



General Assembly

Seventy-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
2 December 2016

Original: English

Sixth Committee

Summary record of the 31st meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 4 November 2016, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Danon (Israel)
later: Mr. Turbék (Vice-Chair) (Hungary)

Contents

Agenda item 74: Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts
(*continued*)

Agenda item 79: Diplomatic protection (*continued*)

Agenda item 85: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction
(*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (*continued*)

Agenda item 80: Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from
hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm (*continued*)

Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Central American Bank for Economic
Integration in the General Assembly

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the Conference of Ministers of Justice of the
Ibero-American Countries in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Youth Organization for
Ibero-America in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pacific Islands Development Forum in the
General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian
Political Parties in the General Assembly (*continued*)


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/>).

16-19302 (E)



Please recycle 



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 74: Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts (*continued*)

Oral report by the Chair of the Working Group on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts

1. **Mr. Luna** (Brazil), Chair of the Working Group, said that pursuant to General Assembly resolution 68/104, the Sixth Committee had decided to establish a working group to further examine the question of a convention on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts, with a view to taking a decision or other appropriate action on the basis of the relevant articles. It had also been decided that the Working Group would be open to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

2. The Working Group had had before it the written comments submitted by Governments, contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/71/79), as well as an update, for the period 2013 to 2016, of the compilation of decisions in which the articles and the accompanying commentaries had been referenced by international courts, tribunals and other bodies (A/71/80).

3. The Working Group had held three meetings, on 13, 19 and 21 October 2016. At the first meeting, the consideration of the agenda item by the General Assembly since the adoption of the articles by the Commission had been recalled. As the plenary debate had revealed that a divergence of opinion on the fate of the articles continued to exist, delegations had been asked to further elaborate on their positions and underlying concerns, so as to possibly identify areas of convergence and areas of divergence. An increased number of delegations had spoken in favour of moving towards the negotiation of a convention on the basis of the articles. Pointing to the extensive reliance on the articles by international courts and tribunals, they had argued that the degree of maturity for codification had been reached. They had emphasized that a convention would strengthen the rule of law and enhance legal certainty, especially regarding the elements contained in the articles that would not enjoy the status of customary international law. A convention would also lessen the currently inconsistent application of the

articles, including by making it easier for domestic courts to take cognizance of them.

4. It had also been pointed out that the continued postponement of a decision on the fate of the articles could give rise to a perception of disagreement among States, thereby potentially undermining the status of the articles. Indecision by the General Assembly would also affect the consideration of other projects concluded by the Commission, such as the articles on diplomatic protection and on the responsibility of international organizations. For those delegations, a conference would allow for the participation of all States in law-making and would not necessarily be a risky undertaking, given the general support enjoyed by the articles. Some delegations had indicated that, in a conference, the articles could be presented as a default position, from which deletion or modification would require a qualified majority.

5. Some delegations had argued that there was no need for a convention on the subject, noting, *inter alia*, that the articles were already widely accepted and had gained sufficient authority, that the secondary norms might not be suitable for codification, and that the articles would be more valuable in their current form. It had also been acknowledged that it would be premature to consider all the articles as settled customary international law and that State practice itself should be allowed to develop. A fundamental concern in a negotiating exercise would be the risk of unravelling the work of the Commission and thereby endangering the carefully calibrated balance achieved in the articles. Some delegations had noted that the ordinary rules of treaty negotiation would not be enough to assuage such concerns. From their vantage point, a negotiating exercise could undermine the coherence of the articles and result in a watered-down text. Some delegations had stressed that, should a convention be adopted but not universally ratified there would be a risk of “de-codification”. Among those delegations opposing a convention, some had suggested adopting the articles as an annex to a General Assembly resolution or in the form of a declaration of the General Assembly.

6. At the second meeting, the Chair had presented a non-paper, entitled “Informal Working Notes from the Chair,” outlining the different points of view on any possible action on the basis of the articles. Delegations

had generally supported the preparation of that non-paper to guide the discussions in the Working Group. The non-paper had stressed that any decision on the fate of the articles, including on the process for reaching such a decision, should be taken by consensus and on the basis of sufficient information. Based on elements gathered from previous discussions, the non-paper had proposed short-term, mid-term and long-term objectives on which the Working Group could focus to reach a definite decision. It had been made clear that the issues raised therein would be without prejudice to the positions of delegations and that the non-paper would be subject to modification at later stages, in order to continue to be useful for an evolving debate.

7. Delegations had used the second and third meetings of the Working Group to exchange views on the suggestions contained in the non-paper. Many delegations had suggested holding meetings of the Working Group on an annual basis, arguing that it would allow for a more thorough discussion, while other delegations had suggested that the Working Group should meet less frequently. A reflection on the risks that some delegations saw in embarking on a negotiating exercise was also proposed and, in that context, the Working Group had discussed whether additional safeguards could be established so as to assuage any concerns.

8. The non-paper had also suggested that the Working Group should further reflect on current State practice. Delegations had generally considered that it could be helpful to have a report of the Secretary-General listing, including in the form of a table, the references made to the articles in the almost 400 decisions of international courts and tribunals and other bodies already compiled by the Secretary-General since 2001, as well as in the submissions of the parties to the relevant disputes. Delegations had also exchanged views on the utility of having information on procedural options for possible action on the basis of the articles, without prejudice to the question of whether any action was appropriate.

9. The exchange of views in the Working Group had formed the basis of informal consultations on a draft resolution, which had then continued outside the framework of the Working Group.

10. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Chair of the Working Group on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts.

11. It was so decided.

Agenda item 79: Diplomatic protection (*continued*)
(A/C.6/71/L.14)

Oral report by the Chair of the Working Group on diplomatic protection

12. **Mr. Joyini** (South Africa), Chair of the Working Group, said that pursuant to General Assembly resolution 68/113, the Sixth Committee had decided to establish a working group to further examine, in the light of the written comments of Governments as well as views expressed in the debates held at the sixty-second, sixty-fifth and sixty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly, the question of a convention on diplomatic protection, or any other appropriate action, on the basis of the articles on diplomatic protection, and to also identify any difference of opinion on the articles. The Sixth Committee had also decided to open the Working Group to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Working Group had had before it the written comments of Governments issued in the most recent report of the Secretary-General (A/71/93 and Corr.1).

13. The Working Group had held two meetings, on 17 and 19 October 2016, at which the history of the consideration of the agenda item by the Sixth Committee had been recalled. In light of the differences of opinion expressed during the debate in the plenary, the primary task of the Working Group had been to solicit the views of Governments on a feasible way forward, to be reflected in the draft resolution to be negotiated at the current session. Several delegations had taken the floor to reiterate their positions expressed during the plenary debate. Those who had spoken in favour of the eventual adoption of the articles as a convention had stressed, inter alia, the important role the articles had played in clarifying and developing rules of customary international law, and had emphasized the legal certainty which a convention would bring. Other delegations had continued to oppose such an outcome, including for the reason that the negotiation of a convention would be premature in

the absence of a consensus on the substance of the articles, and in light of the continued consideration of the fate of the articles on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts. Reference was also made to concerns regarding specific provisions of the articles on diplomatic protection.

14. The suggestion had been made that a road map might be developed to help guide the work of the Working Group in the future. However, it had been recalled that the inconclusive nature of the work on the State responsibility articles had made it difficult in the past to develop a coherent plan of action for the articles on diplomatic protection. The possibility of “de-linking” the work on the two sets of articles had been raised, but had received little support. Likewise, delegations had not been in a position to suggest more specific elements of a road map. His sense of the state of play was that delegations continued to need more time to consult and to further develop and articulate their positions on a process to move the work forward. Developments in the work on the State responsibility articles would undoubtedly have a bearing on those views and positions.

15. With those general conclusions in mind, the focus of the Working Group had been on reaching agreement on a draft resolution deferring a decision on the fate of the articles on diplomatic protection to a future session, and the Working Group had successfully concluded its consideration of a proposal for such a draft resolution.

16. In conclusion, he called on delegations to continue to keep the articles on diplomatic protection under consideration during the inter-sessional period, with a view to making concrete proposals on how to proceed the next time the topic was discussed. In particular, thought might be given to developing a “dual-track” approach, whereby delegations could exchange views on both the content and possible final form of the articles, especially since they included elements of both codification and progressive development of international law. Such reflection would be preliminary in nature, and without prejudice to the other “track” of work being undertaken in the context of the articles on State responsibility. Indeed, such an initial conversation at a future meeting of the Working Group could include precisely an examination

of the nature and extent of the linkage between the two sets of articles.

17. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Chair of the Working Group on diplomatic protection.

18. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.14: Diplomatic protection

19. **Mr. Joyini** (South Africa), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that, as indicated in the report of the Working Group on diplomatic protection, Governments continued to prefer a draft resolution deferring consideration of the decision on the final form of the articles on diplomatic protection to a future session, primarily because the fate of the text continued to be linked to that of the articles on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts. The draft resolution had been prepared on the basis of the debate in the plenary and in the Working Group and was based on General Assembly resolution 68/113. The Working Group had discussed the draft resolution at both of its meetings and no substantive suggestions for amendments had been made.

20. Other than a technical update to the final preambular paragraph and the footnote thereto, no changes had been made to the preamble. Paragraph 1 was based, verbatim, on resolution 68/113. Under paragraph 2, the General Assembly would decide to include the agenda item in the provisional agenda of its seventy-fourth session and, within the framework of a working group of the Sixth Committee, to continue to examine the question of a convention on diplomatic protection or any other appropriate action and to also identify any difference of opinion on the articles. The selection of the seventy-fourth session for returning to the agenda item had been motivated in part by a desire to align the consideration of the fate of the articles on diplomatic protection with the consideration of the articles on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts.

Agenda item 85: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction (*continued*)
(A/C.6/71/L.23)

Oral report by the Chair of the Working Group on the scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction

21. **Ms. Guillén-Grillo** (Costa Rica), Chair of the Working Group, recalled that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 70/119, the Sixth Committee had decided again to establish a working group, open to all Member States and relevant observers to the General Assembly, to continue to undertake a thorough discussion of the scope and application of universal jurisdiction. The Working Group had had before it a number of reports of the Secretary-General on the scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction (A/71/111, A/70/125, A/69/174, A/68/113, A/67/116, A/66/93, A/66/93/Add.1 and A/65/181), the records of the oral reports of the Chair on the work of the Working Group in 2015 (A/C.6/70/SR.27), 2014 (A/C.6/69/SR.28), 2013 (A/C.6/68/SR.23) and 2012 (A/C.6/67/SR.24), and an informal paper of the Working Group (A/C.6/66/WG.3/1), commonly referred to as the “road map”, containing agreements on methodology and a list of issues for discussion. The Working Group had also had before it two informal compilations prepared by the Secretariat, one containing relevant multilateral and other instruments, and the other containing excerpts from decisions of international tribunals, along with the Chair’s informal working paper, which had been distributed and discussed in previous sessions of the Working Group and had provided the basis for the Working Group’s discussions.

22. The Working Group had held three meetings, on 13, 14 and 21 October 2016. It had conducted its work in the framework of informal consultations. At its first meeting, on 13 October, the Chair had presented an overview of past proceedings, including the discussions that had led to the drawing up and refinement of the informal working paper; the points listed in the working paper were for illustration purposes only and without prejudice to the positions of delegations.

23. The Working Group had then proceeded to discuss the third section of the Chair’s informal working paper, covering the application of the concept

of universal jurisdiction. After a number of important contributions from delegations, revisions had been made to the third section, primarily focusing on the manner in which the discussion points were presented; those revisions had been reflected in the updated informal working paper.

24. At the conclusion of the second meeting, the Chair had proposed the inclusion of the discussion points for the first two sections in the “road map”, namely on the definition of the principle of universal jurisdiction and on the scope of the principle. To reflect the discussions on the definition that had taken place during the third meeting, the elements of the definition had been separated, focusing on, first, the gravity of the crimes at issue and, second, the jurisdictional connection to the State seeking to exercise universal jurisdiction.

25. Turning to the third section, on the scope of the principle of universal jurisdiction, she said that, drawing on all of the sources set out in footnote 1 of the informal working paper and on the statements made by delegations during the plenary examination of the agenda item, a number of additional points had been included. The intention had been to seek to achieve a compromise among the positions expressed by delegations. It had been recalled that the initial draft of the informal paper on scope presented by the Chair in 2012 had reflected a set of potential categories to crimes for which the principle of universal jurisdiction might be applicable. Those broad categories had drawn upon the terminology employed by the Commission in its work on a draft code of crimes against the peace and security of mankind by focusing on “core crimes” and “treaty crimes”. The result was a non-exhaustive illustrative list of core crimes and crimes for which the treaty-based application of the principle of universal jurisdiction might potentially arise. Several of the crimes listed under the heading of core crimes could of course be set out in a treaty, but a distinction had been drawn between such core crimes and the purely treaty-based presence of the principle. The list had been the subject of detailed comment, giving the impression that the Working Group might need to explore the possibility of having a shorter list, a generic formulation, or a combination of the two approaches.

26. The list as currently presented, together with the other points included in the section on scope, aimed to

provide a middle ground between the positions of delegations. The list focused on those core crimes which had received support from States for the potential application of universal jurisdiction, while acknowledging the presence of treaty-based forms of universal jurisdiction (whether described as “quasi-universal jurisdiction” or otherwise), and also indicating that it was still up to States to determine how they incorporated developments in international law into their practice. Based on the discussions, the Chair had revised the section on scope to make it clearer and to focus on the sources of potentially applicable crimes subject to the exercise of universal jurisdiction as reflecting treaty or customary international law, and on the fact that, absent a specific obligation making the application of universal jurisdiction mandatory, its exercise was subject to the decision of individual States.

27. The Working Group had certainly achieved progress over the six years of its work. It had moved from a very concise “road map”, outlining areas to focus on through individual discussion papers, to a combined set of elements under each of the three sections that had been identified, and then to a full set of discussion points covering all three sections. All delegations were to be commended for their fruitful and engaged contributions. As was clear from comments made in both the plenary debate and within the Working Group, delegations remained divided about the possibility of sending some aspects of universal jurisdiction to the Commission for consideration, as had been proposed on several occasions by a number of delegations. However, after six years of hard work, she believed that future work could be based on the progress made in the discussions, as reflected in the revised informal working paper.

28. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Chair of the Working Group on the scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction.

29. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.23: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction

30. **Mr. Waweru** (Kenya), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that it was a

technical update of General Assembly resolution 70/119. The most noteworthy updates were in paragraph 2, where the Working Group was again given the mandate to continue, during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly, to discuss the scope and application of universal jurisdiction; and in paragraph 5, under which the General Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its seventy-second session an item devoted to the topic.

Agenda item 108: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (*continued*)

Oral report by the Chair of the Working Group on measures to eliminate international terrorism

31. **Mr. Perera** (Sri Lanka), Chair of the Working Group, recalled that, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 70/120, the Sixth Committee had decided to establish a working group with a view to finalizing the process on the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism as well as discussing the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Pursuant to paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 51/210 and consistent with past practice, the Working Group was open to all States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency. In keeping with its established practice, the Working Group had decided that members of the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee established by the General Assembly in its resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996 would continue to act as Friends of the Chair. The Working Group had had before it the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its sixteenth session (A/68/37) and the annexes thereto; written proposals relating to the outstanding issues surrounding the draft convention; an informal summary of the discussions during the plenary and the informal consultations prepared by the Chair, including the proposed accompanying draft resolution; a letter from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (A/60/329); and a letter from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the Chair of the Sixth Committee (A/C.6/60/2).

32. The Working Group had held three meetings, on 17 and 20 October and 1 November 2016. At its first

meeting, it had adopted its work programme and had decided to hold discussions in the framework of informal consultations. At that meeting, the Working Group had discussed outstanding issues relating to the draft convention. At its second meeting, it had considered the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Informal consultations on the draft convention and on the way forward had been held at all three meetings. The Chair and the coordinator of the draft comprehensive convention had also engaged in informal and bilateral discussions with interested delegations on the outstanding issues relating to the draft convention.

33. At its third meeting, the Working Group had decided to recommend that, at the seventy-second session of the General Assembly, the Sixth Committee should establish a working group with a view to finalizing the process relating to the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism, as well as discussions included in its agenda, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 54/110, concerning the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations. The Working Group had also recommended that the General Assembly should recognize the efforts of Member States to resolve any outstanding issues and that it should encourage all Member States to redouble their efforts during the intersessional period.

34. During the informal consultations on 17 October 2016, the Chair had provided detailed background information on the work undertaken thus far and an update on the status of the negotiations regarding the outstanding issues surrounding the draft convention, including the attempts made over the years to overcome the differences among delegations. Delegations had generally reaffirmed their commitment to the negotiating process and had mentioned the issues that remained unresolved. In particular, some delegations had reiterated the need for all proposals to be fully taken into account so that the definition of terrorism was as clear and as comprehensive as possible. Other delegations had affirmed that there was a need for political will to overcome the remaining differences. In that regard, the view had been expressed that changing the name of the draft comprehensive convention might help in managing expectations as to the scope of the convention, thus

moving the process forward. Other delegations had expressed doubts as to whether such a change in name would achieve that purpose.

35. Some delegations had affirmed that the 2007 proposal contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its sixteenth session (A/68/37) still constituted a valid departure point which had not been rejected outright by any delegations. Some delegations, despite preferring the text as had been previously elaborated following negotiations in 2002, had been prepared to consider the 2007 text as a possible way forward. The view had been expressed that the definition of terrorism must be broad enough to encompass all terrorist acts, wherever and by whosoever committed. Other delegations had expressed the view that the pre-eminence of international humanitarian law must be respected at all times, including in situations of foreign occupation, so as not to render unlawful acts which were lawful and were governed by that law.

36. Delegations had also exchanged views in relation to draft article 3 [18] of the 2007 text. Concerning paragraph 1, a proposal had been advanced to refer explicitly to the definition of national liberation movements as contained in Protocol I Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, in order to add clarity to the text. The question had also been raised as to the interpretation of paragraph 2, specifically whether the meaning of "armed forces" would include both State and non-State actors and whether the potential inclusion of non-State actors might mean that attacks by terrorist organizations would not be governed by the convention in certain circumstances. In that regard, the Chair had invited delegations to avoid conflating the legislative process with that of adjudicating context-specific cases on the basis of the text that might be drafted. Concerning the way forward in the negotiations, the view had been expressed that the timing of the discussions might be reassessed, and that it was perhaps time to start holding consultations biennially. The view had also been expressed that, in the absence of political agreement, the time had perhaps come to acknowledge that consensus was currently unattainable and that consultations should be suspended.

37. During the informal consultations on 20 October and 1 November, the coordinator had given an account of the efforts made to advance the consultations towards completion of the draft comprehensive convention. He had described the negotiating efforts at the bilateral and small-group level and had reiterated the necessity for further informal consultations. He had noted that there was a willingness to continue redoubling efforts during the intersessional period. Regarding the process for the future, he had noted that although some delegations had proposed to have a formal intersessional meeting where the output of such informal processes would be reported, the preponderant view had been that a more informal setting would be more conducive to the detailed discussion which was necessary in order to advance in the negotiations. With that in mind, he had expressed the willingness to hold bilateral discussions, starting in late January 2017, to prepare for a fruitful and substantial intersessional dialogue. Concerning the substance of the outstanding issues to be considered during such a dialogue, he had referred to some general questions concerning the scope of the draft comprehensive convention, specifically the references to “armed forces” and conduct which was “not unlawful”, and in general, the relationship between the law of counter-terrorism and the law of armed conflict.

38. During the informal consultations on 17 and 20 October 2016, delegations had commented on the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations to formulate a joint organized response of the international community to terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Several delegations had reiterated their support for the convening of a high-level conference, expressing the view that the differences in opinion concerning the draft comprehensive convention on terrorism were of a political nature, and could thus be resolved only at such a level. Some other delegations had expressed the view that the convening of such a conference would be premature until agreement was reached at the technical level. During the informal consultations on 20 October, the sponsor delegation of Egypt had recalled that it had made the proposal to convene an international conference more than a decade earlier. In light of the political impasse in the negotiations on the draft comprehensive convention, it was important to clearly assess whether political agreement was possible or not.

39. The Chair of the Working Group, the Friends of the Chair and the coordinator had been heartened to note that there appeared to be fresh interest among delegations in exploring other potential avenues. The issues of concern revolved around draft article 3 [18], in particular a clear understanding of and compromise on the scope of the exception reflected as a “choice of law” clause. Throughout the informal consultations and discussions, positive ideas that could be the subject of further exploration had been presented; some guarded optimism was therefore justified. To move forward, Member States should continue to be willing to show flexibility and to demonstrate the necessary political will.

40. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Chair of the Working Group on measures to eliminate international terrorism.

41. *It was so decided.*

42. *Mr. Turbék (Hungary), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.*

Agenda item 80: Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm
(continued) (A/C.6/71/L.20)

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.20: Consideration of prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and allocation of loss in the case of such harm

43. **Ms. Benešová** (Czechia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that the text was based on General Assembly resolution 68/114, with a few technical updates, and had been prepared on the basis of the debate of the Sixth Committee at the current session. The preambular paragraphs contained technical updates to include references to the most recent reports of the Secretary-General. In paragraphs 1 and 2, the articles on prevention of transboundary harm from hazardous activities and the principles on the allocation of loss in the case of transboundary harm arising out of hazardous activities were commended to the attention of Governments, without prejudice to any future action. Under paragraph 5, the General Assembly would examine the item again during its seventy-fourth session. Since she believed that the draft resolution had gained sufficient support in the

Sixth Committee, she proposed that it should be adopted without a vote.

44. *Mr. Danon (Israel) resumed the Chair.*

Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Central American Bank for Economic Integration in the General Assembly (A/C.6/71/L.19)

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.19: Observer status for the Central American Bank for Economic Integration in the General Assembly

45. **Ms. Flores** (Honduras), introducing the draft resolution, said that the original sponsors had been joined by Belize, Colombia and Spain. As stipulated in its constitutive agreement and reflected in document [A/71/141/Rev.1](#), the Central American Bank for Economic Integration was an international juridical person and specialized institution whose purpose was to promote the economic integration and balanced economic and social development of Central America. The granting of observer status would strengthen the region's autonomy within the world economy, reaffirm the self-determination of the Central American region, as expressed through a common approach at the international level, and promote sustainable development by participating in multilateral alliances.

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the Conference of Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/71/L.5)

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.5: Observer status for the Conference of Ministers of Justice of the Ibero-American Countries in the General Assembly

46. *Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.5 was adopted.*

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Youth Organization for the Ibero-America in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/71/L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.6: Observer status for the International Youth Organization for Ibero-America in the General Assembly

47. *Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.6 was adopted.*

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Pacific Islands Development Forum in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/71/L.8)

Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.8: Observer status for the Pacific Islands Development Forum in the General Assembly

48. **Mr. Bai** (Fiji) said that Germany, Qatar, Tajikistan and Tonga had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.6/71/L.8 was adopted.*

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/71/L.4)

50. **The Chair** announced that he had received a communication from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations indicating that the sponsors of draft resolution [A/C.6/71/L.4](#) had decided not to pursue the request for observer status in the General Assembly for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties at the current session, while reserving the right to present it at a future session.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.