



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
5 November 2014

Original: English

Sixth Committee

Summary record of the 10th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 14 October 2014, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Gharibi (Vice-Chair). (Iran)

Contents

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation in the General Assembly

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pacific Community in the General Assembly

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>).

14-62590 (E)



Please recycle A small graphic of a recycling symbol, consisting of three arrows forming a triangle.



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

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly (A/66/141 and A/C.6/69/L.4)

Draft resolution A/C.6/69/L.4: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** recalled that, at its sixty-eighth session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status of the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly to its sixty-ninth session (decision 68/588).

2. **Ms. Zeytinöglü Özkan** (Turkey), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/69/L.4 on behalf of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and her own country, said that the Cooperation Council clearly met the two criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status in the General Assembly: it was an intergovernmental organization, and it covered matters of interest to the General Assembly. It operated through annual meetings of Heads of State, ministers and working groups. In its statutory documents, its member States embraced the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The main purposes of the Council were strengthening mutual confidence among the parties, maintaining peace in the region and beyond, coordinating actions to combat international terrorism, separatism, extremism and transborder crimes and creating favourable conditions for trade and investment, economic growth, social and cultural development, promotion of the rule of law, good governance and the protection of human rights. It could thus contribute, on a regional basis, to achieving the objectives of the United Nations. The granting of observer status would initiate a mutually beneficial dialogue and would greatly assist the Council in fostering regional initiatives.

3. **Ms. Krasa** (Cyprus) said that her delegation continued to have serious reservations as to whether the criteria under General Assembly decision 49/426 were fulfilled, and in particular whether the activities of the Cooperation Council of the Turkic-speaking States covered activities of interest to the General Assembly. Although its membership was limited, it could be inferred that its operations were not limited to its member States. It was evident from its founding

document and the declarations of its annual summits that its areas of interest included a number of international issues of doubtful relevance to the membership. One such issue was Cyprus, yet at no time had the Government of Cyprus been consulted, nor had it been associated with the Council. An entity seeking observer status should conform to the resolutions of the principal organs of the United Nations; however, 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 therefore recommended that the resolution be withdrawn from the Committee's agenda until such time as there was substantial progress in the matter, currently under consideration for the fourth time. Repeated deferrals were adversely affecting the work of the Committee and of the Organization.

4. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia) said that both the criteria identified in General Assembly decision 49/426 were important for the granting of observer status, namely, the legal status of the organization making the request and the nature of its activities. The primary consideration should be whether granting such status would benefit the United Nations and promote the purposes and principles set out in its Charter. His delegation continued to have serious concerns about the Council's restricted membership, its operations extending far beyond the scope of its membership and the inconsistency between its nature and its areas of interest. In particular, the annual declarations of the Council did not properly reflect the principles of international law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, such as respect for equality and the right to self-determination, sovereignty and the peaceful resolution of international disputes. As there had been no sustained progress in addressing those concerns, his delegation was not in a position to support the request to grant the Council observer status.

5. **Mr. Israfilov** (Azerbaijan) recalled that 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 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. It met the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status. Such a status would enable the Council to effectively develop cooperation ties with the United Nations system and thereby interact with other organizations enjoying the same status. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to support and adopt by consensus the draft resolution.

6. **Mr. Isakov** (Kyrgyzstan) said that the Cooperation Council clearly met the two criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 and fully deserved to be granted observer status in the General Assembly. The granting of such a status would initiate a mutually beneficial dialogue between the two organizations and assist the Council in its endeavours to foster regional initiatives. The Council was currently interacting with the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the Economic Cooperation Organization, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization and the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia, in particular. He reiterated the hope that the Committee would support and adopt by consensus the draft resolution.

7. **Mr. Musikhin** (Russian Federation) stressed that, over the years, no agreement had been able to be reached on the request and that, despite the arguments he had heard, the issue remained unresolved. An innovative approach needed to be found that would reflect the consensual nature of the Committee's work.

8. **Ms. Zeytinoglu Özkan** (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, while it was true that the Council had a limited membership, the number of member States was not one of the criteria for granting observer status. Furthermore, in accordance with its rules of procedure, the Council could accept new members and observers. As for the assertion that its annual declarations were not in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, she cited the Declaration of its fourth summit, held in June 2014, in which the participating Heads of State welcomed the resumption of the comprehensive negotiation process in Cyprus and confirmed their strong support for a political settlement in that country under the auspices of the United Nations. She regretted having to put forward the same arguments as at the

previous session and agreed that an innovative approach should be sought, in order to achieve the desired consensus. The Committee must not become a politicized forum. Her delegation would continue to seek support for the draft resolution through informal channels.

9. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation, as well as that of Cyprus and, to some extent, that of the Russian Federation, had strong reservations regarding the request and they had not been adequately addressed by the representative of Azerbaijan; the latter was seeking to politicize the Committee's deliberations on the item by spreading lies about his country. He requested that delegation to modify its behaviour and to focus on the legitimate concerns being discussed.

10. **Ms. Krasa** (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the declaration of the summit of the Cooperation Council, quoted by the representative of Turkey, ran counter to Security Council resolution 550 (1984), which condemned all secessionist actions, and Security Council resolution 1251 (1999), which called for a State of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship.

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

12. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly (A/67/191)

13. **The Chair** recalled that, at its sixty-eighth session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status for the International Chamber of Commerce in the General Assembly to its sixty-ninth session.

14. **Ms. Le Fraper du Hellen** (France) said that, since 2012, when observer status had first been requested for the International Chamber of Commerce, the many discussions in the Committee on the subject had revealed considerable support for its activities. As a quasi-universal institution, represented in most of the States Members of the United Nations, it had long been making a significant contribution to economic development, international trade, and peace and security; it already enjoyed observer status in the

Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and was actively involved in all the Organization's many areas of concern, playing a leading role, for example, in discussions on climate change and the sustainable development goals and the post-2015 development agenda.

15. While, however, the International Chamber of Commerce was represented in many countries by governmental entities, it was not an intergovernmental organization, either structurally or formally, and therefore did not meet one of the two criteria laid down in General Assembly decision 49/426. For the past two years, her delegation had been seeking to address that problem. The possibility had been explored of modifying the criteria: the time was not ripe for that. The question had also been raised whether the International Chamber of Commerce could be accepted with a hybrid status — part association, part intergovernmental organization. Again, that approach had not proved fruitful.

16. Since no consensus was in sight, her delegation had not prepared a draft resolution; it would continue to have informal discussions on the issue in order to identify other options. One possibility was the establishment of a supporting intergovernmental structure, which could then itself request observer status. For the time being, there was no point in pursuing the discussion in the Committee, which might revert to it once a consensus emerged. Her delegation preferred to close on a positive note and not to squander the immense capital of friendly support for the International Chamber of Commerce.

17. **Ms. Millicay** (Argentina) thanked the representative of France for her constructive approach and stressed that the role of the Committee was not to modify the aforementioned criteria but to ensure compliance with them. The reservations expressed at previous sessions by her delegation were unrelated to the merits of the International Chamber of Commerce and concerned only its non-fulfilment of the intergovernmental criterion. She was confident that the Chamber would continue to make a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations through its consultative relations with the Economic and Social Council.

18. **Mr. Musikhin** (Russian Federation), while praising the work of the International Chamber of Commerce, said that the criteria set out in the General

Assembly decision must be strictly observed. His delegation therefore welcomed the proposal of the representative of France to close the discussion on the item and commended her flexibility and creativity in seeking a solution.

19. **Ms. Dieguez Lao** (Cuba), joined by **Ms. Krasa** (Cyprus), likewise thanked the representative of France for her constructive and flexible approach. Her delegation had always advocated strict compliance with the criteria laid down, while fully appreciating the positive contribution of the International Chamber of Commerce to the work of the Organization. Cuba enjoyed excellent relations with that institution and would be happy to cooperate with France in any further initiative on the issue.

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation in the General Assembly (A/69/142; A/C.6/69/L.2)

Draft resolution A/C.6/69/L.2: Observer status for the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation in the General Assembly

20. **Mr. Masood Khan** (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/69/L.2](#) on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Nigeria. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/69/142](#). The Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation (D-8) was an intergovernmental organization established in June 1997 to promote development cooperation. It currently had eight members, namely, Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan and Turkey. Its objectives were to promote its member States' role in the world economy, diversify and create new opportunities in trade relations, enhance participation in decision-making at the international level, and improve standards of living. Its principles stressed peaceful cooperation, and its activities focused on many areas that were also priorities of the United Nations in the context of socioeconomic growth and sustainable development. Its charter stipulated the establishment of collaborative relationships with other countries, regional and international organizations, and non-governmental organizations, with a view to establishing partnerships and initiating joint projects.. Granting observer status to the Developing Eight Countries Organization for

Economic Cooperation would allow it to further its objectives and develop synergies with United Nations-led efforts to promote sustainable development.

21. **Ms. Ismail** (Malaysia) said that, as a member of the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation, her delegation recognized the vast potential for development of the D-8 community, given its large amounts of land, skilled labour force, diversified human capital, rich natural resources and large market of more than 1 billion people. Recognizing the opportunities and challenges faced by developing countries, it envisioned D-8 as a cooperative mechanism to improve the positions of those countries in the world economy, diversify and create new opportunities in trade relations, enhance support at the national level and further strengthen the weight and voice of its members at the regional and international levels. As well as hosting many technical meetings, the D-8 member States had agreed to broaden areas of economic and industrial cooperation, placing emphasis on the need for the engagement of both the public and private sectors in order to further promote private sector activities within their countries.

22. Her delegation supported the request for observer status for the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation, considering that its proposed contribution to the United Nations and its programmes, specifically in the area of economic cooperation, was timely and constructive.

23. **Ms. Zeytinoglu Özkan** (Turkey) said that, as a founding member of the Developing Eight Countries Organization for Economic Cooperation, her delegation wished to stress that the concrete achievements of D-8, including the establishment of a visa agreement, a customs agreement and a preferential trade agreement, had proved its relevance and value added as an international organization. Furthermore, it was a unique example of a successful and innovative development initiative bringing together countries from different continents and regions. Lastly, as a proactive organization willing to further deepen and diversify its activities in line with current world developments, it had established a committee of wise men to examine prospects, challenges and opportunities for enhancing cooperation among member States. Observer status in the General Assembly would therefore be beneficial not just for D-8 but for the United Nations as well.

24. **Mr. Musikhin** (Russian Federation), reiterating that his delegation considered requests for observer status first and foremost on the basis of the criteria established by the General Assembly, said that it stood ready to work constructively on the draft resolution but requested some clarifications and the provision of additional documents in order to establish the legal status of the entity. In particular, it would be helpful to have a copy of the charter adopted in 2012.

25. **Ms. Omotese** (Nigeria) said it was clear from the membership composition of D-8 that it was a global arrangement for economic cooperation, rather than a regional one. Its objectives, as enshrined in its charter, were consistent with those of the United Nations and were also in line with the post-2015 development agenda. She therefore urged Member States to support the draft resolution.

26. **Mr. Masood Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation stood ready to engage with the delegation of the Russian Federation and would provide it with all the documents it needed.

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pacific Community in the General Assembly (A/69/143; A/C.6/69/L.3)

Draft resolution A/C.6/69/L.3: Observer status for the Pacific Community in the General Assembly

27. **Mr. Thomson** (Fiji), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/69/L.3, said that Australia, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand and Samoa had become sponsors. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document A/69/143. The Pacific Community was by definition an intergovernmental organization established by treaty and it fully met the criteria for observer status set forth in General Assembly decision 49/426. As a technical organization rather than a political one, it provided assistance to the Pacific small island developing States in the areas of energy, transport, public health, agriculture development, disaster risk reduction, human development, development statistics, oceans, fisheries and marine ecosystems. The work of the Pacific Community was highly relevant to the United Nations, since it was a critical enabler of the region's response to the Millennium Development Goals, and would perform a similar role in the future with regard to the sustainable development goals and post-2015 development agenda.

The request for observer status in the General Assembly was also indicative of the Community's commitment to working with the United Nations in implementing sustainable development in the Pacific region. The granting of observer status would greatly help the region to synchronize its development programmes with those of the United Nations.

28. **Mr. Arbogast** (United States of America) said that his delegation fully supported the request for the Pacific Community to be granted observer status in the General Assembly. His Government deeply valued its long-standing relationship with its Pacific island neighbours, including its partnership with them in regional organizations such as the Pacific Community, which remained the principal technical and scientific organization supporting Pacific island countries and territories. His delegation particularly appreciated the Community's leadership in addressing such challenging global issues as climate change, ocean protection, fisheries management, sustainable economic development and human and social development. Granting observer status in the General Assembly to the Pacific Community would allow it more effectively to fulfil its responsibility in helping to overcome global challenges and would also be of benefit to the United Nations.

29. **Mr. Musikhin** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation had examined the documentation submitted in relation to the request for observer status for the Pacific Community to see whether it complied with the criteria established by the General Assembly. It had concluded that the Community's activities in providing assistance and promoting development in the Pacific region were of interest to the General Assembly and that its legal status clearly met the Assembly's criteria. His delegation was therefore ready to support the draft resolution.

30. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba) said that her delegation had always supported requests for observer status from organizations that met the criteria established under General Assembly decision 49/426. Having examined the relevant documentation and listened to the explanations given by the representative of Fiji in relation to the request for observer status currently before the Committee, her delegation supported the draft resolution. The Pacific Community had much to contribute to the General Assembly, particularly since it had played an important role in fostering cooperation, integration and development in

the Pacific region and had evolved into a scientific and technical knowledge-based development organization.

31. The consideration of requests for observer status should be given the utmost importance in the Committee's programme of work. While compliance with the criteria established under General Assembly decision 49/426 was essential, the consideration of requests for observer status was not merely a procedural matter and the Committee should not have to undertake all the related analysis in a single day. Her delegation called on the Secretariat to allow more time at the next session for the Committee to consider requests in greater depth, with full analysis of all the relevant documentation.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.