



General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 July 2020

Original: English

Seventy-fifth session

Item 87 of the annotated preliminary list*

The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction

The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report has been prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution [74/192](#), by which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the basis of information and observations received from Member States and relevant observers, as appropriate, on the scope and application of universal jurisdiction, including, where appropriate, information on the relevant applicable international treaties and their national legal rules and judicial practice.

* [A/75/100](#).



I. Introduction

1. The present report has been prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution [74/192](#), on the basis of comments and observations submitted by Governments and observers. It contains a summary of such comments and observations received since the issuance of the report of 2019 ([A/74/144](#)) and should be read together with that and prior reports ([A/65/181](#), [A/66/93](#) and [A/66/93/Add.1](#), [A/67/116](#), [A/68/113](#), [A/69/174](#), [A/70/125](#), [A/71/111](#), [A/72/112](#), [A/73/123](#) and [A/73/123/Add.1](#)).
2. In accordance with resolution [74/192](#), section II of the present report, together with tables 1 to 3, is focused on specific information regarding the scope and application of universal jurisdiction on the basis of relevant national legal rules, applicable international treaties and judicial practice. Information received from observers is provided in section III. Section IV contains a synopsis of issues raised by Governments for possible discussion.
3. Responses were received from Canada, El Salvador, Greece, Malaysia, Portugal, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey, Turkmenistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zimbabwe.
4. The African Union, the Council of Europe, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the United Nations Environment Programme also submitted responses.
5. The complete submissions are available on the website of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly (www.un.org/en/ga/sixth/).

II. Scope and application of universal jurisdiction on the basis of relevant national legal rules, applicable international treaties and judicial practice: comments by Governments

A. Basic legal rules

1. Relevant national legal rules¹

Canada

6. Canada reported that the principle of universal jurisdiction is incorporated in its legislation to the extent that Canadian courts may prosecute certain crimes that did not take place in Canada.

7. Canada further reported that, in 2000, the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act was enacted, incorporating into domestic law the prohibition of violations of international criminal law and international humanitarian law that are subject to individual criminal responsibility under the Rome Statute. Canada clarified that its Criminal Code extends criminal liability under universal jurisdiction for certain offences, for the most part when linked to the presence of the person in Canada after the commission of the alleged offence.

El Salvador²

8. El Salvador reiterated that, under article 10 of its Criminal Code, universal jurisdiction is regulated as an independent principle (see sect. II.B below).

¹ Table 1 contains a list of crimes concerning which universal jurisdiction is established by various codes, as mentioned in the comments by Governments. Table 2 contains specific legislation relevant to the subject, based on information submitted by Governments.

² For previous comments submitted by El Salvador, see [A/65/181](#), [A/66/93](#), [A/67/116](#), [A/69/174](#), [A/72/112](#), [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

Greece³

9. Greece reported that article 8 of the new Greek Penal Code (Law 4619/2019, Official Gazette, vol. A 95/11.6.2019), as amended by Law 4623/2019 (Official Gazette, vol. A 134/9.8.2019), provides that penal laws apply both to nationals and to foreigners, irrespective of the laws of the place where the act was committed, for certain acts committed abroad (see tables 1 and 2 below).

Malaysia⁴

10. Malaysia reported that certain crimes in its legislation could be subject to universal jurisdiction and extraterritorial jurisdiction (see tables 1 and 2 below).

11. Although there has been no criminalization of piracy in Malaysian law, the High Court has jurisdiction to try piracy according to the Courts of Judicature Act 1964 (Act 91). It is thus unclear to Malaysia whether the basis of jurisdiction to try piracy is universal jurisdiction or another principle of criminal jurisdiction. Regarding slavery-like practices and torture, in its view none of the domestic legislation of Malaysia or the international conventions to which it is a party provides for the application of universal jurisdiction.

Portugal⁵

12. Portugal reported that, under article 4 of its Criminal Code, criminal legislation is applicable to all acts committed in Portuguese territory. Under article 5(1) of the Criminal Code, criminal legislation is also applicable to acts perpetrated outside Portuguese territory, when committed (see also tables 1 and 2 below):

(a) By Portuguese citizens against other Portuguese citizens who reside in Portugal;

(b) By Portuguese citizens or by foreigners against Portuguese citizens, if the offender is present in Portugal and if the acts are punishable in the territory where they took place but are not prosecuted in that territory, and extradition cannot be performed or it is decided not to surrender the offender in response to a European arrest warrant or other international agreement binding on Portugal;

(c) By foreigners, irrespective of the nationality of the victim, if the offender is present in Portugal and extradition cannot be performed or it is decided not to surrender the offender in response to a European arrest warrant or other international agreement binding on Portugal;

(d) By any person, in respect of crimes of computer and communications fraud, crimes of counterfeiting of money, credit certificates and sealed values, and of faking dies, weights and equivalent objects; the category of crimes against national independence and integrity; the categories of crimes against the rule of law and of electoral crimes; the crime of terrorism; and certain crimes committed by terrorist organizations.

13. Portugal clarified that the crimes listed in paragraph 12 (d) above are crimes for which the law establishes absolute universal jurisdiction, namely, the judicial authorities may pursue any individual, regardless of that individual's nationality, place of residence or location. Portugal emphasized that Portuguese law also provides for conditional universal jurisdiction (see sect. II.B below).

³ For previous comments submitted by Greece, see [A/68/113](#) and [A/70/125](#).

⁴ For previous comments submitted by Malaysia, see [A/65/181](#).

⁵ For previous comments submitted by Portugal, see [A/65/181](#).

Senegal

14. Senegal reported that its criminal jurisdiction has long been based on the criteria of nationality and territoriality. Act No. 2007-05 of 12 February 2007, which amended its Code of Criminal Procedure to implement the Rome Statute, introduced the principle of universal jurisdiction in its criminal law. Accordingly, Senegalese courts have jurisdiction over genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes, as well as terrorist acts. The Act also established the Extraordinary African Chambers (see sect. II.A.3 below).

15. A quasi-universal jurisdiction is envisaged in Senegalese legislation under Act No. 2018-03 of 23 February 2018 on combating money-laundering and the financing of terrorism. This Act enables Senegalese courts to try natural and legal persons wanted for the offences covered therein, when the offence is committed in the territory of a State party to the Treaty on the West African Monetary Union or the Treaty on the West African Economic and Monetary Union, or of a third State. In the latter case, Senegalese courts have jurisdiction if there is an applicable international convention.

Slovenia⁶

16. Slovenia reported that article 13 of its Penal Code regulates the application of the principle of universal jurisdiction. Under article 13(2), the principle of universal jurisdiction applies to cases where a foreign national commits a criminal offence abroad, is apprehended on the territory of Slovenia and is not extradited to a foreign country. This provision is applicable according to the principle of subsidiarity and the principle of double criminality. Slovenia noted various limitations to the application of the principle, such as permission from the Minister of Justice for prosecution in certain cases.

17. Slovenia stated that criminal offences that can be tried under universal jurisdiction are regulated in accordance with the Kampala amendments to the Rome Statute, while noting that universal jurisdiction for the crime of aggression is not incompatible with international law. Slovenia also stated that the definition of piracy in its Penal Code is compatible with the definition in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

18. Moreover, article 13(3) of its Penal Code provides a legal basis for the exercise of universal jurisdiction, since it applies in cases where a foreigner commits a crime abroad that can be prosecuted in all countries, irrespective of where it is committed, by virtue of international treaty law, customary international law or general principles of international law recognized by the international community. Prosecution under that provision depends on approval by the Minister of Justice. Criminal procedural rules are equally applicable in the context of the principle of universal jurisdiction, thus ensuring recognized standards of due process.

Switzerland⁷

19. Switzerland reiterated its previous comments that, under Swiss law, the principle of universal jurisdiction is a secondary jurisdiction exercised when no other court with stronger jurisdictional ties can try an alleged offender. The requirement of “close ties” with Switzerland ceased to exist in 2011 when its legislation was amended to implement the Rome Statute.

⁶ For previous comments submitted by Slovenia, see [A/65/181](#).

⁷ For previous comments submitted by Switzerland, see [A/65/181](#) and [A/73/123](#).

20. The scope of universal jurisdiction is defined in the general provisions of the Swiss Criminal Code, and Switzerland recognizes and applies the principle of universal jurisdiction for specific offences (see tables 1 and 2 below).

Turkey⁸

21. Turkey reiterated its previous comments regarding article 13 of its Penal Code. Turkey reported that the prosecution of certain crimes, such as genocide and crimes against humanity, is subject to a request by the Minister of Justice, while other crimes, such as crimes against the security of the State, can be prosecuted *proprio motu* (see tables 1 and 2 below).

22. Turkey also reiterated its comments regarding the treaties to which it is a party that include “prosecute or extradite” provisions (see table 3 below).

Turkmenistan

23. Turkmenistan reported that its Criminal Code envisages a series of crimes for which universal jurisdiction is established (see tables 1 and 2 below). A series of crimes against peace and the security of humankind are provided for in chapter 21 of its Criminal Code, in particular planning, preparing, unleashing or conducting a war of aggression (art. 167-1); the use of prohibited means and methods of warfare (art. 167-4); violations of the laws and customs of war (art. 167-5); criminal breaches of international humanitarian law during an armed conflict (art. 167-6); failure to act or the issuance of a criminal order during an armed conflict (art. 167-7); genocide (art. 168); participation in armed conflicts or hostilities in foreign States (art. 169-2); and attacks against internationally protected persons (art. 170). Under the laws of Turkmenistan, amnesties and pardons do not apply to the gravest violations of human rights or norms of international humanitarian law.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

24. The United Kingdom noted that the jurisdiction of its courts to try crimes is premised on a presumption of territoriality, unless there is express statutory provision to the contrary. It reported that there are some offences over which its courts can exercise jurisdiction even where there is no apparent link to the United Kingdom (see tables 1 and 2 below). The fact that the United Kingdom has decided to provide for such jurisdiction as a matter of domestic law does not necessarily mean that it considers that these offences attract universal jurisdiction as a matter of international law (see sect. II.B below).

Zimbabwe

25. Zimbabwe reported that it does not have national legislation on universal jurisdiction. Zimbabwe is not averse to promoting judicial cooperation in respect of crimes to which the principle applies in accordance with extradition treaties to which it is a party.

2. Applicable international treaties

26. On the basis of information received from Governments, a list of the treaties referred to by Governments is provided in table 3 below.

⁸ For previous comments submitted by Turkey, see [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

3. Judicial practice

Canada

27. Canada reported two cases in which individuals were prosecuted in Canada for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes committed in Rwanda in 1994 (cases 2009 QCCS 2201 and 2011 CSON 1254).

El Salvador⁹

28. El Salvador reiterated its previous comments regarding judgment No. 44-2013/145-2013, of 13 July 2016, judgment No. 26-S-2016, of 24 August 2016, judgment No. 558-2010, of 11 November 2016, as well as decision No. 24-S-2016, of 24 August 2016.

29. In El Salvador, the application of universal jurisdiction is recognized as lawful when the State in which the crime was committed, or the State which has jurisdiction under other principles of criminal law, is unwilling or unable to investigate, prosecute and punish the crime.

30. Article 7 of the policy for criminal prosecution of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed during the armed conflict in El Salvador recognizes the power of States to exercise extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction pursuant to universal jurisdiction and provides that the State in whose territory the alleged perpetrator of serious human rights violations, crimes against humanity, genocide or war crimes is present is required to prosecute or extradite him or her.

Malaysia

31. Malaysia reported that, in the Gulf of Aden incident, pirates were charged and convicted in Malaysia for crimes other than the crime of piracy itself, as there is neither a definition of piracy nor a penalty prescribed for piracy under its national legislation.

Senegal

32. Senegal reported that Act No. 2007-05, which established the Extraordinary African Chambers, made it possible to try Hissèn Habré, whose case was previously considered to be outside the jurisdiction of the Senegalese courts.

Slovenia

33. Slovenia reported that no criminal cases have been prosecuted on the basis of universal jurisdiction in Slovenia.

Switzerland¹⁰

34. Switzerland reiterated its comments regarding crimes against humanity and war crimes cases before Swiss courts. Switzerland offered an example of a case where, on 26 March 2019, the Public Ministry of the Confederation sent an indictment to the Federal Criminal Court based on universal jurisdiction for the first time. The case concerned the prosecution of a Liberian national for war crimes.

35. Switzerland also indicated that international legal cooperation plays a key role in facilitating the collection of evidence for proceedings such as the one mentioned

⁹ For previous comments submitted by El Salvador, see [A/65/181](#), [A/66/93](#), [A/67/116](#), [A/69/174](#), [A/72/112](#), [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

¹⁰ For previous comments by Switzerland, see [A/65/181](#) and [A/73/123](#).

above. It reiterated its commitment to facilitating legal cooperation and called upon all States to collaborate to promote the success of related proceedings.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

36. The United Kingdom reported that, on 13 November 2019, the Supreme Court gave its judgment in the case of *R v TRA* [2019] UKSC 51, which concerned the interpretation of the term “person acting in an official capacity” under the Criminal Justice Act 1988. The Act implements in domestic law certain obligations of the United Kingdom pursuant to the 1984 Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Supreme Court considered the implications of universal jurisdiction as part of its process of interpreting the Convention.

B. Conditions, restrictions or limitations to the exercise of jurisdiction

Constitutional and domestic legal framework

Canada

37. Canada submitted that, for certain offences, universal jurisdiction is dependent on the presence of the alleged perpetrator in Canada after the commission of the offence; presence in Canada in practice is defined as longer than a fleeting visit. Such offences include, inter alia, crimes against humanity, genocide and torture. For other offences, such as piracy, full universal jurisdiction applies.

38. A File Review Committee decides, on the basis of established criteria, how to proceed with an allegation of a crime pursuant to the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act; the criteria include, inter alia, the type of crime, the likelihood of prosecutorial success and the alleged perpetrator’s presence in Canada.

39. Canada reported that if a person was previously tried in another State for the same act, he or she can plead *autrefois acquit*, *autrefois convict* or pardon and is deemed to have been so tried and dealt with in Canada. Nevertheless, the person is not deemed to have been so tried and dealt with under the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act if it is found that the court proceedings in that other State (a) were for the purpose of shielding the person from criminal responsibility; or (b) were not conducted independently or impartially in accordance with due process norms recognized by international law, and were conducted in a manner that, in the circumstances, was inconsistent with an intent to bring the person to justice.

40. The Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act, the Criminal Code and the Geneva Conventions Act include provisions for seeking the consent of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General for universal jurisdiction offences, with a view to permitting implications relating to foreign policy, concurrent claims of jurisdiction and other implications to be considered. All crimes in Canada are subject to prosecutorial discretion.

El Salvador

41. Pursuant to article 10 of the Salvadoran Criminal Code, the application of the principle of universal jurisdiction does not depend on the place where the crime was committed or on the individuals involved. Salvadoran law does not set out a list of crimes to which the application of universal jurisdiction is limited. Rather, it provides that the crime in question must have affected property internationally protected by

specific agreements or rules of international law or must seriously undermine universally recognized human rights.

Portugal

42. Besides the crime for which Portuguese law establishes absolute universal jurisdiction (see sect. II.A above), Portuguese law establishes conditional universal jurisdiction for other crimes. Such conditional universal jurisdiction applies when the offender is present in Portugal and cannot be extradited or handed over, or it was decided not to extradite or hand over the offender (for example, in relation to genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, recruitment of mercenaries or the crime of aggression, in accordance with Law 31/2004 of 22 July 2004).

Senegal

43. In addition to the observations regarding Act No. 2007-05 and Act No. 2018-03 (see sect. II.A above), Senegal reported that it is a signatory to international instruments that encourage parties to establish jurisdiction over certain offences when the perpetrator is present in their territory and the State does not extradite the perpetrator.

Slovenia

44. Slovenia observed that universal jurisdiction should be applied in accordance with existing international law rules on immunities of Heads of State and Government.

Switzerland¹¹

45. Switzerland reiterated that the Swiss legal order subscribes to a “conditional” or “limited” concept of the principle of universal jurisdiction.

Turkey¹²

46. Pursuant to article 13 of the Turkish Penal Code, certain crimes, such as genocide and crimes against humanity, can be prosecuted in Turkey even if there exists a decision of conviction or acquittal from another country regarding the same crime. Legal safeguards, including the deduction of periods already spent in custody or detention, would apply in such cases.

47. In 2003, Law No. 4912 was enacted with the purpose of granting jurisdiction to Turkish courts over crimes that fell within the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The law required the physical presence of the accused in Turkey, while giving precedence to the Tribunal’s jurisdiction, and could be considered an example of the codification of conditional universal jurisdiction.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

48. In the view of the United Kingdom, the availability of universal jurisdiction does not mean that such jurisdiction should always be exercised; universal jurisdiction should be exercised responsibly. Domestic prosecuting authorities would not usually seek to institute proceedings against a suspect who was not present in the jurisdiction, and may need prior permission to proceed. For example, national proceedings for grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions can be instituted in England and Wales only with the consent of the Attorney General.

¹¹ For previous comments submitted by Switzerland, see [A/65/181](#) and [A/73/123](#).

¹² For previous comments submitted by Turkey, see [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

III. Scope and application of universal jurisdiction: comments by observers

African Union¹³

49. The African Union stated that the principle of universal jurisdiction is a legal tool available to States in the fight against impunity for crimes such as war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide, in line with article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union.

50. The African Union reiterated its previous comments regarding the African Union Model National Law on Universal Jurisdiction over International Crimes, while emphasizing two aspects of the scope and application of the principle: priority of the territorial State and complementarity, and immunity of sitting Heads of State and State officials.¹⁴ It noted that the principle of universal jurisdiction is at times subject to abuse by some States against African leaders and applied in a selective and political manner. It observed that this has the potential to undermine peace efforts and stability on the African continent as well as other existing international law principles, such as the principle of sovereign equality of States.

51. The African Union reported on the practical application of universal jurisdiction in Africa in the Hissène Habré case.

52. Determination of the scope and application of the principle should be done with equal consideration of all other legal obligations that form the basis for international relations. The process of defining the scope and application of the principle should be State-led and discussions should remain in the Sixth Committee, rather than being referred to the International Law Commission.

Council of Europe¹⁵

53. The Council of Europe referred to relevant treaties, such as the 1957 European Convention on Extradition (ETS No. 24), which includes the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare* and which has been ratified by all 47 member States of the Council of Europe, the 1959 European Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (ETS No. 30), also ratified by all 47 member States of the Council of Europe plus three non-member States, the 1974 European Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitation to Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes (ETS No. 82), and the 1970 European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgments (ETS No. 70). It was noted that the latter two treaties have not been widely ratified.

54. The Committee of Ministers, in 2011, adopted the guidelines on eradicating impunity for serious human rights violations. Guideline XII provides for the importance of mutual legal assistance, prosecutions and extraditions, and cooperation to prevent and eradicate impunity.

55. On the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, it was reported that the Grand Chamber had pronounced its judgment in the case of *Nait-Liman v. Switzerland*.¹⁶ The Court found that the decision of the Swiss courts to decline universal jurisdiction for compensation claims in respect of the non-pecuniary

¹³ For previous comments submitted by the African Union, see [A/66/93](#), [A/68/113](#) and [A/71/111](#).

¹⁴ The model law is on file with the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat.

¹⁵ For previous comments submitted by the Council of Europe, see [A/66/93](#), [A/68/113](#), [A/69/174](#) and [A/72/112](#).

¹⁶ European Court of Human Rights, *Nait-Liman v. Switzerland*, No. 51357/07, judgment of 15 March 2018. See also [A/72/112](#).

damage caused by the alleged torture of the applicant in Tunisia did not violate the applicant's right of access to a court under article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court held that member States are under no international law obligation to provide universal civil jurisdiction for torture, emphasizing that universal jurisdiction is relatively widely accepted by the States with regard to criminal matters. It was emphasized that its findings do not call into question the "broad consensus within the international community on the existence of a right for victims of acts of torture to obtain appropriate and effective redress, nor the fact that the States are encouraged to give effect to this right by endowing their courts with jurisdiction to examine such claims for compensation, including where they are based on facts which occurred outside their geographical frontiers".¹⁷

International Committee of the Red Cross¹⁸

56. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) reiterated previous comments on several aspects of universal jurisdiction related to international humanitarian law.

57. The Committee reiterated that States have increasingly recognized the principle of universal jurisdiction as an important means of ending impunity for the commission of serious violations of international humanitarian law and other international crimes. In that connection, it mentioned the universal acceptance of the Geneva Conventions (196 States parties) and the continued ratification of or accession to Additional Protocol I (174 States parties), but noted that there have been no new accessions to those treaties since 2019. The Committee emphasized that there have been accessions to other treaties relevant to the subject, such as Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Rome Statute.

58. ICRC reiterated its previous comments regarding the creation by States of specialized units to deal exclusively with the substantive and procedural specificities of international crimes. It also reiterated comments on the establishment of some form of universal jurisdiction over serious violations of international humanitarian law in national frameworks, while noting that no new legislation directly related to universal jurisdiction has been adopted recently.

59. ICRC observed an increase in domestic prosecutions based on universal jurisdiction for serious violations of international humanitarian law. It offered examples of extraterritorial investigations initiated by national prosecution services in relation to international crimes alleged to have been committed in situations of armed conflict, in Argentina, France and the Netherlands. The Committee mentioned national cases in which procedural steps have been taken, in Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and the United States of America (civil case), as well as other cases that have been concluded on the basis of universal jurisdiction, in Belgium, France and the United Kingdom.

60. ICRC reiterated its support to States in their implementation of international humanitarian law, including, but not limited to, the obligation to repress serious violations of international humanitarian law through the exercise of universal jurisdiction. It further reiterated that its Advisory Service on International Humanitarian Law offered legal advice and technical assistance to government experts on national implementation of international humanitarian law. The Committee continued to provide expertise on international humanitarian law to national judicial

¹⁷ European Court of Human Rights, *Naït-Liman v. Switzerland*, No. 51357/07, judgment of 15 March 2018, para. 218.

¹⁸ For previous comments submitted by the International Committee of the Red Cross, see [A/66/93](#), [A/68/113](#), [A/69/174](#), [A/70/125](#), [A/71/111](#), [A/72/112](#), [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

authorities and was thus cognizant of the efforts being made by States and the challenges they faced in prosecuting serious violations of international humanitarian law. It also reiterated that it was finalizing the drafting of an international humanitarian law manual specifically aimed at judicial authorities. Committee tools designed to assist States in understanding and implementing their obligations under international humanitarian law took the form of databases, reports and technical documents.

61. ICRC also reiterated its support to States for establishing appropriate national legislation to respond to serious violations of international humanitarian law on the basis of all grounds of jurisdiction, including universal jurisdiction, while recognizing the judicial, procedural and practical challenges that States faced regarding the principle.

United Nations Environment Programme¹⁹

62. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) reiterated that universal jurisdiction could play a significant role in bridging the gaps in the enforcement of international environmental law. UNEP reiterated comments related to environmental crimes and their connection with transnational organized crime. It emphasized that there was a need for the international community to recognize and address environment-related crimes as a serious threat to peace and sustainable development.

63. UNEP underlined the importance of environmental rule of law, stating that it extended beyond the environmental sector, as it also strengthened the rule of law more broadly, supported sustainable economic and social development, protected public health, contributed to peace and security, and protected the fundamental rights of people. Environmental rule of law should be a priority for States.

64. UNEP drew attention to calls from civil society organizations and some academics regarding the creation of an international crime of ecocide, specifically through amending the Rome Statute.

IV. Nature of the issue for discussion: specific comments by States

Canada

65. Canada recognizes universal jurisdiction as a well-established principle of international law over the most serious international crimes. Since such crimes attack the interests of all States, it is in their interest to ensure that these crimes are suppressed and that perpetrators are prosecuted. These crimes are established in customary international law (e.g., piracy, slavery, torture) and some are codified in international legal instruments (e.g., the Rome Statute) and exist independent of domestic criminal law.

66. Canada stated that the primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting international crimes rests with the State in which the crime occurred and the State of nationality of the perpetrators. Universal jurisdiction is an important complementary mechanism that can fill a jurisdictional gap when the territorial State is unwilling or unable to exercise jurisdiction. In addition, all States, consistent with their international obligations and domestic law, should assist national courts and international tribunals in prosecuting serious international crimes through cooperation.

¹⁹ For previous comments submitted by the United Nations Environment Programme, see [A/72/112](#).

El Salvador²⁰

67. El Salvador reiterated that universal jurisdiction plays a significant role in combating impunity for the most serious crimes of concern to the international community, including torture, genocide and crimes against humanity. Universal jurisdiction also plays a role in ensuring justice, truth and full reparation for victims. El Salvador further stated that it would maintain its commitment to the continued consideration of the topic in the Sixth Committee.

Malaysia²¹

68. Malaysia stated that an in-depth legal analysis of universal jurisdiction is necessary to achieve common consensus and understanding by all Member States. While universal jurisdiction could help to ensure accountability, end impunity and protect the rights of victims, it is necessary to find the right balance between ending impunity and not abusing the principle of universal jurisdiction.

Senegal

69. In the view of Senegal, universal jurisdiction has the merit of combating impunity and acting as a deterrent. The fact that some States enshrine the principle in their national laws while others retain the classic criteria for jurisdiction could be a source of significant disparities between the different criminal systems. To rectify such a situation, Senegal observed that it would be useful for the international community to approach the issue globally, in particular by means of a specific text that could lead to harmonization of, or at least greater convergence between, national laws.

Slovenia

70. In the view of Slovenia, universal jurisdiction is a principle of customary international law that should be exceptionally applied according to the principle of subsidiarity. Slovenia stated that the principles of universal jurisdiction and *aut dedere aut judicare* may overlap but are distinct. Universal jurisdiction is aimed at combating impunity, ensuring accountability and protecting the rights of victims. It entitles any State to prosecute and try the most serious international crimes solely on the basis of their nature, but the primary responsibility to prosecute perpetrators of such crimes should rest with those States on whose territory the crimes were committed. Treaty law, customary international law and general principles of international law recognized by the international community are the guiding sources in defining such crimes, and a list of offences covered by universal jurisdiction should not be exhaustive.

71. Slovenia emphasized that, to improve the application of universal jurisdiction, it is necessary to adopt comparable national legislation regarding the most serious international crimes. In that connection, Slovenia called on States to adopt legislation based on the Rome Statute for the establishment of an effective cooperation and mutual assistance mechanism to prosecute the most serious international crimes.

72. Clarifying universal jurisdiction would contribute to its effective use and prevent potential abuse or misuse. Although it is challenging to find the right balance between protecting fundamental human rights and preserving appropriate levels of State sovereignty, it is necessary to reach political consensus regarding the scope and application of universal jurisdiction.

²⁰ For previous comments submitted by El Salvador, see [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

²¹ For previous comments submitted by Malaysia, see [A/65/181](#).

Switzerland²²

73. Switzerland recalled its view that the principle of universal jurisdiction is a customary principle and an effective tool for fighting impunity.

74. Switzerland reiterated its call for the International Law Commission to be involved in the consideration of the issue, since the international community has not been able to reach a consensus on the definition and scope of universal jurisdiction. It considered that the Commission's work could contribute to more informed discussions within the Sixth Committee and the working group on the topic.

Turkey²³

75. Turkey reiterated its previous comments and emphasized the importance of observing the delicate balance between ensuring the legitimacy and reliability of universal jurisdiction on the one hand, and preventing impunity for specific crimes on the other.

Turkmenistan

76. Turkmenistan submitted that, according to the principle of universal jurisdiction, States have a right and an obligation to exercise jurisdiction solely on the basis of the nature of the crime, regardless of where it was committed, the nationality of the perpetrator, the nationality of the victim, or any other factors. As universal jurisdiction is based mainly on the nature of the crime (such as genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, torture and acts of international terrorism), prosecution is in the "universal" interest of the international community as a whole.

77. Universal jurisdiction is one of several types of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction, should apply only in exceptional circumstances, and should be complementary to national jurisdiction. Turkmenistan emphasized that the application of the principle must not encroach on State sovereignty or immunity granted under international law to Heads of State or Government, diplomatic personnel and other officials; bringing charges and issuing arrest warrants against such individuals not only violates established international rules, but also undermines the principle of the sovereign equality and independence of States.

78. In the view of Turkmenistan, universal jurisdiction is a useful legal tool in combating impunity, but a comprehensive comparative study of national and international norms on the matter is needed given that, inter alia, States have not yet developed a uniform approach to the matter, and the concept of universal jurisdiction, including the conditions for its application, still need to be defined.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

79. The United Kingdom considers the term "universal jurisdiction" to refer to national jurisdiction established over a crime, irrespective of the location of the alleged crime, the nationality of the alleged perpetrator, the nationality of the victim or other links with the prosecuting State. Universal jurisdiction is distinct from the jurisdiction of international judicial mechanisms established by treaty and from other established categories of extraterritorial jurisdiction. It is also distinct from "extradite or prosecute" regimes provided for in treaties, which usually require at least the presence of the accused on the territory of the contracting State before jurisdiction can be exercised. At the international level, the application of an "extradite or

²² For previous comments submitted by Switzerland, see [A/65/181](#) and [A/73/123](#).

²³ For previous comments submitted by Turkey, see [A/73/123](#) and [A/74/144](#).

prosecute” regime to nationals of States that are not parties to the relevant treaty may depend on the status of the regime as a matter of customary international law.

80. The United Kingdom highlighted the lack of international consensus about the nature, scope and application of universal jurisdiction, which in its view might be due to practical constraints on exercising universal jurisdiction and difficulties involved in a “one size fits all” approach to a range of crimes. It would thus be premature to take a definitive view on the crimes to which universal jurisdiction should apply or on a methodology for determining such crimes; adopting a definitive list or methodology risks undermining the ability of States to agree on how best to deal with a particular crime by limiting their options in respect of jurisdiction.

Zimbabwe

81. In the view of Zimbabwe, universal jurisdiction is a principle of international law that enables criminal jurisdiction solely on the basis of the nature of the crime, regardless of where the crime was committed, the nationality of the perpetrator, the nationality of the victim, or any other connection to the State exercising jurisdiction. Universal jurisdiction is anchored to the principle that the crime committed is considered a crime against all and that any State is authorized to punish it.

82. Universal jurisdiction is a useful means of combating impunity and holding perpetrators of serious crimes accountable. Zimbabwe recalled that its position on universal jurisdiction is informed by article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union, and that the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights gives effect to the foundational principles of universal jurisdiction.

83. Zimbabwe clarified that the principle is a mechanism of last resort, should be exercised in good faith, should not be abused for political ends, and should complement, not substitute, national jurisdictions. It should be exercised with due respect for principles of international law, such as the sovereign equality of States. Furthermore, its scope and application should be consistent with the territorial jurisdiction of States and the immunity granted to Heads of State and Government and other senior officials under customary international law.

Table 1

List of crimes mentioned in the comments by Governments concerning which universal jurisdiction (including other bases of jurisdiction) is established by their codes

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
Genocide and related offences	Genocide	Canada, El Salvador, Malaysia, Portugal, Senegal, Switzerland, Turkey, Turkmenistan
	Conspiracy and attempt to commit genocide	Canada
	Forming a criminal organization to commit genocide	Turkey
Crimes against humanity and related offences	Crimes against humanity	Canada, El Salvador, Portugal, Senegal, Switzerland, Turkey, Turkmenistan

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
War crimes and related offences	Conspiracy, attempt to commit crimes against humanity	Canada
	Forming a criminal organization to commit crimes against humanity	Turkey
	War crimes	Canada, El Salvador, Malaysia, Portugal, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkmenistan
	Conspiracy, attempt to commit war crimes	Canada
	Incitement to war	Portugal
Torture	Recruitment of mercenaries	Portugal
	Grave breaches of Geneva Conventions	United Kingdom
		Canada, El Salvador, Malaysia, ^a Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom
Aggression		Canada, Portugal, Slovenia
Piracy and related offences	Piracy	Canada, Greece, Malaysia, Slovenia
	Piracy when murder is attempted	United Kingdom
Terrorism and related offences	Terrorism	Malaysia, Portugal, Slovenia, Turkmenistan
	Use of explosive or other lethal device at government or transportation infrastructure	Canada
	Providing property for terrorist activity	Canada
	Terrorist acts	Greece, Senegal
	Financing of terrorism	Senegal, Turkmenistan
Offences related to transportation and communication	Hijacking aircraft, endangering the safety of aircraft or airport	Canada, Malaysia, United Kingdom
	Seizing control of ship or fixed platform attached to continental shelf	Canada

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
	Seizing control of ship or fixed platform not attached to continental shelf	Canada
	Aviation offences	Malaysia
	Computer crimes	Malaysia
	Communications and multimedia offences	Malaysia
	Computer and communications fraud	Portugal
	Seizing control or hijacking of air, sea or rail transport vehicles and offences related to the damaging of such vehicles	Turkey
	Endangering safety at aerodromes	United Kingdom
	Hijacking ships	United Kingdom
Trafficking in persons and related offences	Trafficking in persons	Greece, Malaysia, Slovenia, Turkey, Turkmenistan
	Migrant smuggling	Turkey
Drug-related offences	Trafficking in narcotic drugs	Greece
	Smuggling of drugs	Slovenia
	Production and trade of narcotics or psychotropic substances	Turkey
	Facilitation of the use of narcotics or psychotropic substances	Turkey
Nuclear-related offences	Possession or use of, commission of indictable offence to obtain, or threat to commit offence with, nuclear material outside Canada	Canada
	Offences relating to nuclear material	United Kingdom
Offences related to the State	High treason against the Greek State or offences against the country's international status	Greece
	Offences against the State	Malaysia

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
	Crimes against national independence and integrity	Portugal
	Crimes against the rule of law	Portugal
	Electoral crimes	Portugal
	Crimes against the insignia of sovereignty of the State and against the respectability of its organs	Turkey
	Crimes against the security of the State	Turkey
	Crimes against the constitutional order and the functioning of that order	Turkey
	Crime against national defence	Turkey
	Crimes involving State secrets and espionage	Turkey
	Crimes against relations with foreign States	Turkey
	Crimes against the foundations of the constitutional system and the security of the State	Turkmenistan
	Crimes against public security and public order	Turkmenistan
	Crimes against public health	Turkmenistan
Fiscal offences	Crimes against the currency	Greece
	Counterfeiting of money	Portugal, Turkey
	Counterfeiting of credit certificates and sealed values	Portugal
	Money laundering	Malaysia, Senegal, Slovenia
	Counterfeiting of seals	Turkey
	Manufacturing and trading of instruments used in the production of money and valuable seals	Turkey
Offences related to protected persons and United Nations personnel	Offences against protected persons	Canada

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
	Offences against United Nations or associated personnel	Canada
	Attacks on persons enjoying diplomatic protection	Turkmenistan
	Attacks and threats of attacks on protected persons	United Kingdom
	Attacks on United Nations workers	United Kingdom
Slavery-related offences		Canada, Malaysia ^a
Hostage-taking		Canada, United Kingdom
Military commander and/or superior responsibility-related offences	Breach of responsibility by military commander	Canada
	Breach of responsibility by a superior	Canada
	Conspiracy, attempt to breach responsibility	Canada
Crimes concerning military service and the military service obligation in Greece		Greece
Punishable act committed by persons in their capacity as officials of the Greek State or in their capacity as officials of an organ or organization of the European Union having its seat in Greece		Greece
Act against or directed at an official of the Greek State or a Greek official of an organ or organization of the European Union, provided it is committed in the exercise of their duties or in connection with the exercise of their duties		Greece
Perjury in the context of proceedings pending before the Greek authorities		Greece
Any other crime to which Greek penal laws apply by virtue of specific provisions or international conventions signed and ratified by Greece		Greece

<i>Category</i>	<i>Crime</i>	<i>State</i>
Trade in strategic items		Malaysia
Faking of dies, weights and equivalent objects		Portugal
Organized crime		Slovenia
Corruption		Slovenia
Smuggling of weapons		Slovenia
Breach of restrictive measures adopted by international organizations (sanctions)		Slovenia
Offences against minors		Switzerland
Crimes or offences prosecuted under the terms of an international agreement		Switzerland
Intentional pollution of the environment		Turkey
Prostitution		Turkey

^a Malaysia clarified that, regarding torture and slavery-like offences, none of the domestic legislation of Malaysia or the international conventions to which it is a party provides for the application of universal jurisdiction.

Table 2
Specific legislation relevant to the subject, based on information submitted by Governments

<i>Category</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>State</i>
Genocide	CAHWCA, sects. 6(1) and 6(1.1)	Canada
	Law 31/2004 of 22 July 2004	Portugal
	Criminal Code, arts. 431-1 to 431-5	Senegal
	Criminal Code, art. 264	Switzerland
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
	Criminal Code, art. 168	Turkmenistan
Crimes against humanity	CAHWCA, sects. 6(1) and 6(1.1)	Canada
	Law 31/2004 of 22 July 2004	Portugal
	Criminal Code, arts. 431-1 to 431-5	Senegal
	Criminal Code, art. 264a	Switzerland
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey

<i>Category</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>State</i>
War crimes and related offences	CAHWCA, sects. 6(1) and 6(1.1)	Canada
	Geneva Conventions Act, sect. 3(1)	
	Geneva Conventions Act 1962 (Act 512), sects. 3(1) and 3(2)	Malaysia
	Law 31/2004 of 22 July 2004	Portugal
	Criminal Code, arts. 431-1 to 431-5	Senegal
	Penal Code, art. 102	Slovenia
	Criminal Code, arts. 264b to 264j	Switzerland
	Geneva Conventions Act 1957, sect. 1	United Kingdom
Torture	Criminal Code, sect. 7(3.7)	Canada
	Federal Constitution, art. 5(1)	Malaysia ^a
	Penal Code (Act 574), sects. 40, 43, 44, 319, 331, 503	
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
	Criminal Code, art. 182-1	Turkmenistan
	Criminal Justice Act 1988, sect. 134	United Kingdom
Aggression	Law 31/2004 of 22 July 2004	Portugal
	Penal Code, art. 103	Slovenia
Piracy and related offences	Criminal Code, sect. 74	Canada
	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
	Courts of Judicature Act 1964 (Act 91), para. 22(a)(iv)	Malaysia
	Maritime Enforcement Agency Act 2004 (Act 633), sect. 6(3)(c)	
	Penal Code (Act 574), sect. 3	
	Penal Code, art. 374	Slovenia
	Piracy Act 1837, sect. 2	United Kingdom
Terrorism and related offences	Criminal Code, sects. 7(3.72) and 7(3.73)	Canada
	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
	Penal Code, sect. 4	Malaysia
	Law 52/2003 of 22 August 2003, arts. 2 and 4	Portugal

<i>Category</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>State</i>
Offences related to transportation and communication	Criminal Code, arts. 279-1 to 279-3 and 279-5	Senegal
	Criminal Code, art. 271	Turkmenistan
	Criminal Code, sects. 7(2), 7(2.1) and 7(2.2)	Canada
	Aviation Offences Act 1984	Malaysia
	Computer Crimes Act 1997, sect. 9	
	Communications and Multimedia Act 1998, sect. 4	
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
Trafficking in persons and related offences	Aviation Security Act 1982, sects. 1, 2 and 6	United Kingdom
	Aviation and Maritime Security Act 1990, sects. 1, 9 to 14	United Kingdom
	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
	Anti-Trafficking in Persons and Anti-Smuggling of Migrants Act 2007, sect. 4	Malaysia
	Criminal Code, art. 221	Portugal
	Criminal Code, arts. 129-1 and 271-1	Turkmenistan
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
Drug-related offences	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
Nuclear-related offences	Criminal Code, sect. 7(2.21)	Canada
	Nuclear Material (Offences) Act 1983, sect. 1 to 2(A)	United Kingdom
Offences related to the State	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
	Penal Code, sect. 4	Malaysia
	Criminal Code, arts. 308 to 321, 325 to 345	Portugal
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
	Criminal Code, chap. 22, arts. 171–180, chap. 29, arts. 271–291, chap. 30, arts. 292–310	Turkmenistan
Fiscal offences	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece

<i>Category</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>State</i>
	Anti-Money-Laundering, Anti-Terrorism Financing and Proceeds of Unlawful Activities Act 2001	Malaysia
	Criminal Code, arts. 262–271	Portugal
	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
Slavery-like practices	Federal Constitution, art. 6	Malaysia ^a
	Anti-Trafficking in Persons and Anti-Smuggling of Migrants Act 2007 (Act 670), sect. 2	
	National Service Training Act 2003 (Act 628), art. 6	
Hostage taking	Criminal Code, sect. 7(3.1)	Canada
	Taking of Hostages Act 1982, sect. 1	United Kingdom
Offences related to protected persons and United Nations personnel	Criminal Code, sects. 7(3) and 7(3.71)	Canada
	Internationally Protected Persons Act 1978, sect. 1	United Kingdom
	United Nations Personnel Act 1997, sects. 1 to 3	United Kingdom
Military commander and/or superior responsibility-related offences	CAHWCA, sects. 7(1), 7(2) and 7(2.1)	Canada
Crimes concerning military service and the military service obligation in Greece	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
Punishable act committed by persons in their capacity as officials of the Greek State or in their capacity as officials of an organ or organization of the European Union having its seat in Greece	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
Act against or directed at an official of the Greek State or a Greek official of an organ or organization of the European Union, provided it is committed in the exercise of their duties or in connection with the exercise of their duties	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece

<i>Category</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>State</i>
Any other crime to which Greek penal laws apply by virtue of specific provisions or international conventions signed and ratified by Greece	Penal Code, art. 8	Greece
Trade in strategic items	Strategic Trade Act 2010, sect. 4	Malaysia
Faking of dies, weights and equivalent objects	Criminal Code, arts. 262–271	Portugal
Breach of restrictive measures adopted by international organisations (sanctions)	Penal Code, art. 374(a)	Slovenia
Offences against minors	Criminal Code, art. 5	Switzerland
Crimes or offences prosecuted under the terms of an international agreement	Criminal Code, art. 6	Switzerland
Intentional pollution of the environment	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey
Prostitution	Penal Code, art. 13	Turkey

Abbreviation: CAHWCA, Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act.

^a Malaysia clarified that, regarding torture and slavery-like offences, none of the domestic legislation of Malaysia or the international conventions to which it is a party provides for the application of universal jurisdiction.

Table 3

Relevant treaties which were referred to by Governments, including treaties containing *aut dedere aut judicare* provisions

A. Universal instruments

<i>Category</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>State</i>
Human rights	ILO Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)	Malaysia
	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948	Canada, Malaysia
	Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 1956	Malaysia
	ILO Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)	Malaysia
	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966	El Salvador
	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966	El Salvador

<i>Category</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>State</i>
	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1984	Canada, United Kingdom
	Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989	Malaysia
	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, 2006	Senegal
	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2006	Malaysia
Law of armed conflict	Geneva Conventions, 1949	Canada, Malaysia, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe
Law of the sea	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1982	Canada, Malaysia, Slovenia
Safety of maritime navigation	Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988	Canada, United Kingdom
	Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, 1988	Canada
Aircraft or civil aviation safety	Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, 1963	Malaysia, Turkey
	Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, 1970	Canada, Malaysia, Turkey
	Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, 1971	Canada, Malaysia, Turkey, United Kingdom
	Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, 1988	Canada
Narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances	Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961	Turkey
	Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971	Turkey
Penal matters	Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 1973	Canada, Turkey, United Kingdom
	International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, 1979	Canada, United Kingdom
	Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, 1994	Canada, United Kingdom

<i>Category</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>State</i>
	Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 1998	Canada, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland
	United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2000	Senegal
	Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2000	Senegal
	Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2000	Senegal
	Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2001	Senegal
	United Nations Convention against Corruption, 2003	Senegal
Nuclear matters	Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, 1979	Canada, United Kingdom
	Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, 2005	Canada
Terrorism	International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 1997	Canada
	International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, 1999	Canada, Senegal
	International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, 2005	Canada

B. Regional instruments

<i>Category</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>State</i>
Human rights	American Convention on Human Rights, 1969	El Salvador
Terrorism	European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism, 1977	Turkey
Constitutive instruments	Constitutive Act of the African Union, 2000	Zimbabwe

Abbreviation: ILO, International Labour Organization.