



General Assembly

Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
29 November 2013

Original: English

Sixth Committee

Summary record of the 11th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 16 October 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Silva (Vice-Chair) (Brazil)*later:* Mr. Kohona (Chair) (Sri Lanka)

Contents

Agenda item 78: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission (*continued*)

Agenda item 167: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly

Agenda item 168: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law in the General Assembly

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Anti-Corruption Academy in the General Assembly

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa in the General Assembly

Agenda 173: Observer status for the Global Green Growth Institute in the General Assembly

Agenda item 80: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

13-51409 (E)



Please recycle



In the absence of Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka), Mr. Silva (Brazil), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 78: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission
(continued) (A/68/173)

1. **Mr. Hameed** (Pakistan) said that the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement were major participants in United Nations peacekeeping operations and important stakeholders in the policy formulation and effective implementation of mandates. His delegation appreciated the role of the Office of Legal Affairs, which had referred to States of nationality the cases of nine United Nations officials for investigation and possible prosecution during the reporting period, and noted that three States of nationality had already raised the matter with the relevant officials.

2. The issue of criminal accountability of United Nations officials was of the utmost importance, because it was linked with the image of the United Nations as an organization that had a fundamental role in the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of the rule of law by setting an example in its own work. Pakistan fully supported a zero-tolerance policy for crimes committed by United Nations officials and experts on mission.

3. As a troop-contributing country, Pakistan supported the idea of pre-deployment training of United Nations officials and experts on mission. It had developed training modules that formed part of the curricula for mandatory courses required in the career progression of professional officials. It was willing to share its training experience with the Secretariat and the United Nations membership.

4. Pakistan had been participating actively in the proceedings of the working group on criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission to delineate the scope of deliberations and identify jurisdictional gaps, if any, in that area of work. The Sixth Committee's work in promoting international cooperation in that field would increase transparency and accountability in the United Nations. The implementation of the relevant General Assembly resolutions would go a long way towards filling gaps that might exist in any national jurisdiction. It would be useful to explore whether or not there was a need

for the General Assembly to take measures in that respect at the current stage.

5. Pakistan agreed with those delegations which had indicated that it was still premature to discuss a draft convention on criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission. The Committee should currently focus on the identification of issues and ways of addressing substantive matters; the issue of form could be settled at a later stage.

6. **Mr. Leonidchenko** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation attached particular importance to the Committee's work on crimes committed by United Nations officials. It firmly condemned all such crimes, which cast a shadow on the principles and ideals in the name of which the Organization had been established. The United Nations must take all necessary measures to prevent crimes being committed by its officials and experts. The preventive measures drafted with the active participation of the General Assembly were appropriate to the scale of the problem.

7. Proactive cooperation among States and with the Organization was extremely important in bringing offenders to justice. As could be seen in the Secretary-General's thematic reports, the penal legislation of most States and the relevant international legal instruments were sufficient to ensure effective cooperation between States in that area. For the fight against impunity to be effective, the Secretariat must inform States about violations in a timely and complete fashion. The channels of communication between the Organization and States should be further strengthened in that regard.

8. The Russian Federation commended the preventive activities carried out by States, peacekeeping operations and special political missions, including preliminary training and briefing of staff. The investigation of charges against United Nations officials should be conducted in strict compliance with the norms of international law. A leading role in jurisdiction should be played by the State of nationality of the international civil servant. In view of the particular legal status of such persons, that would help ensure their right to a fair trial.

9. His delegation was not opposed to further discussion of the expediency of drafting a legally binding document, for example an international convention, but it saw no need for such a document at the current time.

10. *Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka) took the Chair.*

11. **The Chair** said that, before proceeding with the consideration of the individual requests for observer status in the General Assembly, he would give the floor to representatives who had asked to make statements of a general nature.

12. **Mr. Estrémé** (Argentina) said that his delegation attached considerable importance to the question of the admission of observers to the General Assembly. However, given that under General Assembly decision 49/426 the Committee did not have the authority to apply criteria other than those contained therein, his delegation was concerned that the explanatory memorandum had not been circulated as required for one of the requests made for the current session of the General Assembly. In recent years, a number of Member States had sought the status of observer in the General Assembly for non-governmental organizations. Although those bodies made a valuable contribution to the Organization, they should more appropriately have requested consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. His delegation was not opposed to deferral of such requests, but they were a matter of concern because the organizations in question could already have been making a contribution to the work of the United Nations if they had requested consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

13. Member States that submitted requests should be the first to decide whether or not an organization fulfilled the requirements under Assembly decision 49/426. It was for the Sixth Committee to determine whether the organization requesting observer status in the General Assembly fulfilled those requirements. That could be done through a verification of the constitutive instruments of the organization. It was in that spirit that his delegation would approach the treatment of the requests to be considered at the current session of the Sixth Committee.

14. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba) said that the granting of observer status in the General Assembly was a subject of great importance for the Organization. Her delegation was concerned about the way in which analysis of the topic was conceived. It was not possible to work properly when the agenda included two additional items for consideration at the same session. There must be an adjustment of the items on the agenda to ensure that Member States could perform their work properly. In 2012, a number of Member

States had stressed the need to avoid an overlapping of agenda items.

15. Her delegation hoped that, as a result of the analysis of the work of the sessions and the interaction between the Secretariat and Member States, it would be possible to respond more effectively so that Member States could analyse the requests submitted with the necessary care. Her delegation underscored the need for compliance with the criteria established under General Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status. The Sixth Committee did not have a mandate to alter the criteria.

16. The requests and constitutive agreements of organizations seeking observer status must be circulated sufficiently in advance so that Member States had a clear idea of the nature of such bodies. The Committee should not deal with the question in a superficial manner. The topic should not be reviewed in clusters, as though the granting of observer status were a mere formality.

17. **Ms. Cabello de Daboin** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that at previous sessions, her delegation had questioned the Sixth Committee's working methods with regard to the consideration and granting of observer status in the General Assembly. It was also concerned about the General Committee's methods for referring new items to the Sixth Committee. The Sixth Committee needed to be allowed sufficient time to analyse the requests and to take decisions in line with the rules.

18. The requirements under General Assembly decision 49/426 for the submission of requests were not mutually exclusive. The Committee should consider requests one by one. Each request must include a copy of the constitutive instrument of the organization concerned; otherwise, consideration should be deferred to the following session. When an organization met the requirements, its request should be approved immediately; hence the need for sufficient time to consider the request and to take a decision. If an organization gave rise to doubts or reservations, its consideration should be deferred to the following session of the General Assembly, but no further. If an organization clearly did not fulfil the requirements under decision 49/426, its request should be rejected.

19. Although in the past the Sixth Committee had granted observer status to organizations which had not fulfilled the requirements, it had done so with the

reservation that such a practice should not become a custom. It would be very cumbersome to inform an organization year after year that it did not meet the requirements. Her delegation would continue to work to find a solution for the working methods on the subject.

20. **The Chair** invited the Committee to consider the individual agenda items on requests for observer status in the General Assembly

Agenda item 167: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly (A/66/141 and A/C.6/68/L.2)

Draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.2: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly

21. **The Chair** recalled that, at its sixty-seventh session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly to its sixty-eighth session (decision 67/525).

22. **Mr. Jafarov** (Azerbaijan), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.2 on behalf of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey and his own country, drew attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document A/66/141.

23. The Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States had been created in 2009 as an intergovernmental organization with the overarching aim of promoting comprehensive cooperation among its four founding States. The Council's legal status as an intergovernmental organization was clear. In its statutory documents, its member States embraced the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations together with other universally recognized norms and principles of international law, including those relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of good-neighbourly relations. The Council served as a regional instrument for enriching international cooperation in central Asia and the Caucasus, and its activities covered matters of interest to the General Assembly. It clearly met the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status. All relevant information on the Council's founding documents and its activities had been provided in accordance with that decision. The granting of observer status would initiate

a mutually beneficial dialogue and would greatly assist the Council in fostering regional initiatives.

24. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia) said that the activities of the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States did not meet the requirement set out in General Assembly decision 49/162 that observer status was to be granted to intergovernmental organizations whose activities covered matters of interest to the General Assembly. The declarations which the Council adopted annually and the statements of some of its members on its behalf contained passages that were not in line with the nature and purpose of the Charter and failed to reflect the principles of international law enshrined therein, such as respect for equality, the right to self-determination, sovereignty and the peaceful resolution of international disputes. Consequently, his delegation was not in a position to support the request to grant observer status to the Council and asked that the item be removed from the agenda of the General Assembly.

25. **Ms. Demetriou** (Cyprus) said that her delegation continued to have serious reservations as to whether the criteria under General Assembly decision 49/162 were fulfilled, and in particular whether the activities of the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States covered activities of interest to the General Assembly. The membership of that Council continued to be limited to its four founding States. The Council's founding declaration stated that it would operate with the aim of enhancing cooperation for all Turkic-speaking States and developing contacts and public links among peoples of the Turkic-speaking countries, thus implying that its activities included, but were not limited to, its member States. It was unclear what those activities were and which parts of the world were concerned. It should be noted that the map on the Council's official website continued to include part of her own country, Cyprus.

26. It was evident from its founding document and the declarations of its annual summits since 2011 that the Council included in its areas of interest a number of international issues, but at no point had it clarified what its relevance was to those issues or what it saw as its role or involvement in that regard. One such issue was Cyprus, yet at no time had the Government of Cyprus been consulted, nor had it been associated with the Council. The Council had repeatedly made statements on the Cyprus issue that were not in line with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Her delegation was therefore

not in a position to agree to granting the Council observer status, and it endorsed the Armenian proposal to have the item withdrawn from the Committee's agenda.

27. **Mr. Panin** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation fully agreed with Argentina's approach to the question of the granting of observer status in the General Assembly. Moreover, his delegation had in the past expressed doubts similar to those raised by Armenia and Cyprus on whether the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States fulfilled one of the criteria set out in General Assembly decision [49/426](#). The Council clearly had the characteristic of an intergovernmental organization, but it was a limited organization based on ethnic criteria, and his delegation doubted whether its activities covered matters of interest to the General Assembly. Most importantly, the Russian Federation's contacts with other delegations led it to believe that a consensus was highly unlikely on the granting of observer status to the Council. Accordingly, his delegation was not opposed to the proposal by Armenia to delete the item from the General Assembly's agenda.

28. He urged the sponsors to return to the question at a later stage, when it might be possible to achieve a consensus regarding that request. If most members considered that it was normal to defer a decision from year to year, the Russian Federation had no objection, but currently there did not seem to be any proper basis for granting the Council observer status.

29. **Mr. Şahinol** (Turkey) said that, when his delegation had first introduced the draft resolution at the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the same three delegations which had just spoken against it had asked for more time to digest the information provided and had sought further details. His delegation had made the requested material available, including the agreement establishing the Council. Later, the reasons put forward for opposing the draft resolution had changed.

30. The Sixth Committee was not a political gathering, and it must remain within its mandate. The issue could not be resolved by repeating the same arguments year after year without there being an understanding of what the organization actually did. The Sixth Committee had a long-standing tradition of working on a consensus basis. Although there was no rule preventing a deferral of a decision, that was not

the path his delegation preferred. Some delegations had called for the deletion of the item from the agenda, in which case his delegation would ask for a vote.

31. **Mr. Kasymov** (Kyrgyzstan) said there was no doubt that the Council was an intergovernmental organization. It met the two criteria for obtaining observer status in the General Assembly; the Committee must not devise new ones that were unrelated to Assembly decision [49/426](#). It was to be hoped that, when the time came for taking a decision, the members of the Committee would be able to support the draft resolution.

32. **Mr. Jafarov** (Azerbaijan), stressed that the Council clearly met the necessary criteria. It was to be hoped that political considerations would be set aside and that the Committee would be able to take a decision granting the Council observer status in the General Assembly. The comments by the delegation of Armenia were curious, since Armenia itself did not comply with the Charter of the United Nations and consistently violated fundamental norms and principles of international law, including the resolutions of the Security Council. Echoing the comments by the representative of Turkey, he said that the unconstructive position of a few Member States might compel his delegation to ask for a vote.

33. **The Chair** suggested that consultations should continue and that the Committee should revert to the agenda item at a later stage.

34. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 168: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly ([A/66/198](#); [A/C.6/68/L.3](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.3](#): Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly

35. **Mr. Sea** (Cambodia), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.3](#), said that Sri Lanka and Viet Nam had become sponsors.

36. The International Conference of Asian Political Parties (ICAPP) had been established in 2000 as an international institution to promote cooperation and build networks of political parties in Asia. Over its first decade, it had grown steadily in both membership and influence. In July 2013, an intergovernmental memorandum of understanding on cooperation to

provide support for the activities of ICAPP had been concluded among the Governments in the region to recognize ICAPP as an international organization. To date, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam had signed the memorandum, and Australia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and Turkey were taking the necessary domestic steps to follow suit.

37. As a regional body, ICAPP was involved in debate on the most relevant issues of concern to the region. It had organized many conferences in different countries to strengthen cooperation on addressing regional and global issues, such as dispute settlement, poverty reduction and natural disasters. It cooperated closely with many international organizations and institutions. ICAPP also promoted coalitions with political parties in other regions by organizing meetings with major political parties in Latin America and Africa with a view to forming a global forum of political parties. In recent years, it had developed close relations with the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean (COPPPAL) and the Council of African Political Parties (CAPP).

38. From its inception, ICAPP had been a firm supporter of the United Nations and its activities. ICAPP had played an important role in forging cooperation between the United Nations and political parties in many areas, by channelling to the United Nations system the views of the peoples in all their diversity and providing support for political parties to strengthen their capacity to address all matters relating to international cooperation at the United Nations. Representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific had attended the ICAPP General Assembly as observers and had made fruitful presentations on relevant issues.

39. Granting observer status to the International Conference of Asian Political Parties would allow it to align its activities with the United Nations in the areas of democracy, human rights and the peaceful settlement of disputes and would enable it to play a more active role in the global movement for achieving the objectives of the United Nations.

40. **Mr. De Vega** (Philippines) said that ICAPP could be an effective channel between the General Assembly and Governments in the region. ICAPP and its members were playing an important role in promoting and consolidating emerging democracies and had been working closely together in areas of environmental protection, natural disasters and poverty alleviation. ICAPP could also contribute to the work of the General Assembly in the areas of peace and security, human rights and development in the region.

41. His delegation understood the concerns that certain delegations had expressed in 2012 with regard to the request for observer status for ICAPP, but stressed that the organization fulfilled the criteria set out in General Assembly decision [49/426](#). Observer status in the General Assembly would allow ICAPP to forge closer cooperation between the United Nations and Asian political parties, thus cultivating and sustaining international consensus on the most important United Nations activities.

42. **Mr. Otsuka** (Japan) said that his country greatly appreciated the role played by ICAPP in enhancing mutual understanding and promoting regional cooperation in Asia. If ICAPP were granted observer status in the General Assembly, it would advance cooperation between the United Nations and political parties in Asia.

43. **Ms. Muthukumarana** (Sri Lanka) said that ICAPP was seeking to build a network among political parties across Asia and to strengthen political unity in the region. It was to be hoped that the organization's request would receive positive consideration that would lead to greater cooperation between ICAPP and the United Nations.

44. **Mr. Pham Quang Hieu** (Viet Nam) endorsed the Cambodian representative's comments and urged the Committee to approve the request by ICAPP for observer status in the General Assembly.

45. **Ms. Cabello de Daboin** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) noted that it was the third consecutive year in which ICAPP had requested observer status. Her delegation once again advised ICAPP to seek consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. The request for observer status in the General Assembly should be withdrawn, because ICAPP was not an intergovernmental organization and thus did not fulfil the requirements under General Assembly decision [49/426](#).

46. **Mr. Estrémé** (Argentina) said that her delegation appreciated the contribution of ICAPP to the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean and hoped that those ties could be developed, but it continued to have reservations about the organization's request. The intergovernmental nature of ICAPP was not clearly demonstrated in the documents available to her delegation.

47. **Mr. Jafarov** (Azerbaijan) said that his delegation supported the request made by ICAPP for observer status. Given the organization's recent achievements and its efforts to strengthen its international legal status, including the signing of memorandums of understanding with a number of Governments, the time was right for granting it observer status.

48. **Mr. Kim Saeng** (Republic of Korea) suggested, on the basis of the concerns voiced by a number of delegations, that further informal consultations should be held among interested delegations until the end of the current session of the Sixth Committee.

49. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba), endorsing the comments by the Argentine and Venezuelan delegations, stressed the need to comply with General Assembly decision [49/426](#), whose two cumulative requirements must be taken fully into account.

50. **Mr. Leonidchenko** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation would take part in the consultations proposed by the Republic of Korea, although they would not resolve the question of the status of ICAPP, which was not an intergovernmental organization. The criteria in General Assembly decision [49/426](#) were clear. The work of ICAPP was very positive, and a number of Russian political parties were members, but that did not even make it an interparliamentary organization. Rather, it was an association of political parties. His delegation continued to believe that it would be preferable to grant ICAPP the status of observer with the Economic and Social Council.

51. **Mr. Li Zhenhua** (China) said he agreed with the delegation of the Republic of Korea on the ICAPP request. As there were differences of opinion, delegations should be given more time for consultations on the issue.

52. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to defer a decision on the agenda item in order to allow delegations more time for consultations.

53. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly ([A/67/191](#); [A/C.6/68/L.4](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.4](#): Observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly

54. **Ms. Le Fraper du Hellen** (France), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.4](#) and announcing that Belgium and Monaco had become sponsors, said that the International Chamber of Commerce made a unique contribution to promoting the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Its work was closely interlinked with that of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), and it had participated in the drafting of many conventions on questions concerning international commercial arbitration, including the 1958 Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. Today, it provided UNCITRAL with expertise on all matters relating to e-trade. In the context of the post-2015 development agenda, the International Chamber of Commerce was called upon to promote the involvement of the private sector in the three key areas of sustainable development, namely the economy, the environment and society. It continued to mobilize the business world, in particular for the benefit of the least developed countries.

55. Without the proper status, the International Chamber of Commerce could not make its voice heard in the General Assembly; the purpose of draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.4](#) was to remedy that situation. In 2012, a number of delegations had sought clarification on whether the International Chamber of Commerce had an intergovernmental or a non-governmental status, and they had been informed about its innovative relationship with States. In many countries, the International Chamber of Commerce was represented by governmental ministries. It was not a non-governmental organization. Thus, its status with the Economic and Social Council did not correspond to its nature.

56. The Sixth Committee was not being asked to make an exception to Assembly decision [49/426](#), but rather to grant an application that was adapted to the unique nature of the International Chamber of Commerce, which did not have a political agenda, but

sought to make a contribution in the General Assembly. The International Chamber of Commerce was already a de facto partner of the Assembly, and it would like to become one on paper. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus; they had no intention of asking for a vote.

57. **The Chair** invited delegations to continue consultations on the agenda item, to which the Committee would revert at a later stage.

58. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law in the General Assembly (A/68/141; A/C.6/68/L.5)

Draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.5: Observer status for the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law in the General Assembly

59. **Mr. Bernardini** (Italy), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/68/L.5](#), said that Denmark, Israel, Norway, Turkey and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had become sponsors of the draft resolution. He drew attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/68/141](#), which made specific reference to the relevant constitutional document of the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) and elaborated on the criteria for granting it observer status in the General Assembly

60. UNIDROIT was an independent intergovernmental organization with its seat in Rome; it had been established on the basis a multilateral treaty, the UNIDROIT Statute, and comprised more than 60 member States. Membership was restricted to States acceding to the Statute. The activities of UNIDROIT were in areas of interest to the General Assembly. Its purpose was to study needs and methods for modernizing, harmonizing and coordinating private and commercial law between States and groups of States and to formulate uniform law instruments, principles and rules to achieve those objectives. To that end, it undertook a variety of activities, ranging from the development and adoption of international conventions to the elaboration of model laws, legal and contractual guides, principles and other instruments in the field of private and international commercial law. It also maintained a library, scholarship and internship

programmes and legal cooperation activities promoting the rule of law.

61. The Institute's activities advanced many of the purposes of the United Nations, particularly with regard to progressive codification and harmonization in the field of private law. The strong links between the United Nations and the Institute dated back to the origins of the United Nations, which for many years had entrusted the Institute with the preparation of studies in various areas of private law, ranging from international transport to alimony obligations and the protection of cultural property. Since the establishment of UNCITRAL, that cooperation had taken place mainly within the framework of that Commission's activities.

62. The mandate of UNIDROIT also encompassed topics that fell outside the core mandate of UNCITRAL and thus justified an even broader relationship with the General Assembly. Granting the Institute observer status in the General Assembly would help develop further the natural links between the Institute and the United Nations for greater mutual benefits, and it would lay the foundation for positive interaction between the two institutions.

63. **Mr. Joyini** (South Africa) said that his delegation attached great importance to the agenda item on observer status for UNIDROIT. South Africa was a member of UNIDROIT and participated actively in its legislative activities. UNIDROIT met the criteria for observer status set out in General Assembly decision [49/426](#), since it was an intergovernmental organization open only to States. It had a remarkable success rate in formulating uniform law instruments, principles and rules. It had been cooperating with the United Nations since 1959, and it had a proven track record of working with other United Nations agencies, such as with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the drafting of the 2011 Model Provisions on State Ownership of Undiscovered Cultural Objects.

64. **Mr. Silva** (Brazil) said that UNIDROIT had a solid record of cooperation with United Nations bodies. Granting observer status in the General Assembly to the Institute, which clearly fulfilled the required criteria, would be mutually beneficial and would open up new possibilities for cooperation between the two bodies.

65. **Mr. Sousa Bravo** (Mexico) said that his country participated actively in the important work of UNIDROIT. The status of observer in the General Assembly would make it possible to build on existing synergies in order to improve the process of codification and harmonization of international law.

66. **Mr. Norman** (Canada) said that his country had been a member of UNIDROIT since 1958 and had participated in the elaboration of many important legal instruments adopted by Institute in the area of commercial law. UNIDROIT had a tradition of cooperating with other international bodies, including UNCITRAL, the Hague Conference on Private International Law, UNESCO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Development Law Organization and the World Bank. It also worked with UNCITRAL and the Hague Conference to coordinate international efforts on the formulation of rules of private law. Given the long and positive contribution of UNIDROIT to the international community, it was entirely appropriate for it to be granted observer status in the General Assembly.

67. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba) agreed that UNIDROIT had a long history of dealing with the codifying and harmonizing private law, cooperating with the United Nations and working to elaborate instruments on international private law. Since it met the criteria under General Assembly decision 49/426, her delegation was in favour of granting it observer status in the General Assembly.

68. **Mr. Gharibi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that UNIDROIT continued to make an important contribution to developing and harmonizing international private law. Closer interaction with the General Assembly would better advance the objectives of UNIDROIT and would be mutually beneficial. His delegation therefore hoped that draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.5 could be adopted by consensus.

69. **Mr. Estrémé** (Argentina) said she agreed that granting observer status to UNIDROIT, which fulfilled the criteria under General Assembly decision 49/426, would be beneficial to the work of the United Nations.

70. **Mr. Hameed** (Pakistan) said that granting observer status in the General Assembly to UNIDROIT would go a long way towards promoting harmonization and modernization of international law. The Institute's activities in developing model laws, legal and contractual guides and promoting the principles of

private and commercial law were of great relevance to the work of the United Nations.

71. **Ms. Cabello de Daboin** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), supported by **Mr. Gonzalez** (Chile) and **Mr. Ceriani** (Uruguay), stressed the work of UNIDROIT in the codification of international public and private law. The Institute fulfilled the criteria under 49/426 and would make an important contribution to the work of the General Assembly. Her delegation therefore fully supported the initiative to grant it observer status in the General Assembly.

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Anti-Corruption Academy in the General Assembly (A/68/144; A/C.6/68/L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.6: Observer status for the International Anti-Corruption Academy in the General Assembly

72. **Ms. Quidenus** (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.6, said that Burkina Faso, Finland, Jordan, Mongolia, Pakistan and Spain had become sponsors; she also drew attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document A/68/144.

73. The purpose of the International Anti-Corruption Academy was to promote the effective and efficient prevention and combating of corruption by offering anti-corruption education and professional training, undertaking and facilitating research into all aspects of corruption, providing other relevant forms of technical assistance in the fight against corruption and fostering international cooperation and networking. The activities of the Academy observed the principle of academic freedom, met the highest academic and professional standards and addressed the phenomenon of corruption in a comprehensive and interdisciplinary way, taking due account of cultural diversity, gender equality and recent developments in the field of corruption at the global and regional levels.

74. Membership in the Academy was open to all States Members of the United Nations and to international organizations. The objectives of the General Assembly and the Academy in the fight against corruption were complementary. By advancing the goals of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, promoting the rule of law and providing support and technical assistance in translating anti-

corruption efforts into reality, the Academy contributed to the activities of the United Nations.

75. The promotion of the Academy through the United Nations system could foster broader dissemination of the knowledge gained and the activities offered by the Academy. Granting the Academy observer status would therefore encourage a mutually beneficial institutional dialogue between the Academy and the United Nations.

76. **Ms. Dilogwathana** (Thailand) said that her delegation supported the request by the International Anti-Corruption Academy to be granted observer status in the General Assembly. The fight against corruption was a priority for her Government, which was working closely with the Academy at a number of levels. The Academy was an intergovernmental organization whose activities covered areas of interest to Member States and the General Assembly. It fulfilled all the requirements for observer status, and her delegation therefore hoped that its request would receive unanimous approval.

77. **Mr. Silva** (Brazil) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution. Advancing the goals of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, promoting the rule of law and providing support and technical assistance in translating anti-corruption efforts into reality would benefit from a visible and productive interaction with the General Assembly. Since the Academy met the criteria for the granting of observer status in the General Assembly, closer institutional ties between the two institutions would be mutually beneficial and would open up new possibilities for cooperation.

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa in the General Assembly (A/68/145; A/C.6/68/L.7)

Draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.7: Observer status for the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa in the General Assembly

78. **Mr. Kogda** (Burkina Faso), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.7 and announcing that Austria and Italy had become sponsors, said that the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa had been active for many years in fostering development and combating poverty by promoting sustainable access to hygiene, water and

sanitation services for populations in rural, peri-urban and urban areas in its Member States. The Agency worked to develop and disseminate innovative and sustainable solutions for drinking water, hygiene and sanitation; to assist regional and subregional institutions, States, local communities and public and private partners in the development and implementation of sustainable drinking water, hygiene and sanitation initiatives; to mobilize financial and human resources; and to develop, implement and monitor policies and strategies to promote access to drinking water, hygiene and sanitation.

79. The Agency's objectives — to promote the economic and social development of the populations of its member States — were fully in line with those embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and pursued by a number of its specialized agencies. Observer status would enable the Agency to play an active role in the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals as well as in the elaboration of the post-2015 development agenda and sustainable development goals. It would also provide it with a forum for mobilizing global support for sustainable development projects.

80. Clearly, the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa was an intergovernmental organization which fulfilled, in letter and spirit, the criteria under General Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status.

81. **Mr. Muhumuza** (Uganda) said that the Pan African Intergovernmental Agency for Water and Sanitation for Africa fulfilled the criteria for the granting of observer status in the General Assembly. Accordingly, his delegation called on the Committee to support draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.7.

Agenda 173: Observer status for the Global Green Growth Institute in the General Assembly (A/68/191; A/C.6/68/L.8)

Draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.8: Observer status for the Global Green Growth Institute in the General Assembly

82. **Ms. Paik Ji-ah** (Republic of Korea), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.8, said that Ireland, Peru and Spain had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/68/L.8. She also drew attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document A/68/191.

83. The Global Green Growth Institute had been launched as an international organization in October 2012. It met the criteria for observer status set forth in General Assembly decision 49/426. In accordance with article 5 of the agreement on the establishment of the Global Green Growth Institute, membership was open only to States Members of the United Nations and to regional integration organizations.

84. The Institute was the sole international organization devoted to supporting developing countries in implementing the transition to a green economy. It aimed to contribute to the objectives of the United Nations and other international bodies in the areas of sustainable development and poverty eradication. The Institute's core activity was green growth planning and implementation, through which it provided technical assistance and capacity-building to developing countries to facilitate their elaboration and implementation of green and inclusive economic development strategies.

85. The Institute had completed or was currently conducting green growth planning and implementation programmes in 18 developing countries. Granting observer status to the Global Green Growth Institute would enable it to contribute to current and future goals of the General Assembly in the area of sustainable development, including those on the post-2015 development agenda.

86. **Mr. Karstensen** (Denmark) said that the Global Green Growth Institute met the criteria for observer status set forth in General Assembly decision 49/426. It was the only intergovernmental institution dedicated to supporting the world's developing countries in implementing the transition towards a green economy. It did commendable work in the areas of CO₂ reduction, sustainable development and poverty eradication. It should therefore be granted observer status as an intergovernmental organization in the General Assembly.

87. **Mr. Botor** (Ethiopia) said that the Global Green Growth Institute assisted many countries, including his own, in their pursuit of green growth development compatible with the goal of ensuring long-term environmental sustainability. The Institute's professionals had made a significant contribution to the design of Ethiopia's climate resilience green economy strategy. The Institute had signed a memorandum of understanding with the Ethiopian Development and

Research Institute and was assisting the implementation of that strategy

88. Recognizing the critical role that it could play in Africa to develop and implement the green growth strategy, Ethiopia was working together with the Institute to launch its regional office for Africa in Addis Ababa. The activities to establish the regional office were under way, and his Government would continue to extend its assistance to expedite the process.

89. As the Institute was an intergovernmental organization whose activities were of great interest to the General Assembly and were fully compatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, his Government supported the request to grant it observer status so that the Institute would be in a better position to make an effective contribution in a number of United Nations bodies involved in the development field.

90. **Mr. Sousa Bravo** (Mexico) echoed the statements made by other delegations that had stressed the great value of the Institute, given its function as an international organization that promoted sustainable development in developing countries by providing capacity-building for designing and implementing economic development and green growth strategies to combat poverty, create green jobs, strengthen social inclusion and enhance international efforts to achieve a transition to low-carbon economies. The granting of observer status would be consistent with the objectives agreed at United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) for seeking and consolidating synergies with a view to improving the governance of sustainable development. That required the participation of international organizations working to implement the sustainable development model, as was the case with the Global Green Growth Institute.

91. **Mr. Neelam** (Australia) said that Australia had supported the Global Green Growth Institute since its establishment and believed that it fully met the criteria for being granted observer status in the General Assembly. As a member of the Institute, Australia endorsed its three core objectives: to support and disseminate a new paradigm of economic growth, to target key aspects of economic performance and environmental sustainability, and to improve the economic, environmental and social conditions of developing and emerging countries through

partnerships between developed and developing countries in the public and private sectors.

92. Since its inception, the Institute had proven itself to be effective in supporting developing country governance in facilitating policy and institutional transformations to achieve sustainable development. It helped deliver comprehensive national policies and institutional arrangements for green growth; those policies were always fully backed by the Governments of the countries concerned and were integrated into their national development plans. The Institute also had a direct relationship with the private sector and was facilitating public-private cooperation to help achieve sustainable development. The Institute's work in mobilizing economic activity and supporting job creation while improving environmental sustainability was making a difference. Granting the Global Green Growth Institute observer status would allow it to contribute to the work of the United Nations, in particular in achieving the Millennium Development Goals and delivering the agreed outcomes of Rio+20.

93. **Mr. Ogwen** (Kenya) said that the Global Green Growth Institute would have a greater impact if it were granted observer status in one of the United Nations bodies that dealt directly with sustainable development, such as the high-level political forum of the Economic and Social Council or the United Nations Environment Assembly.

94. **Mr. Pham Quang Hieu** (Viet Nam) said that granting the Institute observer status in the General Assembly would enable it to receive information and provide valuable input to current and future United Nations projects and deliberations, thereby contributing to the work of the Organization, in particular in the area of development. The Institute adhered to the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation therefore hoped that the Institute would be granted observer status in the General Assembly.

95. **Ms. Cabello de Daboin** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) stressed the value of the Institute, but said it would be helpful to have a copy of its statute so as to be certain that it fulfilled the requirements under General Assembly decision [49/426](#). Since her delegation had difficulties about some of the requests that had been made for observer status, it would need to clarify the position it would ultimately take in that regard.

96. **Ms. Millicay** (Argentina) asked whether the statute of the Institute could be made available.

97. **Mr. Gonzalez** (Chile) strongly supported the granting of observer status in the General Assembly to the Global Green Growth Institute.

Agenda item 80: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law ([A/68/521](#))

98. **The Chair** said that at its forty-eighth session, which had been held on 8 and 10 October 2013, the Advisory Committee on the Programme of Assistance had had an extensive discussion on financial issues. A brief summary of the session was contained in paragraphs 68 to 79 of the report, as well as the Committee's conclusions and recommendations concerning the method for funding the activities under the Programme of Assistance during the biennium 2014-2015. He reminded delegations that, in its resolution [67/91](#), the General Assembly had decided "to consider the viability of voluntary contributions as a sustainable method for funding the United Nations Regional Courses in International Law and the United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law and the need to provide a more reliable funding method, taking into account the recommendation of the Advisory Committee at its forty-eighth session".

99. **Mr. Kanda** (Uganda), Chairman of the Advisory Committee, thanked the Codification Division for its continued commitment to the Programme of Assistance and for its efforts to ensure that the Programme was effectively implemented. The Programme of Assistance was at a crucial stage, and it required the support of all Member States to ensure its continuance. Over the past 12 months, informal briefings and consultations had been held by the Advisory Committee, together with interested delegations, and Fifth Committee representatives in particular, to explore ways of ensuring regular budgetary financing, because the voluntary contributions which the Programme had counted on in the past had proved to be very unreliable.

100. At its forty-eighth session, the Advisory Committee had commended the Codification Division on its activities, which were of great value to practitioners and academics in countries around the world, and on its efforts to enhance those activities; it had also recognized the major contribution of the Programme to the teaching and dissemination of

international law for the benefit of lawyers in all countries, legal systems and regions of the world for almost half a century and had stressed the important role that Programme activities, particularly the United Nations Regional Courses in International Law and the United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law, played in the furtherance of the Organization's rule of law programmes and activities.

101. It had recommended that the Secretary-General should be requested to carry out in 2014-2015 the activities specified in his report and in General Assembly resolution 67/91; it had noted with concern the continued insufficient funding for the Programme of Assistance and had concluded that voluntary contributions had not proven to be an adequate method for funding Programme activities specified in the Secretary-General's report and in General Assembly resolution 67/91, in particular the Regional Courses and the Audiovisual Library, and that, consequently, there was a need to provide more reliable funding for those activities. Consequently, it had again recommended that the General Assembly should reiterate its request to the Secretary-General, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 67/91, in particular operative paragraph 7 thereof, to provide to the programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 the resources necessary for the Programme of Assistance to ensure the continued effectiveness and further development of the Programme, in particular the organization of United Nations Regional Courses in International Law on a regular basis and the viability of the United Nations Audiovisual Library of International Law.

102. It was his firm hope that the Sixth Committee would support those recommendations and send a strong signal to the Fifth Committee so as to ensure that essential tools, including regular budgetary funding, were made available for the effective implementation of all aspects of the Programme.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.