			
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 44 (Section 6.A): This section has been amended to make it clearer that it relates to Article 6(1) to 6(3), which stipulate that 'A State Party shall not authorize any transfer...'. The relationship to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) was indicated in the original version through the inclusion of a reference to Articles 6(1) to 6(3) in square brackets at the end of the section. This has now been made more explicit.

Explanation 45 (Section 6.B): Article 10 of the Treaty includes a reference to 'requiring brokers to register or obtain written authorization before engaging in brokering' as measures States Parties may take to regulate brokering. The inclusion of a reference to these specific regulatory measures responds to the observation that questions 'on measures concerning brokering (register? authorizations?)' were omitted from the Initial Reporting template, made in paragraph 13 of the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).

Explanation 46 (Section 6.C): A new section has been included to determine whether or not the reporting State Party has a definition of 'brokering' in its national legislation. Details of whether and how States define the types of transfer identified in Article 2(2) (export, import, transit, trans-shipment and

<p>D. The definition of brokering used in national legislation [Articles 6(1) to 6(3) and Article 10] (please specify in particular if there are extraterritorial elements in the definition, for instance the activities of nationals resident abroad, or transfers that take place between two third countries)</p>		
<p>D. Does your State only apply control measures to prevent brokering other than in violation of the prohibitions in Article 6? (If 'YesNo', please specify the other control measures that your States applies to brokering)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>E. The competent national authority(-ies) for the regulation of brokering [Article 5(5)] (please specify below)</p>		
<p>E. National brokering controls contain exemptions (for instance for national armed forces or defence industry) [Articles 6 & 10] (If 'Yes', please provide further information below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>
		<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>

brokering) in their national legislation will help build a compendium of common practice among States Parties in this area. The previous section (former section 6.B) referring to the 'definition of brokering used in national legislation' has been replaced by this rephrasing.

Explanation 47 (Section 6.D): This question was moved and reformulated as a question (see deleted E below). The aim is to determine if the reporting State has implemented measures to regulate brokering beyond Article 6.

<p>F. National brokering controls go beyond the fulfillment of obligations under Article 6 of the Treaty (for instance regulating brokering in other situations) (if 'Yes', please specify the additional scope of control)</p>			
<p>G. Measures to regulate brokering are applicable also to other categories of conventional arms than those covered in Article 2(1) [Article 5(3)] (if 'Yes', please elaborate below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>H. Apart from the competent national authority, the following ministries or government authorities may be involved in the decision-making process for a control measure related to brokering [Article 5(5)] (please specify below)</p>			
<p>I. Information / documentation required in an application related to brokering (please elaborate below)</p>			
<p>J. Additional voluntary information relevant to national brokering controls (please specify below)</p>			

7. DIVERSION			
A. Measures foreseen in the national control system to prevent the diversion of conventional arms covered by Article 2(1) [Article 11(1)]		Yes	No
i)	assessing the risk of diversion of an export [Article 11(2)] (if 'No', please provide background below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	cooperation and information exchange, where appropriate and feasible and pursuant to national law, with other States Parties [Article 11(3)] (if 'No', please provide background below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. The national control system includes appropriate measures to be taken, pursuant to national law and in accordance with international law, when a diversion of transferred conventional arms under Article 2(1) has been detected [Article 11(4)]		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(if 'No', please elaborate below)			

C. Measures included in the national control system to prevent the diversion of conventional arms covered by Article 2(1) [Article 11(1)] :		Yes	No
i)	establishment of mitigation measures [Article 11(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	provision, upon request, of end use / end user documentation to the exporting State [Article 8(1)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	requirement for end use / end user assurances from an importing State (or industry) [Article 8(1)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	examination, where appropriate, of parties involved in a transfer [Article 11(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v)	requirement, where appropriate, for additional documentation, certificates, assurances for a transfer [Article 11(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vi)	exchange of relevant information with other States Parties on effective measures to address diversion, as well as on illicit activities and actors [Articles 11(5) & 15(4)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*vii)	reporting through the Secretariat to other States Parties on measures taken to address diversion of transferred conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) [Articles 11(6) & 13(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
*vii i)	other measures [Article 11(1)] (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
D. Measures included in the national control system, to be taken when a diversion of transferred conventional arms has been detected [Article 11(4)]		Yes	No	
i)	alerting potentially affected States Parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ii)	investigative and law enforcement measures at the national level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iii)	using international tracing mechanisms to identify points of diversion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iv)	other measures (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p>E. Measures taken to prevent or address diversion are applicable also to other categories of conventional arms than those covered in Article 2(1) [Article 5(3)]</p> <p>(If 'Yes', please elaborate below)</p>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>F. Additional voluntary information relevant to the prevention of diversion of conventional arms</p> <p>(Please specify below - for instance regarding measures in place to avoid diversion in the context of the international movement of conventional arms referred to in Article 2(3) of the Treaty)</p>			
<p>8. RECORD KEEPING</p>			
<p>A. The national control system includes provisions for maintaining records regarding:</p> <p>[Article 12(1)] (it is mandatory to retain records for one of the two options below)</p>	Yes	No	<p><i>Explanation 48 (Section 8.A.i): The phrase 'of the Treaty' is redundant has been deleted.</i></p>
<p>i) issued authorizations for the export of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) of the Treaty [Article 12(1)]</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>ii)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	actual exports of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) of the Treaty [Article 12(1)] (if 'No' to both (i) and (ii), please elaborate below)			<p><u>Explanation 49 (Section 8.A.ii):</u> The phrase 'of the Treaty' is redundant has been deleted.</p> <p><u>Explanation 50 (Section 8.B):</u> A request for the reporting State to include details of how long records are kept has been included to assist in the collection of information on national practice in this area, and also having in mind the potential use of knowing practices about the practical implications and / or inconveniences of keeping records for more than ten years.</p> <p><u>Explanation 51 (Section 8.C.i):</u> The phrase 'of the Treaty' is redundant has been deleted.</p> <p><u>Explanation 52 (Section 8.C.ii):</u> The phrase 'of the Treaty' is redundant has been deleted.</p>
B. Records are kept for a minimum of 10 years [Article 12(4)]				
	(If 'Yes', please elaborate for how many years records are kept. If 'No', please elaborate below)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
C. The national control system includes provisions for maintaining records regarding :				
		Yes	No	
i)	imports of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) of the Treaty into national territory as final destination [Article 12(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ii)	authorizations for the transit and/or trans-shipment through national territory of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) of the Treaty [Article 12(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iii)	authorizations related to the conduct of brokering activities included in the scope of the national control system (for instance relating to a register of brokers) [Article 10]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

D. Records cover other categories of conventional arms than those specified in Article 2(1)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
(If 'Yes', please elaborate below)		
E. Additional voluntary information relevant to national record keeping		
(Please specify below - for instance types of information preserved in national records for exports and imports respectively)		

9. REPORTING

A. The national control system allows for the provision of information for the preceding calendar year concerning authorized or actual exports and imports of conventional arms covered under article 2 (1) as required by Article 13(3)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
(If 'No' or only partially, please elaborate below)		
B. Additional voluntary information relevant to national reporting		

Explanation 53 (Section 9.A): Details of the information required under Article 13(3) of the Treaty have been included here so the State/person reporting does not need to review or refer back to the wording of Article 13(3) in order to be in a position to answer this question (i.e. it ensures the section is self-contained and no cross-referencing with other documents – the Treaty – is required).

(please specify below, for instance if national reports are publicly available - if available on the open internet please provide the relevant hyperlink)

10. ENFORCEMENT

A. Measures are in place that provide the ability to enforce of the national laws and regulations that implement the provisions of the Arms Trade Treaty [Article 14]

Yes

No

(If 'No', please elaborate below)

B. National legislation allows the provision to another State Party of jointly agreed assistance in investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings in relation to violations of national measures established pursuant to this Treaty [Article 15(5)]

Yes

No

(If 'No', please elaborate below)

C. National measures have been taken to prevent, in cooperation with other States Parties, the transfer of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1) of the Treaty becoming subject to corrupt practices [Article 15(6)]

Yes

No

(Please elaborate below)

D. Additional voluntary information relevant to national enforcement

(Please elaborate below - for instance measures taken to criminalize offences against national laws and regulations that implement the provisions of the Arms Trade Treaty and to prescribe legal penalties in these cases.)

11. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

A. Cooperation is possible with other States Parties of the Treaty with a view to its effective implementation, where such cooperation is consistent with national law and security interests [Article 15(1)]

Yes

No

(If 'No', please elaborate below)

B. Additional voluntary information relevant to participation in international cooperation

(Please elaborate below - for instance in terms of the measures suggested in Article 15, or in terms of participation in international or regional cooperation in the transfer control area)

12. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

A. National regulations and policy allow for the provision - upon request and if in a position to do so - of implementation assistance as set out in Article 16(1)		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
(If 'No', please elaborate below)			
B. The State is in a position to provide assistance with the following:		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
i)	<u>Establishing and/or maintaining a national control system [Article 5(2)]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	<u>Establishing and/or maintaining a national control list [Articles 5(2)-(4)]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	<u>Designating competent national authority (-ies) [Article 5(4)]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 54 (Section 12.B): This section (B) has been added to give a State Party that is in a position to provide assistance in accordance with Article 16(1) of the Treaty, an opportunity to specify the type of assistance the State is in a position to provide. This addition responds to the observation that questions relating to international assistance were omitted from the Initial Reporting template made in paragraph 13 of the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).

v)	<u>Designating a national point of contact(s) [Article 5(6)]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
v)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the export of arms and items, including a process for conducting risk assessments [Article 7]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
vi)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the import of arms [Article 8]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
vii)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the transit and trans-shipment of arms [Article 9]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
viii)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the brokering of arms [Article 10]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

x)	<u>Establishing measures to prevent and address diversion [Article 11]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
x)	<u>Record-keeping [Article 12]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
xi)	<u>Reporting [Article 13]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
xii)	<u>Other</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	C. The State would like to receive assistance with the following:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
i)	<u>Establishing and/or maintaining a national control system [Article 5(2)]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation 55 (Section 12.C): This section (C) has been added to give a State Party that would like to request assistance in accordance with Article 16(2) of the Treaty, an opportunity to specify the type of assistance the State wishes to request/receive. This addition responds to the observation that

	(if 'Yes', please specify below)			<p>questions relating to international assistance were omitted from the Initial Reporting template made in paragraph 13 of the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).</p>
ii)	Establishing and/or maintaining a national control list [Articles 5(2)-(4)] (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iii)	Designating competent national authority (-ies) [Article 5(4)] (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iv)	Designating a national point of contact(s) [Article 5(6)] (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
v)	Establishing measures to regulate the export of arms and items, including a process for conducting risk assessments [Article 7] (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
vi)	Establishing measures to regulate the import of arms [Article 8]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	(if 'Yes', please specify below)			
vii)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the transit and trans-shipment of arms [Article 9]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
viii)	<u>Establishing measures to regulate the brokering of arms [Article 10]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ix)	<u>Establishing measures to prevent and address diversion [Article 11]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
x)	<u>Record-keeping [Article 12]</u> (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
xi)	<u>Reporting [Article 13]</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	(if 'Yes', please specify below)		
xii)	Other (if 'Yes', please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	D. National regulations and policy allow the provision for contribution of financial resources to the Voluntary Trust Fund established under Article 16(3) of the Treaty (if 'No', please elaborate below)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	E. Additional voluntary information relevant to the provision- or receipt of implementation assistance (Please specify below - for instance regarding assistance provision capacities or assistance needs,)		

Explanation 56 (Section 12.D): Article 16(3) of the Treaty encourages States Parties to 'contribute' resources to the Fund, hence the word 'provision' has been replaced with 'contribution' to more accurately reflect the language of the Treaty.

13. DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

<p>A. National regulations and policy allow for consultations and, by mutual consent, cooperation in the settlement of disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the Treaty by at least one of the means outlined in Article 19(1)</p> <p>(If 'No', please elaborate below)</p>			
<p>B. National regulations and policy allow for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Treaty through recourse by mutual consent to arbitration as outlined in Article 19(2)</p> <p>(If 'No', please elaborate below)</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>C. Additional voluntary information relevant to dispute settlement under the terms of the Treaty</p> <p>(Please specify below)</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">ANNEX A. Summary of updates to the previous Initial Report</p>			
<p><i>Please include a description of the parts of the State's previous Initial Report that have been updated:</i></p>			<p><i>Explanation 57 (Annex A):</i> This section has been added to give a State Party that is submitting a revised or updated Initial Report an opportunity to describe the changes to the State's national control system that have been introduced or implemented since the State submitted its previous Initial Report. This addition responds to the observation that 'there is not a single indication of the update requirement, nor a process</p>

	<p>or template to do so' made in paragraph 10 of the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.Rev1)).</p>
<p>(this page is intentionally blank)</p>	

ANNEX B. CO-CHAIRS' EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE ANNUAL REPORTING TEMPLATE



31 March 2021

Issued by: the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting

Original: English

**ATT WORKING GROUP ON TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING
CO-CHAIRS' EXPLANATION OF THE DRAFT PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE ANNUAL REPORTING TEMPLATE**

The following table provides an explanation of the adjustments proposed by the Co-chairs of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting (WGTR) to the revised Annual Reporting template, as contained in Annex C of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP6 ([ATT/CSP6.WGTR/2020/CHAIR/607/Conf.Rep](#)). The text of the revised Annual Reporting template is presented in the first column, with all draft proposed adjustments appearing in track changes. An explanation for each of the draft proposed changes is provided in the second column, parallel to where the draft proposed adjustment appears in the revised Annual Reporting template.

Revised Annual Report	Explanation for adjustment
<p align="center">THE ARMS TRADE TREATY</p> <p align="center">REPORTING TEMPLATE</p> <p>ANNUAL REPORT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 13(3) - EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS COVERED UNDER ARTICLE 2-(1)</p> <p>This provisional template is intended for use by States Parties to the Arms Trade Treaty when preparing their annual report in accordance with the Treaty's Article 13(3).</p> <p>The template has two main tables, one for exports and the other for imports. The tables are similar in construction, making it possible to have a common set of explanatory notes for both.</p>	

Article 5(3) of the Treaty states that “National definitions of any of the categories covered under Article 2 (1) (a)-(g) shall not cover less than the descriptions used in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms at the time of entry into force of this Treaty”. Against this background, Annex 1 reproduces the UN Registry Definitions of Categories I-VII at the time of the ATT’s entry into force. For category VIII (small arms and light weapons), the UN Registry template for voluntary reporting of this category at the time of the ATT’s entry into force has been employed as an approximation.

Annex 2 allows reporting States Parties to, if they so wish, include more specific information on national definitions of reported categories.

Annex 3 comprises two templates for nil reports, one for exports and one for imports. They may be used in place of a report in table format if a States Party has no transactions to report.

The title page of the template contains information on the submitting country and authority, but also a ‘table of contents’ in tick-box form, to indicate which of the different available forms have been included in the national submission. There is also a ~~(voluntary)~~ section where the reporting Government may indicate whether any commercially sensitive and/or national security-related data has been withheld in accordance with Article 13.3 of the Treaty

Explanation 1 (Cover page paragraph 3): The word ‘Registry’ was corrected to ‘Register’.

Explanation 2 (Cover page paragraph 6): The word ‘voluntary’ has been deleted because the designation of information to be provided as mandatory or voluntary raises a broader issue of what is mandatory and voluntary information under the Treaty and thus affects national interpretation. This debate would go beyond the WGTR mandate. Designating certain information as voluntary or mandatory has been considered confusing, because the Treaty does not prescribe exactly which information needs to be provided. That is also clearly indicated in questions 1 and 2 of the FAQ-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation. The said document, in question 22, clarifies what “represents a common understanding – not a Treaty obligation – of what information States Parties should include as a minimum when they report their authorized or actual exports and imports”. In that regard this is just a question of aligning the language of the annual reporting template and the FAQ-type guidance document. For clarity, there is also a difference between the voluntary or mandatory nature of information on the one

On the title page of each of the four reporting forms (exports, imports, nil exports, nil imports) a State Party ~~has the option of indicating that the form is for distribution only to other States Parties to the Treaty~~ must indicate whether the form may be made publicly available. This makes it possible to restrict access to some forms but not others, which provides an additional measure of flexibility to the reporting States Party.

Guidance to facilitate the preparation of the annual report can be found in the document “Reporting Authorized or Actual Exports and Imports of Conventional Arms under the ATT” (hereinafter: ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation), which is available in the Tools and Guidelines section of the ATT website. This document was endorsed by States Parties at CSP3 as an informative and open-ended reference document for States Parties when preparing their annual report. At CSP5 States Parties endorsed a number of amendments that were necessary to reflect the introduction of the online reporting tool.

hand and the voluntary or mandatory nature of treaty provisions on the other hand. This adjustment only refers to the voluntary or mandatory nature of information to be reported. In that respect this does fall within the remit of the WGTR’s work.

Explanation 3 (Cover page paragraph 7): This sentence has been amended to align it to the revised wording in the body of the report (see Explanation 10) and to make it clear(er) that the reporting State Party must indicate whether the report should be made publicly available. The current wording is confusing and has led to some States Parties indicating that they only want distribution to other States Parties against their actual intention.

Explanation 4 (Cover page paragraph 8): This sentence has been added to alert reporters to the existence and availability of the FAQ-type guidance document, reflecting the observation that consideration should be given to whether the work in the working groups should be reflected in the templates, captured in paragraph 6 of the WGTR Co-chairs’ inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs’ Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.R ev1)).

GOVERNMENT OF _____

ANNUAL REPORT ON EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 13(3) OF THE ARMS TRADE TREATY

REPORT FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR _____

National Point of Contact for this Report:

Name :		Mr. <input type="checkbox"/>	Mrs. <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Position/Job title :</u>			
Organisation :			
Fixed Phone :			
Mobile Phone :			
Fax:			
E-mail :			

Explanation 5 (National Point of Contact): This section has been amended in three ways.

- 1) Tick boxes enabling the reporter to indicate whether he/she is a 'Mr' or 'Mrs' have been included. Information on the gender/title of the reporting person helps in communication with the individual.
- 2) A field asking the reporter to indicate his/her 'Position/Job title' has been inserted for informational and communication purposes.
- 3) The field for 'Fax' has been deleted as fax machines are largely obsolete and this field has rarely – if ever – been used by a reporting State.

Date of Submission Report :		<p>Explanation 6 (Date of Report): The word ‘Submission’ has been replaced with ‘Report’ because often the date indicated in the ‘Date of Submission’ field is <u>not</u> the actual date the State Party submitted the report to the ATT Secretariat. In practice, it generally reflects the date that the report was finalised by the State Party, or the date it was ‘signed off’ by the responsible Government entity. But sometimes there is a delay between the date of finalisation or ‘sign off’ and the actual date of submission to the ATT Secretariat. Accordingly, this date can be misleading if taken as an indication of the date of submission. The ATT Secretariat records the actual date of submission in a database as the date that the ATT Secretariat <i>received</i> the Annual Report (via email, post or through the online reporting tool). Often the date of (actual) submission recorded by the ATT Secretariat does not match the ‘Date of Submission’ indicated in the Annual Report.</p>	
The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) may use the relevant information in this Annual Report as a basis for the reporting State’s report to the United Register on Conventional Arms (UNROCA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Explanation 7 (UNODA/UNROCA): This section has been added to give the reporting State the opportunity to consent to UNODA using the relevant information in the State’s submission of its ATT Annual Report as a basis for its report to the UN Register of Conventional Arms. This change responds to the suggestion made in paragraph 16 of the WGTR Co-chairs’ inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs’ Report to CSP5</p>	
Contents of report (check as appropriate)			
		Yes	No
i)	Nil report on exports of conventional arms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Nil report on imports of conventional arms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Annual report on exports of conventional arms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

iv)	Annual report on imports of conventional arms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>(ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.R ev1)). The proposal was introduced in 2019 in line with the longstanding call for synergies between the reporting regimes. The Treaty indicates that “the report submitted to the Secretariat may contain the same information submitted by the State Party to relevant UN frameworks, including the UNROCA”. The proposal to create this synergy between the reporting regimes will benefit UNROCA and in that regard allow for a more comprehensive overview of the global arms trade, not only involving ATT States Parties but, potentially, all UN Member States.</p>
v)	National definitions of categories of conventional arms reported	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
				<p><u>Explanation 8 (Cover page – Scope of report):</u> The reference to ‘voluntary information’ has been deleted because of the reasons detailed in Explanation 2.</p> <p>The reporter has also been given an opportunity to consider explaining why and what kind of information was withheld.</p>
Scope of report (voluntary information)		Yes	No	
<p>In the submitted report, some commercially sensitive and/or national security-related data has been withheld in accordance with Article 13.3 of the Treaty¹ (If ‘Yes’ please consider explaining why and what kind of information was withheld)</p>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
EXPORTS OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS¹²				<p><u>Explanation 9 (Exports Subheading):</u> See Explanation 2.</p>
<p>- SHADED COLUMNS AND ROWS REPRESENT <u>VOLUNTARY INFORMATION THAT GOES BEYOND THE COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT INFORMATION STATES PARTIES SHOULD INCLUDE AS A MINIMUM WHEN THEY REPORT THEIR AUTHORIZED OR ACTUAL EXPORTS AND IMPORTS-</u></p>				
Reporting country :		Calendar Year :	Cutoff date ²³ :	

In this report, the following definition of the term exports was used³⁴ (check as appropriate) :

Physical transfer of items across a national border :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer of title :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer of control :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please provide a brief description below) :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

This Annual Report on exports may be made publicly available⁵ ~~is available only to States Parties~~

Yes No

Explanation 10 (Exports - Availability): Two changes have been introduced here.

1) The phrase ‘is available only to States Parties’ has been replaced with ‘may be made publicly available’. **Why?** Because the phrase ‘is available only to States Parties’ has been misinterpreted by some States Parties and has caused some confusion. In some instances, it has led some States to tick the box because they have understood that if they do not tick the box, the report will not be available to *anyone*, even States Parties. The intention is to make it clear that if a State Party ticks ‘yes’ to this statement, the report will be made available to *everyone*. And if they tick ‘no’, the report will only be available to States Parties.

2) The single tick box with no indication of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ has been replaced with two tick boxes, one marked ‘yes’ and one marked ‘no’. **Why?** The use of a single tick box with no indication of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ seems to have caused some

Category of arms⁴ arms ⁶ [I-VIII]	Authorised or actual exports ⁵ exports ⁷		Extent of exports ⁶ exports ⁸ (choose one or both)		Final importing State ^{9,11}	State of origin (if not exporter) ^{10,12}	Remarks ¹⁴ Remarks ¹³	
	Auth.	Act.	Number of items ^{7,9}	Value ^{8,10}			Description of Item	Comments on the transfer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

A. I-VII UN Registry Categories ¹⁴² (national definitions shall not cover less than the definitions provided in Annex 1 ¹³⁵)									
I.	Battle tanks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
II.	Armoured combat vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
III.	Large-calibre artillery systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
IV.	Combat Aircraft	a) manned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) unmanned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
V.	Attack helicopters	a) manned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) unmanned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
VI.	Warships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
VI I.	Missiles & missile launchers	a) Missiles etc	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) MANPADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

confusion in the past. Some States Parties put a cross *outside* the box as a way of indicating ‘no’ (on the assumption that if they tick inside it means ‘yes’). This led their reports to be made available only to States Parties, erroneously. The use of a ‘yes’ box and a ‘no’ box should make it easier for States to indicate whether they agree with the statement or not.

B. VIII. Small Arms and Light Weapons ^{164, 167}									
Small Arms (aggregated) ¹⁶⁸		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
2.	Rifles and carbines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
3.	Sub-machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
4.	Assault rifles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
5.	Light machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
6.	Others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Light Weapons (aggregated) ¹⁶⁷		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
1.	Heavy machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
4.	Recoilless rifles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
5.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						

In this report, the following definition of the term imports was used³⁴ (check as appropriate) :

Physical transfer of items across a national border :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer of title :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer of control :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please provide a brief description below) :	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

This Annual Report on imports <u>may be made publicly available</u>⁵ is available only to States Parties	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Explanation 13 (Imports - Availability): See Explanation 10.

Category of arms ⁴⁶ [I-VIII]	Authorised or actual imports ⁵⁷		Extent of imports ⁶⁸ (choose one or both)		Exporting State ⁹¹¹	State of origin (if not exporter) ⁴⁰¹ 2	Remarks ¹³⁴⁴	
	Auth.	Act.	Number of items ⁷ items ⁹	Value ⁸¹⁰			Description of Item	Comments on the transfer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

A. I-VII UN Registry Categories ¹⁴² (national definitions shall not cover less than the definitions provided in Annex 1)- ¹⁵³									
I.	Battle tanks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
II.	Armoured combat vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
III.	Large-calibre artillery systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
IV.	Combat aircraft	a) manned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) unmanned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
V.	Attack helicopters	a) manned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) unmanned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
VI.	Warships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
VI I.	Missiles & missile launchers	a) Missiles etc	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
		b) MANPADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

B. VIII. Small Arms and Light Weapons ^{164, 167}									
Small Arms (aggregated)¹⁸⁶		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
1.	Revolvers and self-loading pistols	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
2.	Rifles and carbines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
3.	Sub-machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
4.	Assault rifles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
5.	Light machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
6.	Others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Light Weapons (aggregated)¹⁹⁷		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
1.	Heavy machine guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
2.	Hand-held under-barrel and mounted grenade launchers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
3.	Portable anti-tank guns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
4.	Recoilless rifles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
5.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						

	Portable anti-tank missile launchers and rocket systems										
6.	Mortars of calibres less than 75 mm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
7.	Others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
C. Voluntary National Categories¹⁸²⁰ (please define in Annex 2)											
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>								
EXPLANATORY NOTES											
<p>1) See questions 29 to 31 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.</p>											

Explanation 14 (Imports Section C): See Explanation 2.

Explanation 15 (Explanatory Note 1): This explanatory note was added to alert reporters to the existence and availability of the FAQ-type guidance document, and direct them to the relevant section of the guidance document. The references to specific questions in the FAQ-

- 2) States Parties that do not have any exports and/or imports to report should file a "nil report" clearly stating that no exports/imports have taken place in any of the categories during the reporting period. Templates for such nil reports are included in Annex 3. [See also question 33 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.](#)
- 3) Date for collected statistics (for instance 30 June or 31 December). [See also question 3 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.](#)
- 4) Based on UN Registry practice. An international arms transfer could mean, in addition to the physical movement of equipment to or from national territory, the transfer of title to- and control over the equipment. Other criteria are also possible. States Parties should here provide a description of the national criteria used to determine, for control purposes, exactly when an arms transfer takes place. [See also question 5 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.](#)

type guidance document were included to indicate that the document contains guidance on the specific element of the reporting template at hand, with a view to optimise the use of the 'FAQ'. Amendments to the 'FAQ' – which would require consensus – could potentially require also amending the reporting template, but practice so far has shown this is unlikely. Since its adoption, the FAQ-type guidance document has only been amended to be in line with the newly developed online reporting tool; no substantive changes have been proposed. In any case, amendments to the 'FAQ' would at most require changing or adding a question number in the AR template. If the CSP would endorse an amendment that requires changing or adding a question number in the reporting template, the CSP could simply task the Secretariat to do so.

[Explanation 16 \(Explanatory Note 2\)](#): See Explanation 15.

[Explanation 17 \(Explanatory Note 3\)](#): See Explanation 15.

[Explanation 18 \(Explanatory Note 4\)](#): The word 'Registry' was corrected to 'Register'.

The final sentence was added for the reasons explained in Explanation 15.

5) If you wish this Annual Report to be publicly available and posted on the public area of the ATT website, tick ‘Yes’. If you tick ‘No’, this Annual Report will be posted on the restricted area of the website and will not be publicly available. See question 41 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

Explanation 19 (Explanatory Note 5): This explanatory note was added to ensure reporting States understand the consequences of ticking ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to this question.

The final sentence was added for the reasons explained in Explanation 15.

4)6) As outlined in Articles 2 (1) (a)-(h) and 5(3). **For more precise definitions of the categories, see Annex 1.** See also section B.ii. in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

Explanation 20 (Explanatory Note 6): See Explanation 15.

5)7) Article 13(3) allows reporting of either authorised or actual exports / imports. The choice can be made at the national level for a report as a whole or category by category. Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box for each category reported whether the value represents authorisations (Auth.) or actual exports (Act.). **It is highly desirable that national choices in this respect, once made, should remain stable over time for reasons of consistency and continuity.** A State Party wishing to report ~~both authorised and actual exports / imports~~ quantity and value may of course do so, but then needs to submit two tables, one for authorised exports / imports and the other for actual exports / imports. See also questions 9 to 11 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

Explanation 21 (Explanatory Note 7): The phrase ‘quantity and value’ was replaced with ‘authorised and actual exports / imports’ because this reflects the wording in Article 13(3).

The final sentence was added for the reasons explained in Explanation 15.

6)8) The size of exports / imports may be indicated either as quantity or as value. The choice can be made at the national level for each category of arms, but, **once made, should remain stable over time for reasons of consistency and continuity.** A State Party wishing to report both quantity and value may of course do so. See also question 24 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

Explanation 22 (Explanatory Note 8): See Explanation 15.

7)9) Standard UN Registry reporting variable. Please indicate unit, if not ‘pieces’.

Explanation 23 (Explanatory Note 9): The word ‘Registry’ was corrected to ‘Register’.

8)10) _____ Optional alternative. Please indicate unit (for example national currency).

11) In line with UN Registry practice. See also questions 22 and 23 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation on breaking down information.

Explanation 24 (Explanatory Note 11): See Explanation 15.

12) In line with UN Registry practice. NB: This is a shaded column because this information goes beyond the common understanding of what information States Parties should include as a minimum when they report their authorized or

Explanation 25 (Explanatory Note 12): This explanatory note was amended in three ways.

~~actual exports and imports, voluntary in terms of the obligations of the ATT. See also question 24 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.~~

13) In line with UN Registry practice. In the first "Remarks" column, States Parties may, if they so wish, describe the item transferred by entering the designation, type, model or any other information considered relevant. The second column may be used to explain or clarify the nature of the transfer - for instance if it is temporary (e.g. for exhibitions or repairs), or if it is industrial in nature (perhaps intended for integration into a larger system). NB: In line with UN Register practice, States Parties may choose between reporting respectively small arms and light weapons as an aggregate, or by sub-type~~These are shaded columns, voluntary in terms of the obligations of the ATT. See also questions 25 to 28 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.~~

~~14)~~ 14) As outlined in Article 2 (1) (a)-(g), See Annex 1 for the UN Registry's more precise definitions of the categories I-VII, including subcategories. See also question 12 and Annexes 1 and 2 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

~~15)~~ 15) See Article 5(3). See also question 12 and Annexes 1 and 2 in the 'FAQ'-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

1) The word 'Registry' was corrected to 'Register'.
 2) The phrase 'voluntary in terms of the obligations of the ATT' was replaced with wording that reflects the findings and observations made in paragraphs 4(2) and 5 of the WGTR Co-chairs' inventory of comments and suggestions made by WGTR participants regarding the reporting templates (see Annex A of the WGTR Co-chairs' Report to CSP5 (ATT/CSP5.WGTR/2019/CHAIR/533/Conf.Rep.R ev1)).
 3) The final sentence was added for the reasons described in Explanation 15.

Explanation 26 (Explanatory Note 13): This explanatory note was amended in three ways.

1) The word 'Registry' was corrected to 'Register'.
 2) The phrase 'voluntary in terms of the obligations of the ATT' was replaced for the reasons described in Explanation 2.
 3) The final sentence was added for the reasons described in Explanation 15.

Explanation 27 (Explanatory Note 14): See Explanation 15.

Explanation 28 (Explanatory Note 15): See Explanation 15.

~~11~~16) As outlined in Article 2 (1) (h), with sub-categories taken from the UN Register~~y~~ template for voluntary reporting of Small Arms and Light Weapons in alignment with the provision in Article 5(3), which stipulates that: ‘For the category covered under Article 2 (1) (h), national definitions shall not cover less than the descriptions used in relevant United Nations instruments at the time of entry into force of this Treaty’. This choice has been made provisionally, pending later agreement between States Parties on the desirability of using this or another UN description or definition of SALW sub-categories (for instance from the UN Firearms Protocol or the International Tracing Instrument - ITI). NB: The SALW sub-categories in this report are shaded, in line with the UN Register practice that allows States to choose between reporting small arms by sub-type or as an aggregate representing voluntary information in terms of the obligations of the ATT. See also questions 13 and 14 and Annex 3 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

~~12~~17) “national definitions shall not cover less than the descriptions used in relevant United Nations instruments at the time of entry into force of this Treaty” (Article 5(3)) See also question 12 and Annexes 1 and 2 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

~~13~~18) In line with UN Register~~y~~ practice, States Parties may choose between reporting small arms by sub-type or as an aggregate. See also question 13 and Annex 3 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

~~14~~19) In line with UN Register~~y~~ practice, States Parties may choose between reporting light weapons by sub-type or as an aggregate. See also question 13 and Annex 3 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

~~15~~20) Article 5(3) encourages States Parties to apply the provisions of the Treaty to the broadest range of conventional weapons. Any such additional categories are voluntary and categories used may vary between States Parties. If provided at all, extra categories should be more precisely defined in Annex 2. See also questions 15 and 16 in the ‘FAQ’-type guidance document on the annual reporting obligation.

Explanation 29 (Explanatory Note 16): This explanatory note was amended in five ways.

- 1) The word ‘Registry’ was corrected to ‘Register’.
- 2) A detailed reference to Article 5(3) of the ATT has been added to alert reporters to the source of the categories of small arms and light weapons listed in the reporting template.
- 3) The phrase ‘description or’ has been inserted in the phrase ‘UN *description or* definition of SALW sub-categories’ to reflect the wording in Article 5(3), which refers to ‘descriptions’ used in relevant UN instruments.
- 4) The phrase ‘voluntary in terms of the obligations of the ATT’ was replaced for the reasons described in Explanation 2.
- 5) The final sentence was added for the reasons explained in Explanation 15.

Explanation 30 (Explanatory Note 17): See Explanation 15.

Explanation 31 (Explanatory Note 18): See Explanation 15.

Explanation 32 (Explanatory Note 19): See Explanation 15.

Explanation 33 (Explanatory Note 20): See Explanation 15.

ANNEX 1
UN Registry Definitions of Categories I-VII¹

I. Battle tanks

Tracked or wheeled self-propelled armoured fighting vehicles with high cross-country mobility and a high-level of self-protection, weighing at least 16.5 metric tons unladen weight, with a high muzzle velocity direct fire main gun of at least 75 millimetres calibre.

II. Armoured combat vehicles

Tracked, semi-tracked or wheeled self-propelled vehicles, with armoured protection and cross-country capability, either: (a) designed and equipped to transport a squad of four or more infantrymen, or (b) armed with an integral or organic weapon of at least 12.5 millimetres calibre or a missile launcher.

III. Large-calibre artillery systems

Guns, howitzers, artillery pieces, combining the characteristics of a gun or a howitzer, mortars or multiple-launch rocket systems, capable of engaging surface targets by delivering primarily indirect fire, with a calibre of 75 millimetres and above.

IV. Combat aircraft

- a) Manned fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft, designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons or other weapons of destruction, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized electronic warfare, suppression of air defence or reconnaissance missions;
- b) Unmanned fixed-wing or variable-geometry wing aircraft, designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided missiles, unguided rockets, bombs, guns, cannons or other weapons of destruction.

The term “combat aircraft” does not include primary trainer aircraft, unless designed, equipped or modified as described above.

Explanation 34 (Annex 1): The word ‘Registry’ was corrected to ‘Register’ (in the subheading and the footnote).

¹ Excerpted from the 2014 UN Registry reporting template

V. Attack helicopters

- a) Manned rotary-wing aircraft, designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided or unguided anti-armour, air-to-surface, air-to-subsurface, or air-to-air weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons, including versions of these aircraft which perform specialized reconnaissance or electronic warfare missions;
- b) Unmanned rotary-wing aircraft, designed, equipped or modified to engage targets by employing guided or unguided anti-armour, air-to-surface, air-to-subsurface, or air-to-air weapons and equipped with an integrated fire control and aiming system for these weapons.

VI. Warships

Vessels or submarines armed and equipped for military use with a standard displacement of 500 metric tons or above, and those with a standard displacement of less than 500 metric tons, equipped for launching missiles with a range of at least 25 kilometres or torpedoes with similar range.

VII. Missiles and missile launchers²

- a) Guided or unguided rockets, ballistic or cruise missiles capable of delivering a warhead or weapon of destruction to a range of at least 25 kilometres, and means designed or modified specifically for launching such missiles or rockets, if not covered by categories I through VI. For the purpose of the Register, this sub-category includes remotely piloted vehicles with the characteristics for missiles as defined above but does not include ground-to-air missiles.
- b) Man-Portable Air-Defence Systems (MANPADS)³.

ANNEX 2

Reporting country :		Calendar Year :	
----------------------------	--	------------------------	--

Specific (diverging or more detailed) national definitions of categories I-VIII

² Multiple-launch rocket systems are covered by the definition of category III.

³ MANPADS should be reported if the MANPAD system is supplied as a complete unit, i.e. the missile and launcher/Grip Stock form an integral unit. In addition, individual launching mechanisms or grip-stocks should also be reported. Individual missiles, not supplied with a launching mechanism or grip stock need not be reported.

(or simple reference to initial report, if this information was provided there)

No	Description
I.	
II.	
III.	
IV.	
V.	
VI.	
VII.	
VIII.	

Definitions of ~~voluntary~~-additional national categories - Section C of table(s)
 (or simple reference to initial report, if this information was provided there)

No	Description

[Explanation 35 \(Annex 2\)](#): See Explanation 2.

<p>ANNEX 3 A</p> <p>NIL REPORT</p> <p>Exports of Conventional Arms¹</p>						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;">Reporting country :</td> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;">Calendar Year :</td> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> </tr> </table>			Reporting country :		Calendar Year :	
Reporting country :		Calendar Year :				
<p>The Government of _____,</p> <p>with reference to Article 13 (3) of the Arms Trade Treaty, hereby submits a ‘nil report’ for exports from territory under our jurisdiction. This report serves to confirm that</p>						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">no actual exports of conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty have taken place from territory under our jurisdiction during the reporting period indicated above.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">no export authorizations have been issued for conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty during the reporting period indicated above.</td> </tr> </table>			<input type="checkbox"/>	no actual exports of conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty have taken place from territory under our jurisdiction during the reporting period indicated above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	no export authorizations have been issued for conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty during the reporting period indicated above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	no actual exports of conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty have taken place from territory under our jurisdiction during the reporting period indicated above.					
<input type="checkbox"/>	no export authorizations have been issued for conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty during the reporting period indicated above.					
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 55%; padding: 5px;"> This nil report on exports may be made publicly available⁵ is available only to States Parties </td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">Yes <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center; padding: 5px;">No <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>			This nil report on exports may be made publicly available⁵ is available only to States Parties	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
This nil report on exports may be made publicly available⁵ is available only to States Parties	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>				
<p>ANNEX 3 B</p>						

Explanation 36 (Annex 3 A): See Explanation 10.

**NIL REPORT
Imports of Conventional Arms¹**

Reporting country :		Calendar Year :	
----------------------------	--	------------------------	--

The Government of _____,

with reference to Article 13 (3) of the Arms Trade Treaty, hereby submits a ‘nil report’ for imports from territory under our jurisdiction. This report serves to confirm that

<input type="checkbox"/>	no actual imports of conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty have taken place to territory under our jurisdiction during the reporting period indicated above.
<input type="checkbox"/>	no import authorizations have been issued for conventional arms listed in Article 2 (1) of the Arms Trade Treaty during the reporting period indicated above.

This nil report on imports is available only to States Parties may be made publicly available⁵	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Explanation 37 (Annex 3 B): See Explanation 10.

ANNEX C. BACKGROUND PAPER: CONSIDERATIONS FOR A SEARCHABLE ONLINE DATABASE



31 March 2021

Prepared by the ATT Secretariat

Original: English

BACKGROUND PAPER: CONSIDERATIONS FOR A SEARCHABLE ONLINE DATABASE

Introduction

The possibility of developing a searchable online database that would facilitate the extraction and analysis of data contained in the ATT Annual Reports has been referenced under standing agenda item 5 – Reporting and transparency functionalities of the IT platform - of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting (WGTR).

In light of this background, the Co-chairs of the WGTR asked the ATT Secretariat to prepare a background paper outlining questions that could be put to States Parties to ascertain what they want and expect from a searchable online database.

Aim of the paper

The ATT Secretariat has prepared this background paper in response to the Co-chairs request. The aim of the paper is to facilitate a discussion among WGTR participants to identify their expectations and preferences for a possible searchable online database, with a view to determining draft parameters and features of such a database.

This, in turn, will be used to obtain a cost estimate for the development of such a database, and it will then be for States Parties (through the WGTR Co-chairs) to assess the cost-benefit of investing in such an instrument, and to decide whether they want to proceed with the development of such a tool, with its cost implications for the ATT budget.

Points for consideration/discussion

1. What is a 'searchable online database'?

In simple terms, a searchable database is a tool or platform that gives users the ability to conduct queries within a set of data. ATT Annual Reports include information or data on arms imports and exports made by reporting States Parties in certain calendar years. In the context of the data contained in the ATT Annual Reports, such a tool might enable users to run queries or ask questions such as: *How many warships did State Party X export to State Party Y in 2017?*

2. Why do participants want a searchable online database?/ What would participants use a searchable online database for?

Participants should consider and explore why a searchable online database is needed or would be useful in the ATT context by discussing questions such as:

- a. *What queries would participants like the database to answer?*

- b. *What information or analysis do participants want the searchable database to produce (e.g., export of raw data only or generate graphs and charts)?*
- c. *Do participants want the database to be able to perform automatic calculations (e.g., what is the total value of weapons exported by State Party X between 2017 and 2021?)*
- d. *What would participants do with the information generated by the database? How will it help them in their work?*
- e. *Would the information generated by the database help States Parties implement any of their obligations under the Treaty e.g., would it help conduct risk assessments under Articles 7 or 11?*

3. Who would use a searchable online database?

There are many stakeholders that might use the information and analysis generated by an ATT searchable database for different reasons.

- a. *How would States Parties use an ATT searchable database?*
- b. *How would Signatories and Observers use an ATT searchable database?*
- c. *How would international and regional organisations use an ATT searchable database?*
- d. *How would civil society use an ATT searchable database?*
- e. *How would industry use an ATT searchable database?*

4. What would an ATT searchable online database add to the existing landscape?

There are publicly available searchable online databases that allow users to conduct queries regarding arms transfers (e.g., the [SIPRI arms transfers database](#), [UN Comtrade](#) and the [COARM \(EU\) online database](#)). The SIPRI arms transfer database relies on a variety of sources when collecting information for its database [including ATT Annual Reports]

- a. *What is the 'added value' of an ATT searchable database?*
- b. *Are there 'gaps' in the existing searchable databases on arms transfers that an ATT searchable database could/would 'fill'?*
- c. *Would the value of the ATT searchable database be limited (compared to other databases) given that it would only analyse information from ATT Annual Reports (and no other sources of information)?*

5. Are there methods of reporting that might limit the efficacy/utility of an ATT searchable database?

5.1 Format

A total of 285 Annual Reports have been submitted by States Parties to the ATT⁴ since the ATT entered into force in December 2014 and the obligation to submit Annual Reports under Article 13(3) came into effect. An online reporting tool was made available in 2018, allowing States Parties to submit their Annual Reports by entering the data directly into an electronic form. Since online reporting was made available, a total of [19]⁵ States Parties have submitted their Annual Reports by filling in the online, electronic form.

⁴ 2015: 52 Annual Reports; 2016: 54 Annual Reports; 2017: 59 Annual Reports; 2018: 62 Annual Reports; 2019: 57 Annual Reports; 2020: one Annual Report so far.

⁵ 2018: seven (7) Annual Reports; 2019: 12 Annual Reports.

The remaining 266 Annual Reports were submitted in Word or PDF format. This means that just over 6% of the data contained in ATT Annual Reports has been entered into the system in electronic format.

If a searchable database is established, the information or data contained in the 266 Annual Reports that were submitted in Word and PDF (as well as any *future* reports submitted in Word or PDF) would need to be manually entered into the electronic database that will form the data source for the searchable database. The costs associated with this manual data entry would need to be factored into a cost estimate.

Alternatively, participants could consider/decide that a searchable online database will only analyse or search data that is entered into the system using the online reporting tool. This would mean that data provided in Annual Reports that are *not* submitted using the online reporting tool would not be in the database and would not be searchable, leading to an incomplete data source. This will also have implications for States that do not use the reporting template at all.

5.2 'Authorized' versus 'actual' transfers

Under Article 13(3) of the ATT, States Parties are required to submit Annual Reports concerning 'authorized or actual' exports and imports of conventional arms covered under Article 2(1), and the Annual Reporting template gives States Parties the option to report on actual or authorized imports and exports. Accordingly, some States Parties submit information on *authorized* transfers for a given calendar year (i.e. how many/what value of arms were granted a licence or permit for export or import) and others submit information on *actual* transfers (how many/what value of arms were physically exported or imported).

- a. *What are the implications of having both types of data in the searchable database?*
- b. *Is it necessary for States Parties to all report the same information to optimize the usefulness of the searchable database, and what are the implications for previous ATT decisions on reporting format?*

5.3 'Number of items' versus 'value'

The Annual Reporting template gives States Parties the option to report on the *number of items* transferred, the *value* of the arms transferred, or both. Accordingly, some States Parties submit information on the *number of arms* transferred and others submit information on the *value* of arms transferred (or both).

- a. *What are the implications of having both types of data in the searchable database?*
- b. *Is it necessary for States Parties to all report the same information to optimize the usefulness of the searchable database, and what are the implications for previous ATT decisions on reporting format?*

5.4 'Public reports' versus 'available to States Parties only'

The Annual Reporting template gives States Parties the option to make their reports publicly available or to make them available to States Parties only. Accordingly, some States Parties make their reports publicly available and others make them available to States Parties only, on the restricted area of the ATT website.

- a. *What are the implications of excluding restricted information from the searchable database?*

- b. Is it necessary for States Parties to make their reports publicly available to optimize the usefulness of the searchable database, and what are the implications for previous ATT decisions on reporting format?*

Next steps

It is hoped that the above questions provide a basis for a discussion among WGTR participants on a possible searchable online database and that the outcome of those discussions will help define the draft parameters and establish the priorities for such a database. Once participants have determined the scope and draft parameters for a possible searchable online database, the ATT Secretariat will obtain cost estimates from appropriate service providers, to inform a cost-benefit analysis of developing such a tool.
