Madame President,

Japan would like to thank the Management Committee for preparing the background paper on reviewing the ATT programme of work. We welcome that the ATT has contributed to establishing common international standards for regulating international trade and export control systems in conventional arms through meaningful discussions among States Parties and implementation efforts by each State Party since 2014.

Japan believes it is the right time to review our work and consider the structure of future meetings this year as the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation approaches the end of discussions on the priority topics identified in the multi-year work plans.

In reviewing how our future work should be formulated, it is necessary to identify our priorities and consider working methods and timeframes from a longer-term perspective, taking into account budgetary implications. In addition, we also need to consider the reality that many new disarmament-related initiatives have been launched recently in line with changes in the global security environment and emerging technologies. Our disarmament calendar is increasingly busy due to the growing number of processes.

In considering the future of the ATT process, Japan attaches importance to the following three points.
Firstly, Japan values the Working Group on Effective Treaty Implementation as a forum for discussion on effective measures to support implementation. In fact, the Working Group has produced several important outcome documents in the past. When it comes to our future work, Japan believes identifying priority topics is key to ensuring this remains an effective process. In addition, the Group should not to expand the number of sub-Working Groups any more than the current amount.

Second, universalizing the Treaty is vital to enhancing the effectiveness of the ATT. Japan believes we need to continue our collective efforts with a longer-term perspective, and it remains one of the critical areas to work on.

Lastly, in terms of the Working Group on Transparency and Reporting, where we discuss compliance with the reporting obligation under Article 13, Japan recognizes the fact that we still need to have discussions on possible measures under certain topics to improve transparency. Nevertheless, we may consider reducing the number of hours for future meetings to ensure the efficiency of the preparatory process.

Based on these points, Japan proposes that the preparatory process be reduced to one set of meetings per year instead of two, with a maximum duration of five days. Considering the complexity of the current disarmament calendar, the current interval between the two preparatory meetings is too short to conduct sufficient preparations for the meetings. In addition, covering other disarmament meetings held subsequently or in parallel is very challenging, particularly for smaller delegations. In this regard, it would be more meaningful to streamline our meeting within a five-day period.

Thank you, Madame President.