



**Wilton
Park**

Report: Advancing the ATT – the road to a strategy

Monday 19 – Wednesday 21 January 2026

In association with
Foreign, Commonwealth &
Development Office



In association with



Foreign, Commonwealth
& Development Office

Report:

Advancing the ATT – the road to a strategy

Monday 19 – Wednesday 21 January 2026

In association with

Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO)

From 19 – 21st January 2026, Wilton Park, in partnership with the UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, hosted a conference on ‘Advancing the Arms Trade Treaty: The Road to a Strategy’.

At the Arms Trade Treaty’s 11th Conference of States Parties in August 2025, States Parties agreed, for the first time, a mandate to elaborate a 5-year strategic plan for the ATT, to:

- Provide greater focus and prioritisation of the ATT’s structures and activities, considering a cross-cutting Treaty perspective and a longer-term direction; and
- Enable States Parties to better measure progress on the implementation and impact of the ATT, against the objectives and priorities of the strategy.

The mandate sets out that the strategy should be agreed no later than by CSP13 in August 2027.

This conference served as an opportunity for States Parties, international and regional organisations, civil society and industry to consider the development of a strategic plan; reflect on the progress and challenges in ATT implementation and universalisation; test emerging thinking on strategy elements; and develop a shared understanding of priorities and

goals to ensure that the Treaty continues to see success through its second decade and beyond.

Discussion focused on a range of aspects of an ATT strategy: its form; the thematic areas it might assess, including implementation, transparency and reporting, and universalisation; what structures and resources are needed to implement it; and what review or follow-up processes may be necessary.

As one of the first substantive opportunities for stakeholders to discuss a strategy, it demonstrated the challenges in focusing discussions strategically, with significant discussion focusing more on Treaty challenges, practical actions and objectives. This report therefore summarises key reflections and takeaways drawn from those discussions, including indicative actions and possible recommendations for the ATT community to consider. It does not seek to reflect every view expressed during the Conference, nor is it a consensus view of participants.

Contents

Key reflections and takeaways	7
Purpose, principles and design	9
Purpose and function of the strategy	9
Strategic objectives and focus	10
Core design principles	10
Ownership, roles and inclusivity	11
Iteration, learning and adaptability	11
Effective implementation of the ATT	11
Uneven implementation and systemic challenges	11
Prioritisation and sequencing implementation efforts	12
Supporting consistent application of Articles 6 and 7	12
Preventing diversion through cooperation and information exchange	13
Transparency and reporting, and use of information	13
Persistent challenges in transparency and reporting	13
Barriers to reporting and under-use of information	13
Using transparency as a tool for national benefit	13
Universalisation	14
Current state of universalisation	14
Factors shaping the pace of universalisation	14
Rethinking universalisation beyond numerical targets	15
Strategic approaches to targeted and context-specific universalisation	15
Peer engagement and support for new and potential States Parties	15
Cooperation, assistance and capacity building	16
Assessing the impact of cooperation and assistance	16
Aligning assistance with strategic priorities and national needs	16
Context-sensitive and peer-driven capacity building	16
Financing and institutions	17
Financial and institutional constraints facing the ATT	17
Risks of over-ambition in a constrained environment	17
Aligning strategy, resources and delivery capacity	17
Addressing financial sustainability and political buy-in	17
Next steps and reflections	18
From strategic intent to collection action	18
Using existing structures to deliver strategic priorities	18

Key reflections and takeaways

- 1 The strategy must be “realistically ambitious”: defining a long-term vision that is impactful and politically meaningful, while operationally feasible.** The strategy should aim to have a meaningful impact on delivering the ATT’s Object and Purpose. At the same time, objectives should address what is deliverable and achievable in its lifespan to not overburden States Parties or the Secretariat. It should establish clear, cross-cutting objectives with reasonably ambitious targets, baselined in current realities, that States Parties can work towards. With this approach, it should be accepted and anticipated that not all objectives will be met, but that similarly meeting all objectives may be a sign of insufficient ambition. In addition, the strategy must be firmly grounded in financial and institutional realities, serving as a practical tool to future resource allocation, capacity building and required Secretariat support. The strategy should not only identify challenges to the Treaty’s implementation but highlight and communicate where the ATT is already having impact, building confidence and reinforcing the Treaty’s relevance, and demonstrating its value to non-States Parties and external stakeholders.
- 2 The core of the strategy should be centred around the Object and Purpose of the ATT by driving effective implementation of key articles (including 5, 6, 7, 11 and 13).** The strategy should be designed to strengthen States Parties’ ability to translate core commitments of the ATT into practical action, guiding improvements to national control systems, reporting practices, export risk assessments, and measures to prevent diversion. Whilst an ideal strategy would advance all articles of the ATT, resource and capacity constraints mean it cannot focus on everything equally. Therefore, it should prioritise and sequence where States Parties can make the greatest progress and demonstrate the most impact, facilitating focused and structured peer support, guidance, and targeted capacity building including through the Voluntary Trust Fund, aligned with national realities that help States Parties build strong and effective systems.

- 3 **We don't need to “reinvent the wheel”.** The ATT has an “embarrassment of riches”: an abundance of existing initiatives, workplans, analyses, previous discussions and CSP recommendations that the strategy could build upon. We also should learn from other treaties and instruments with longstanding Action Plans and review processes but recognise that their approaches are not perfectly applicable to the ATT, given their focus is on prohibiting a specific weapon category. The strategy should therefore integrate into current processes, ensuring that it meshes with and strengthens established practices, avoiding creating any parallel structures or reinventing systems unless strictly necessary. Its purpose should be to guide and focus existing mechanisms, helping States Parties work toward a shared, coherent vision.
- 4 **The strategy should be iterative, not static, and support continuous learning.** While the strategy should establish an overall vision and principles, as well as clear baselines, measurable objectives and indicators, it will not be delivered in its first year. Initial years of the strategy may build our understanding of the status of the ATT to inform and reinforce later actions which progress its goals and objectives, for example, through improving data collection. For the strategy to be sustainable, it should also identify a point of review, for example, a standing agenda item at the CSP, against its agreed objectives. This approach will allow States Parties to refine approaches and adapt to changing requirements through access to improved data, leading to a more informed, effective and sustainable strategy.
- 5 **The strategy should be owned by States Parties and encourage inclusive participation.** For the strategy to progress towards its agreed objectives and remain sustainable, it must be owned and led by States Parties, with support from the Secretariat. From the outset, the strategy should clearly assign responsibilities, centring its delivery and review around the Presidents and officeholders, with involvement from civil society, industry and technical experts. Ensuring continuity and ownership will be essential to sustain progress throughout the strategy's lifespan, creating a process that is accessible, and reflective of diverse national contexts and needs.

Purpose, principles and design

Purpose and function of the strategy

The strategy offers an opportunity to provide greater focus and prioritisation of the ATT's structures and resources, ensuring a coherent approach across cycles, particularly in the context of limited resources. It could also enable the ATT community to better track and measure progress against its agreed objectives and priorities, strengthening the impact of and accountability within the Treaty, as well as provide opportunity to develop specific actions to build on progress made. Whilst yet to be determined, clear purpose, design and principles are crucial in ensuring that it delivers what was agreed in the mandate.

Agreement on the strategy's focus and design will be crucial to ensure that it delivers on the mandate and helps to drive impact and implementation. The strategy should seek to provide focus and direction, whilst remaining firmly grounded in the ATT's Object and Purpose, at the same time, considering present political and institutional realities.

In order to do the above, clarity is needed on what the strategy should seek to achieve. A strategy could be understood, in this regard, as a planning and governance tool, rather than reinterpreting or creating new Treaty obligations. Its value could lie in its ability to set a shared vision and priorities, guide allocation of resources and efforts, identify challenges, and enable measurement of progress and impact. Conversely, a strategy that is overly prescriptive or detailed could risk flexibility or overburdening States Parties, the Secretariat and other stakeholders, particularly those with limited capacity.

Given the early stages of the strategy's development, there are differing expectations on whether it should simply be an aspirational document with high-level objectives or serve as an operational planning instrument. The strategy may end up somewhere in between. Therefore, States Parties should articulate their preferences for the function of this strategy as soon as reasonably possible to develop a shared vision of what the strategy is seeking to achieve and ensure that States Parties and ATT processes can work towards its implementation.

Strategic objectives and focus

Due to the five-year timeline, the strategy should seek to prioritise where it can realistically demonstrate the most impact. This could be envisaged through establishing a limited number of clear, cross-cutting objectives, rather than an overly broad strategy that dilutes focus and ability to make impact.

Sequencing of the strategy is important in this regard, as it may prove difficult to attempt simultaneous progress on all fronts of the strategy. For example, the strategy could establish year-on-year goals and objectives that allow for measurable progress each year with objectives which may build on progress in previous years. By sequencing the implementation of objectives over the lifespan of the strategy in this manner, it could alleviate pressure on States Parties, as well as the Secretariat.

Early years of the strategy could also seek to focus on establishing baselines, improving data quality and strengthening the systems the strategy and ATT need to deliver on its objectives and priorities. Subsequent phases could build on this foundation to drive targeted action and assess progress more meaningfully. Such an approach could more likely sustain political buy-in and avoid setting unrealistic expectations.

Core design principles

A strategy that sets aims too high or too far risks failure from its outset – a “realistically ambitious” strategy that sets goals that are both challenging and achievable, whilst grounded in reality, is most likely to ensure that it remains politically meaningful, yet operationally feasible. A strategy that is perceived as unattainable would not encourage States Parties to invest time and effort to support it and would risk failing to deliver tangible and measurable progress.

The ATT strategy, its objectives, actions and measures should be firmly grounded in the Treaty’s Object and Purpose to reinforce its legitimacy – it should continue to build on the Treaty’s “embarrassment of riches” – including Conference decisions and recommendations, multi-year workplans, voluntary guidance and standing mechanisms, rather than attempting to establish new or parallel structures, or duplicate previous or ongoing work. Learning from other instruments can also be encouraged, with the caveat that their approaches cannot be fully replicated on the ATT given its unique regulatory framework.

Ownership, roles and inclusivity

State Party ownership of the ATT strategy should be a prerequisite for its legitimacy and meaningful, effective implementation. Whilst not shifting responsibility from States Parties on implementing their obligations under the Treaty, and therefore their role in progressing the goals of the strategic plan, the ATT Secretariat and relevant office holders should have a central supporting role to ensure that States Parties have the tools and resources at their disposal to make progress on the strategy's objectives and priorities. This could include ensuring the strategy's progress is led and driven by CSP Presidents across its lifespan, to embed continuity and shared ownership throughout. Civil society, international and regional organisations and industry, as well as collaboration and cooperation through regional peer-to-peer engagement, are also crucial to developing and delivering the strategy and supporting implementation and continuous learning.

Iteration, learning and adaptability

With a view to ensuring the strategy is sustainable in the immediate, medium and long-term, it could be viewed as a living framework that is capable of adapting to new information, changing contexts and emerging challenges. In this manner, the strategy can provide better focus on improving data and baselines so progress and intended impact is realistic and measurable. On the other hand, given that the Object and Purpose of the Treaty remains static, the strategy could also be presented as a static document. Yet, this could further exacerbate the issue of data gaps and understanding a clear baseline, potentially limiting the strategy's ability to understand progress and impact.

Regular, light touch reviews could strengthen the strategy's sustainability within its lifespan and beyond. By doing so, the strategy could support continuous learning and offer opportunities to course correct where necessary. This adaptable approach, as opposed to a rigid structure, could sustain continued engagement with the strategy, as well as ensuring that the ATT's work maintains relevance in changing contexts.

Effective implementation of the ATT

Uneven implementation and systemic challenges

The effective implementation of the ATT's provisions and obligations is the primary means through which the ATT delivers on its Object and Purpose. Whilst the Treaty has made significant progress in supporting states to put the right systems in place to

regulate international arms transfers, it is widely acknowledged that implementation of the Treaty remains uneven across regions and the articles themselves, limiting its impact. This has been illustrated in the barriers facing implementation of Article 5 in strengthening national control systems, where just over half of States Parties currently do not have one, as well as applying Articles 6 and 7. In addition, there remain frequent reports of diversions of arms transferred by ATT States Parties and beyond, undermining confidence in arms control systems due to gaps in cooperation, information sharing and post-shipment controls.

Prioritisation and sequencing implementation efforts

The strategy, in pursuit of strengthening implementation by States Parties and ensuring that they are all able to work towards the same minimum standard, could re-centre implementation as a core priority of the Treaty, ensuring its objectives seek to strengthen national practice. Not all aspects of Treaty implementation can be addressed at once; therefore, objectives could be prioritised and sequenced according to need – for example, first focusing on strengthening national control systems and lists.

Supporting consistent application of Articles 6 and 7

Articles 6 and 7 of the ATT were widely recognised as central yet are often the most difficult articles to operationalise and demonstrate implementation of, due to commercial and national security limitations in what States can share, and the political risks of any exercise. Approaching Articles 6 and 7 in a way that scrutinises or compares individual transfer decisions could discourage engagement and undermine trust, particularly amongst States Parties that are still developing their national control systems. However, there are potential avenues to explore further to ensure meaningful engagement with Articles 6 and 7 within the strategy.

The strategy could frame Articles 6 and 7 as areas for peer-learning, assistance, confidence-building and practical support rather than reinterpretation of Treaty provisions or compliance enforcement. For example, facilitating discussions that explore how risk assessments are conducted, how information is gathered and weighed, and how decision-making is embedded within national systems. This could be envisaged through non-attributed case studies, simulation exercises, structured self-assessments or facilitated exchanges among technical experts – fostering a culture of learning whilst respecting national sensitivities.

Preventing diversion through cooperation and information exchange

On diversion, the strategy could further encourage cooperative, context-sensitive approaches, such as through focused, regional group exchanges and improved feedback loops through the Diversion Information Exchange Forum (DIEF), adding value in trust and confidence building measures and preventing and addressing diversion.

Transparency and reporting, and use of information

Persistent challenges in transparency and reporting

Transparency and reporting are central to the Object and Purpose of the ATT – the Treaty requires reliable, comparable and comprehensive reporting from States Parties on their national implementation practices and arms transfers. Yet, there are persistent challenges – States often submit late or not at all, with a consistent trend toward private reporting for both annual and initial reports. This impedes the ATT community’s ability to understand state behaviour in the conventional arms trade, undermines the ability for the Treaty to undertake substantive work to improve on reporting practices, and makes it difficult to articulate the impact the ATT is having both in terms of national practices and the international trade in conventional arms.

Barriers to reporting and under-use of information

This is compounded by a misunderstanding by States on what reporting to the ATT means in practice – some are worried about risks to their national security, political sensitivities or general capacity and administrative burdens that affect their ability to submit reports. Furthermore, when combined with the lack of publicly available data, annual reports perceived value is limited in their ability to demonstrate the utility and reach of the Treaty in arms transfer practices and transfers themselves.

Using transparency as a tool for national benefit

Whilst improving transparency and reporting within the ATT can be seen as one of the “easier” aspects of the ATT strategy to address given its more quantitative nature allowing it to be easier to track and measure, there are various avenues that could be mobilised in the strategy as a way to improve practice without placing any undue burdens on States Parties. One option could be for the strategy to frame transparency as a tool for national benefit that allows States to build better national systems through

effective data management and interagency coordination and levelling the playing field for arms exporters – rather than as purely an exercise in accountability.

This could be supplemented in the strategy with strengthened analysis of the reporting tools and guidance – for example, evaluating the usefulness of reporting templates and tools and cataloguing the obstacles faced by States, to ensure that existing guidance and resources are better leveraged and targeted. This could include improved feedback loops and strengthened outreach to States struggling to report, such as ensuring regional reporting workshops feed back to the formal ATT processes so that mechanisms better support informed assistance and strengthened dialogue.

Transparency and reporting are central to trust, learning and accountability under the Treaty, but constrained by capacity and uneven use of information. A strategic approach could seek to reframe reporting as a practical tool for improvement, strengthening usability and feedback whilst remaining proportionate to existing resources. Transparency in reporting could help states outside the Treaty understand more about their obligations and enhance universalisation efforts.

Universalisation

Current state of universalisation

The ATT, now standing at 118 States Parties, has broad uptake across the global arms trade – with 86% of the top 50 arms exporters and 80% of the top 50 arms importers either a State Party or Signatory to the Treaty. Regionally, the Asia-Pacific region has been routinely noted as a priority area, given that whilst 25% of states globally are in that region, only 9% are ATT States Parties. Furthermore, universalisation has slowed in recent years, with only seven States ratifying or acceding to the Treaty in the last five years.

Factors shaping the pace of universalisation

There are various reasons as to why universalisation has slowed within the ATT, including a decreasing pool of prospective States Parties, challenging geopolitical dynamics, regional security concerns, and misunderstandings of what it means to become a States Party. This also includes a perception that the Treaty only serves the needs of exporters, affecting the incentive for importing and producing states to join or engage fully with the ATT.

Rethinking universalisation beyond numerical targets

Universalisation being perceived as ensuring that as many states join the Treaty, to ensure that its provisions and obligations extend across the breadth of the international arms trade, may be unrealistic and counterproductive. If all states join over the short-term – whilst this suggests that universalisation efforts have been a numerical success – it raises the question as to whether the Treaty is as powerful as it might have been, or if the practical value or impact of the ATT has been watered down. In addition, whilst ratifying the Treaty in itself should be seen as a success, strong implementation of the Treaty is needed to ensure that the States are upholding their obligations from the outset to better prove the Treaty's relevance and importance in the arms control architecture. Furthermore, quantifying the impact and reach of the ATT merely based on numbers is challenging, particularly given that over time each new ratification will be much harder won than the last.

Strategic approaches to targeted and context-specific universalisation

The strategy, therefore, could be positioned to reframe universalisation as a strategic endeavour – for example, targeting potential regions and states that could aid in best strengthening the norms and attitudes of the Treaty and in turn, the Treaty's effectiveness and credibility, such as in regions where armed violence is more prevalent and more active importing and exporting states. This, in turn, could involve more targeted and context-specific universalisation approaches that reflect regional dynamics and security considerations, as well as clearly demonstrating the practical benefits for joining the Treaty for the targeted region, or state's, specific context.

Peer engagement and support for new and potential States Parties

Better targeted support for ratification, accession and implementation, both through the VTF and through more informal means, for potential and new States Parties could ensure a holistic approach so that states are supported to not only join, but to enact the Treaty's provisions and obligations without delay. Peer-to-peer engagement is important in this regard, particularly within regions or states with similar profiles (importers, exporters, producers etc.) where states may share similar challenges, or amongst new and potential States Parties to share experiences on ratification. By sharing experiences not only on ratification, but also implementation, this ensures that the ATT remains relevant to all States irrespective of their status or profile, further bolstering the ATT's utility to all states and sustaining engagement and support from pre-ratification and beyond. The strategy, therefore, could support more purposeful

engagement by linking universalisation more clearly to implementation support, practical benefits and the Treaty's credibility.

Cooperation, assistance and capacity building

Assessing the impact of cooperation and assistance

Effective support through international cooperation and assistance underpins universalisation efforts and effective implementation of the Treaty's provisions. However, little is understood about their impact, with discussion often limited to the number of VTF projects submitted, accepted or completed rather than the change the initiatives have generated in national practices. Without clearer evidence of what assistance and capacity building is achieving, it is difficult to assess how support is advancing the objectives of the Treaty. If assistance efforts are not prioritised and aligned with national contexts and needs, and a clear understanding of their intended impact, it risks fragmentation, duplication and limited contribution to both the strategic objectives of the strategy and the broader goals of the Treaty.

Aligning assistance with strategic priorities and national needs

The VTF is a valuable mechanism, but one that could be better aligned with strategic priorities, with clearly defined aims aligned with goals, a stronger focus on needs-driven support and a move beyond activity-based measures towards indicators that capture geographical distribution, response to identified needs, and tangible improvements to national practices and capacity. Strengthening matches between donors and recipients, including through better use of existing tools and mechanisms, could also ensuring that assistance is targeted where it is sustainable, replicable and can have the greatest impact.

Context-sensitive and peer-driven capacity building

A "no one-size-fits-all" approach should be central to cooperation and assistance efforts and should be sensitive to national and regional contexts. Cooperation and assistance extends beyond formal funding mechanisms – information sharing, peer-to-peer exchange, particularly at the regional level, are equally important in supporting learning, confidence and capacity. Improving coordination and feedback loops on assistance activity is valuable in this regard to ensure that lessons learned are embedded into future support, and efforts are tracked and measured to demonstrate their impact. With this approach, the strategy could aid in strengthening the coherence, effectiveness and sustainability of cooperation and assistance work,

without creating additional structures or burdens for States Parties and implementing partners.

Financing and institutions

Financial and institutional constraints facing the ATT

The ATT has continually operated under the threat of significant financial constraints, particularly due to the delay or lack of payment of assessed contributions by States Parties and Signatories. Coupled with a small infrastructure consisting of four staff members, there are limitations on what the Secretariat can do to support States to work towards the ATT's Object and Purpose. This environment is exacerbated by broader financial crises across the multilateral space, governments and civil society: organisations are required to ruthlessly prioritise resources and do less with less.

Risks of over-ambition in a constrained environment

The development and implementation of a strategy, despite seeking to clearly assign priorities, tasks and goals, is a risk in itself. A strategy that is too ambitious or mandates the creation of new mechanisms and tasks without due consideration for the current fiscal or operational environment across the ATT community risks failure to deliver on the proposed ambition from the outset.

Aligning strategy, resources and delivery capacity

The strategy, therefore, could provide a framework for aligning ambition with the available financial and human resources, ensuring that there is a more effective use of funds rather than blanket increases on assessed contributions. Following agreement on the strategy's purpose, this framework could establish what the strategy needs to be delivered effectively, with the financial and human resources needed sequenced accordingly so that tasks and budget are distributed realistically and have the greatest strategic value.

Addressing financial sustainability and political buy-in

The historic financial deficit of the ATT could also be addressed by the ATT strategy, so that the Treaty is set up to achieve its goals and overall vision. This could include ensuring better utilisation of payment plans for States struggling to meet their financial commitments, as well as identifying potential alternative funding avenues, for example, a dedicated funding exercise, or securing private sector funding. In order to better make the case to contribute financially to the ATT, the strategy could, overall,

seek to strengthen, and make more accessible, the Treaty's impact narrative to better encourage political buy-in and offer opportunity for both States Parties and non-States Parties to re-engage.

Next steps and reflections

From strategic intent to collection action

The development and ultimate agreement of the first ATT Strategy by 2027 offers a pivotal chance to consolidate progress made over the Treaty's first decade and provide clearer direction into the next. The ATT's continued relevance and impact depend on focus, prioritisation and realism, rather than the expansion of its scope or creation of new obligations. Across all areas of the Treaty – there is a need to align ambition with capacity and sequence actions in a way that supports collective learning and strengthened engagement.

Using existing structures to deliver strategic priorities

The strategy can be a means to re-centre the implementation of the ATT as the core driver of impact, whilst ensuring that universalisation, transparency and assistance efforts are better linked to practical and strategic objectives. New mechanisms and structures are not necessarily needed to recalibrate the goals of the ATT – established structures, guidance and workplans are all of value. In this regard, the strategy's success will depend less on creating new initiatives than on its ability to guide, focus and connect existing efforts.

Building shared understanding and sustaining momentum

Sustained State Party ownership with inclusive participation across civil society, international and regional organisations and industry, as well as continuity across CSP cycles are critical to translate strategic intent into practice and impact. If designed and implemented in a manner that is realistically ambitious, iterative and firmly grounded in the ATT's Object and Purpose, the strategy can reinforce the ATT's credibility, coherence and impact for years to come.

Whilst the destination is set, the path towards it, and the tools we need to support this journey, are still taking shape. Addressing these will require continued reflection and collective effort across the ATT community.

Katie Amos

Wilton Park | March 2026

Wilton Park reports are brief summaries of the main points and conclusions of a conference. The reports reflect rapporteurs' personal interpretations of the proceedings. As such they do not constitute any institutional policy of Wilton Park nor do they necessarily represent the views of the rapporteur. Wilton Park reports and any recommendations contained therein are for participants and are not a statement of policy for Wilton Park, the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) or His Majesty's Government.

Should you wish to read other Wilton Park reports, or participate in upcoming Wilton Park events, please consult our website www.wiltonpark.org.uk.

To receive our monthly bulletin and latest updates, please subscribe to www.wiltonpark.org.uk/newsletter

Wilton Park is a discreet think-space designed for experts and policy-makers to engage in genuine dialogue with a network of diverse voices, in order to address the most pressing challenges of our time.

enquiries@wiltonpark.org.uk

Switchboard: +44 (0)1903 815020

Wilton Park, Wiston House, Steyning,
West Sussex, BN44 3DZ, United Kingdom

wiltonpark.org.uk

