Madam Chair,

First of all, let me thank you and our Australian, Swedish and Ghanaian colleagues again for the excellent work you have done in preparing and steering truly substantive discussions in the preparatory process, that have also led to concrete outcomes. As time is limited I will immediately go into the working group’s conclusions and recommendations, and those of the three sub-groups.

First I will address the working method of the working group, because this is relevant for all working groups. Both as a Belgian delegate and as the co-chair of the transparency and reporting working group, I appreciated the approach with sub-groups and facilitators, but I also agree that we need to reinforce the efficiency and effectivity of our working groups to keep delivering quality work. In that regard, we support the idea of the early nomination of working group chairs, and in fact would also propose that the work of the working groups be ongoing. We must also focus even more on intersessional work, and involve the information exchange portal and informal consultations to use our time between meetings wisely.

Now I will turn to the substance.

Concerning the sub-group on diversion, we welcome the documents that the Australian facilitator prepared and also thank her for taking into account the comments that we made during the May meeting of the sub-group. We are ready to endorse these documents in Annex C and D as informative and open-ended reference documents. As for the future work of the sub-group, we fully endorse the list of issues included in §36 of the report that the sub-group might consider addressing after CSP4. As Belgium and as WGTR co-chair, we also appreciate very much the attention given to the issue of information exchange and the role of both working groups on this. With the three-tier approach that the WGTR recommends to the CSP4, we hope to take a step forward on sharing information, which will require close cooperation between the working groups.

Turning to the sub-group on articles 6 and 7, we are glad that our suggestions about both documents that are presented are included in the final versions. Concerning Annex E, we do find enforcement and transit controls such important elements in implementing article 6 (1), that we would even suggest including a separate title for the guidance on these issues. Furthermore we find that these are issues that need to be explored further, not just in the context of article 6 (1), but more broadly, as they are cross-cutting issues. In that respect a holistic discussion on transit controls could be a suggestion for the working group’s work plan beyond this CSP4. As to that work plan, finally, we would also insist that
the practice of presentations on national systems is focused on the practical application of
the prohibitions in article 6 and the export assessment in article 7.

Concerning the sub-group on article 5, we firstly find that this is the appropriate forum for
States Parties to give general presentations on their national control systems. In that
respect, we found the presentations given by Côte d’Ivoire, Costa Rica and Jamaica very
insightful and call on all States Parties to explain their controls, regardless of their role in
the global arms trade. Concerning the documents that are now presented to the CSP, we
welcome every effort that has the potential of supporting States in their implementation of
the Treaty and we see them as a good start for discussion. We reiterate, though, that both
a welcome pack and a basic guide on establishing a national control system can only be
descriptive of the basic obligations. We should be careful when working on these
documents that we do not prescribe one or the other approach to implementation.

As always, and this goes for all sub-groups and working groups, we will stand ready to
engage on these issues in working group meetings and beyond, to come to concrete
outcomes.

I thank you Madam Chair.