



# General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

## Official Records

Distr.: General  
20 April 2021

Original: English

---

### Sixth Committee

#### Summary record of the 19th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 19 November 2020, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Skoknic Tapia . . . . . (Chile)

### Contents

Agenda item 77: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission (*continued*)Agenda item 78: Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fifty-third session (*continued*)Agenda item 79: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law (*continued*)Agenda item 80: Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its seventy-second session (*continued*)Agenda item 81: Crimes against humanity (*continued*)Agenda item 82: Expulsion of aliens (*continued*)Agenda item 83: Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts (*continued*)Agenda item 84: Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives (*continued*)Agenda item 85: Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (*continued*)Agenda item 86: The rule of law at the national and international levels (*continued*)Agenda item 87: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction (*continued*)Agenda item 88: Responsibility of international organizations (*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 Management Section ([dms@un.org](mailto:dms@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/>).

Agenda item 89: Protection of persons in the event of disasters (*continued*)

Agenda item 90: Strengthening and promoting the international treaty framework (*continued*)

Agenda item 114: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (*continued*)

Agenda item 152: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 171: Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (*continued*)

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly

Agenda item 173: Observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly

Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly

Agenda item 175: Observer status for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands Secretariat in the General Assembly

Agenda item 176: Observer status for the Global Environment Facility in the General Assembly

Agenda item 177: Observer status for the International Organization of Employers in the General Assembly

Agenda item 178: Observer status for the International Trade Union Confederation in the General Assembly

Agenda item 179: Observer status for the Boao Forum for Asia in the General Assembly

Agenda item 180: Observer status for the Small Island Developing States Dock (SIDS DOCK) in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 181: Observer status for the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Institute in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 182: Observer status for the Asian Forest Cooperation Organization in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 183: Observer status for the Global Dryland Alliance in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 126: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Agenda item 142: Programme planning

Agenda item 5: Election of the officers of the Main Committees (*continued*)

*The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.*

**Agenda item 77: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission**  
(continued) (A/C.6/75/L.9)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.9: Criminal accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission*

1. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.9 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 78: Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fifty-third session** (continued)  
(A/C.6/75/L.17)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.17: Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fifty-third session*

2. **Ms. Katholnig** (Austria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Argentina, Cyprus, Latvia, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine. The text was based on General Assembly resolution 74/182, with updates from the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its fifty-third session. In paragraph 7, the Assembly would note with interest the decisions of the Commission regarding its planned work, and, in paragraphs 8 and 9, it would note new proposals that had been made by Member States at the fifty-third session on the Commission's future work in the aftermath of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. In paragraph 14, the Assembly would commend the Commission for the temporal adjustments made in its methods of work in the light of the pandemic and, in paragraph 28, would note that several tools that the Commission had developed could play an important role in assisting States in mitigating the effects of the measures required to control the pandemic, as well as in their economic recovery efforts.
3. **Mr. Llewellyn** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Ecuador, Iceland and Israel also wished to become sponsors.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.17 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 79: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law**  
(continued) (A/C.6/75/L.10)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.10: United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law*

5. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.10 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 80: Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its seventy-second session**  
(continued) (A/C.6/75/L.12)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.12: Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its seventy-second session*

6. **Mr. Cuellar Torres** (Colombia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that, given that the International Law Commission had been unable to meet in 2020 because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the General Assembly had decided, in accordance with decisions 74/559 and 74/566, to postpone the Commission's seventy-second session to 2021. There was therefore no report under the agenda item. The draft resolution reflected that situation. It was based on the previous year's resolution and contained only technical updates.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.12 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 81: Crimes against humanity**  
(continued) (A/C.6/75/L.20)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.20: Crimes against humanity*

8. **Mr. Mikeladze** (Georgia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that it was based on General Assembly resolution 74/187 and contained some technical updates: a fifth preambular paragraph had been added, in which the Assembly would recall resolution 74/187, and paragraph 3 had been updated to provide for the inclusion of the item entitled "Crimes against humanity" in the provisional agenda of the seventy-sixth session.

9. During four rounds of informal consultations on the draft resolution, the engagement by delegations had reflected their high level of interest. Despite the challenges faced with regard to the Committee's working methods in the current circumstances, the discussions had allowed delegations to explore ideas on the way forward and to better understand each other's perspectives. It had become apparent that there was a strong appetite for a more in-depth exchange on the

substance of the draft articles on prevention and punishment of crimes against humanity. His delegation hoped that the forthcoming intersessional period would be used to continue informal dialogue on the way forward with a view to building common ground.

10. **Mr. Arrocha Olabuenaga** (Mexico), speaking in explanation of position before the decision on behalf of Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Lebanon, Norway, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Switzerland, Sweden and his own country, said that it was unfortunate that, despite constructive attempts to make progress on the item, the final text of the draft resolution was what some considered to be a technical rollover. That description of the text was erroneous and misleading. The fact that no reference was made to the COVID-19 pandemic and the ways in which it had prevented deeper substantive negotiations, particularly when delegations had been ready to put forward proposals in that regard, gave the false impression that the Committee had fully discussed the recommendation of the International Law Commission for the second year running with no concrete result. Furthermore, the adoption of a second resolution with the same wording as the resolution adopted the previous year could undermine the relationship between the General Assembly and the Commission, because it would suggest that the Committee was becoming caught in a cycle of consideration and postponement of the draft articles on prevention and punishment of crimes against humanity, as had been the case with previous Commission outputs. For those reasons, the possibility of deferring the agenda item rather than adopting a technical rollover had been proposed.

11. His delegation hoped that the agenda item could be revisited with a constructive and flexible approach in order to break the inertia and establish a process for the consideration of the Commission's recommendation, on terms agreeable to all delegations. It was also to be hoped that the time that had been available for considering the draft articles since their adoption by the Commission, together with the period between the seventy-fifth and seventy-sixth sessions of the General Assembly, would prove to be enough for delegations to be ready to engage in meaningful discussions on the topic. The delegations on behalf of which he was speaking stood ready to engage with all Member States in an open and transparent manner in order to make progress on the agenda item and prove that the Committee could deliver results based on the high-quality products of the Commission.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.20 was adopted.*

## **Agenda item 82: Expulsion of aliens (continued)** (A/C.6/75/L.18)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.18: Expulsion of aliens*

13. **Ms. Cerrato** (Honduras), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that the text reflected that of General Assembly resolution 72/117, with some technical updates. In the fifth preambular paragraph, the Assembly would take note of the comments of Governments and the discussion in the Committee on expulsion of aliens at the sixty-ninth and seventy-second sessions of the General Assembly. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the Assembly would recall its resolutions 69/119 and 72/117. In paragraph 2, the phrase "takes note of the articles on the expulsion of aliens presented by the International Law Commission" had been deleted, and the Assembly would simply acknowledge the comments expressed by Governments in the Committee at the seventy-fifth session. In paragraph 3, the Assembly would decide to include the agenda item in the provisional agenda of its seventy-eighth session, with a view to examining, inter alia, the question of the form that might be given to the articles or any other appropriate action.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.18 was adopted.*

## **Agenda item 83: Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts** (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.11)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.11: Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts*

15. **Ms. Fielding** (Sweden), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Argentina, Brazil, Croatia, Ecuador, Hungary, Luxembourg, Montenegro, San Marino, Ukraine and Uruguay. After one round of informal consultations, delegations had agreed that a technical rollover would be the most appropriate way forward, taking into account the particular circumstances prevailing during the current session. The draft resolution was thus based on General Assembly resolution 73/204. The preambular paragraphs were largely unchanged, apart from the necessary technical updates; the update of the reference in the seventeenth preambular paragraph; and the deletion of what had been the eighteenth preambular paragraph. An outdated reference had been removed from paragraph 4; a reference in paragraph 8 had been updated; former paragraphs 9 and 12 had been deleted; and paragraphs 11, 13 and 14 had been updated to reflect the

fact that the item would be considered by the General Assembly at its seventy-seventh session.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.11 was adopted.*

17. **Ms. Ponce** (Philippines) said that her country dissociated itself from the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, which contained references to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. The Philippines had withdrawn from the Rome Statute effective 17 March 2019, in accordance with its principled stand against those who politicized human rights and disregarded its independent and well-functioning organs and agencies, which continued to exercise jurisdiction over charges arising from its efforts to protect its people. As in all democracies, the wheels of justice sometimes turned slowly, but they did turn. The rule of law could not and should not be compromised for immediate retribution.

18. Notwithstanding its withdrawal from the Rome Statute, the Philippines reaffirmed its commitment to the fight against impunity for atrocity crimes and had national legislation punishing such crimes. Many conveniently forgot that the Rome Statute was anchored on the principle of complementarity: States had the first responsibility and right to prosecute international crimes, and the Court could exercise jurisdiction only where national legal systems failed or were unable to do so. The Philippines was able and willing. The Court had never been conceived as a substitute for national courts, as some would like it to be.

**Agenda item 84: Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.16)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.16: Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives*

19. **Ms. Laukkanen** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Brazil, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Sweden and Uruguay. After two rounds of informal consultations, delegations had agreed that a technical rollover would be the most appropriate way forward. The draft resolution was thus largely based on General Assembly resolution 73/205 and provided for the extension of the relevant mandates regarding the reporting of serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations. In the

draft resolution, the Assembly would decide to include the current item in the provisional agenda of its seventy-seventh session.

20. During the informal consultations, several textual proposals had been made and briefly discussed, but it had not been possible to reach consensus on most of them because of the limitations on negotiations arising from the current exceptional circumstances. However, the draft resolution included a new fifteenth preambular paragraph, in which the General Assembly would recognize that measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, as well as close cooperation between States in that regard, were particularly important in the light of the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

21. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.16 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 85: Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.3)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.3: Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization*

22. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.3 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 86: The rule of law at the national and international levels (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.4)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.4: The rule of law at the national and international levels*

23. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.4 was adopted.*

24. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation wished to dissociate itself from the consensus on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, because it contained a reference to the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening and coordinating United Nations rule of law activities (A/75/284), paragraph 65 of which included a reference, under the heading "Other international accountability mechanisms", to the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011. His delegation had addressed letters to the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly noting the grave legal gaps that had characterized the process leading up to the establishment of the Mechanism. The Syrian Arab Republic looked after the



interests of its people and was therefore opposed to that type of process.

**Agenda item 87: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction** (*continued*)  
(A/C.6/75/L.13)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.13: The scope and application of the principle of universal jurisdiction*

25. **Mr. Korbich** (Ghana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau in the absence of the coordinator, said that the text was based on General Assembly resolution 74/192, with mostly technical updates. The second preambular paragraph had been updated to include a reference to resolution 74/192, and the third preambular paragraph had been updated to take into account the Committee's discussions on the agenda item at the current session. In paragraph 2, the Assembly would decide to establish a working group of the Committee to continue to undertake a thorough discussion of the scope and application of universal jurisdiction at the seventy-seventh session; in other words, the working group on the item would be established on a biennial basis. In paragraph 3, the Assembly would again invite Member States and relevant observers to submit information on the scope and application of universal jurisdiction and request the Secretary-General to prepare and submit a report to the Assembly at its seventy-sixth session. In paragraph 5, the Assembly would decide to include the item in the provisional agenda of its seventy-sixth session.

26. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.13 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 88: Responsibility of international organizations** (*continued*) (A/C.6/75/L.19)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.19: Responsibility of international organizations*

27. **Ms. de Souza Schmitz** (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that, during the plenary debate, some delegations had expressed support for considering the negotiation of an international convention on the basis of the articles on the responsibility of international organizations elaborated by the International Law Commission, while others had expressed reservations. Some delegations had also suggested that the cycle of consideration of the current agenda item be aligned with that of the agenda item "Responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts", because of the relationship between the two topics. Other delegations had highlighted the fact that there were differences between the articles on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts and the articles on responsibility of international

organizations, including with regard to the amount of State practice available and whether the texts constituted codification or progressive development of international law.

28. The draft resolution was a technical rollover of General Assembly resolution 72/122. Given the limitations imposed on meetings within the United Nations premises at the current session in order to contain the spread of COVID-19, only one round of virtual informal consultations had been held to discuss the text. The first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution had been updated to include a reference to resolution 72/122, in which the Assembly had commended the articles to the attention of Governments and international organizations. The fifth preambular paragraph, in which the Assembly would take note of the comments of Governments and international organizations, had also been updated. In paragraph 1, the Assembly would take note once again of the articles on the responsibility of international organizations and commend them to the attention of Governments and international organizations without prejudice to the question of their future adoption or other appropriate action. In paragraph 2, the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to update the compilation of decisions of international courts, tribunals and other bodies referring to the articles and to invite Governments and international organizations to submit information on their practice in that regard, as well as written comments on any future action regarding the articles, and also request the Secretary-General to submit that material well in advance of its seventy-eighth session. In paragraph 3, the Assembly would decide to include the item in the provisional agenda of its seventy-eighth session with a view to examining, *inter alia*, the question of the form that might be given to the articles.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.19 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 89: Protection of persons in the event of disasters** (*continued*)

30. **Mr. Taufan** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Bureau, said that a zero draft of the draft resolution on the agenda item, based on General Assembly resolution 73/209 and containing technical updates, had been circulated for consideration by delegations and had subsequently been discussed in virtual informal consultations. During the consultations, a proposal had been made by the delegation of Colombia, also on behalf of Italy, Jamaica, Japan and Nigeria, to defer the consideration of the agenda item to the seventy-sixth session of the Assembly. No objections had been made to that proposal. He therefore wished to recommend that

consideration of the agenda item be deferred to the seventy-sixth session. He encouraged interested delegations to continue consultations so that the Committee would be in a position to adopt a draft resolution on the item at the seventy-sixth session.

31. **The Chair** said he took it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer consideration of the agenda item to its seventy-sixth session.

32. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 90: Strengthening and promoting the international treaty framework** (*continued*)  
(A/C.6/75/L.15)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.15: Strengthening and promoting the international treaty framework*

33. **Mr. Khng** (Singapore), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that the text was based on General Assembly resolution 73/210. Key paragraphs from that resolution had been retained, including paragraph 1, in which the Assembly would recall Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, reaffirm the importance of the registration and publication of treaties, as well as their accessibility, and stress that the regulations to give effect to Article 102 should be useful and relevant to Member States and should be kept updated.

34. Aside from the necessary technical updates, a number of substantive changes had been made. In the second preambular paragraph, the Assembly would recall its resolutions 71/328 and 73/346, which reaffirmed that multilingualism was a core value of the United Nations, and request the Secretary-General to continue to make efforts to ensure that multilingualism was not undermined by the measures taken in response to the liquidity situation and the COVID-19 pandemic. In paragraph 5, the Assembly would encourage the Treaty Section of the Office of Legal Affairs to continue to organize workshops on treaty law and practice as regularly as possible, including through the use of information and communications technology when necessary owing to extraordinary circumstances, and invite States and interested international organizations and institutions to continue to support that activity.

35. In paragraph 8, the Assembly would note that most submissions of treaties for registration were in electronic format, and in that connection would encourage the Secretary-General to develop, in consultation with and on the basis of feedback from Member States and within existing resources, an online treaty registration system to facilitate submissions of

treaties for registration, as an additional option to the existing ways of submission in electronic or hard-copy format. Lastly, while the Assembly would note that some Member States continued to consider that there remained outstanding issues where the regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter might need further consideration or possible updating, it would decide to defer consideration of proposals on the regulations to the seventy-sixth session, taking into account the limitations on meetings within the United Nations premises at the current session aimed at containing the spread of COVID-19. In that connection, the Assembly would also take note of proposals made by Member States on the regulations, encourage Member States to submit to the Secretariat any additional proposals before 30 June 2021, and request the Secretariat to transmit all the proposals it had received to Member States.

36. **Mr. García López** (Spain), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that the draft resolution contained some forward-looking innovations that would undoubtedly constitute a functional step forward in streamlining and improving the means by which the Secretariat carried out its mandated activities. A prime example was the process introduced to study the possible establishment of an electronic and online procedure for the submission of treaties for registration and publication.

37. During the plenary debate, his delegation had submitted a functional proposal to provide the Secretariat with an additional tool to help reduce the time and costs involved in registering and publishing treaties. The proposal had been to allow the possibility of using courtesy translations of treaties into any of the six official languages, in order to expedite and facilitate the translation into English and French of treaties drafted in non-official languages of the Organization. That proposal had, however, been left out of the draft resolution owing to a lack of consensus, even though it had enjoyed support from various delegations representing various regions of the world. The apparent reason for the lack of consensus had been to allow for the consideration of another type of proposal, which had been deemed more appropriate. That proposal had been to allocate more budgetary resources to the treaty registration and publication activities of the Secretariat.

38. Out of deep respect for the value of consensus as the method used for the adoption of decisions in the Committee, his delegation wished to emphasize that opposition to or disagreement with proposals of a functional nature, which sought to improve the functioning of the Organization, such as the proposal submitted by Spain, should be based on more than a

preference for an option that constituted a budgetary increase in the resources allocated to any activity of the Secretariat.

39. His delegation believed that any proposal that offered additional tools to enable the Secretariat to improve its functioning and to comply with its various mandates under the Charter of the United Nations could not be considered incompatible or irreconcilable with an increase in the budgetary resources made available to the Secretariat. The two types of initiatives could and indeed must co-exist. The tasks of formulating proposals that improved the functioning of the Organization and, where appropriate, opting to allocate more resources to certain activities of the Secretariat, must be go hand in hand, and must not hinder the achievement of a consensus.

40. Spain would continue to formulate proposals that allowed the Organization to leverage its strengths, including multilingualism, in order to improve its functioning. In that functional spirit, Spain gladly joined the consensus on the adoption of the draft resolution and hoped that its content would ultimately serve to enhance the fulfilment and effectiveness of the mandate under Article 102 of the Charter.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.15 was adopted.*

42. **Mr. Elgharib** (Egypt) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution despite the unfortunate lack of flexibility displayed by some delegations during the informal consultations. During those consultations, Egypt had proposed to introduce a succinct paragraph that would merely emphasize the importance of registering treaties in accordance with the regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter. The proposal was aimed primarily at filling a gap in the draft resolution that had been apparent to his delegation and to reiterate the importance of abiding by the regulations. Although the overwhelming majority of delegations had not objected to the proposal, and some had even expressed support for it, a few delegations had adopted an unjustifiable and uncompromising approach by rejecting the proposal without presenting any objective arguments or even attempting to work constructively on the text. Instead, they had falsely characterized the purpose of the proposal in a manner that was not even supported by the text.

43. While the reasons for such a subjective approach were self-evident, it remained unfortunate that it had come at the expense of a proposal which had simply been aimed at ensuring the rule of law, which was the *raison d'être* of the Sixth Committee.

44. **Ms. Ozgul Bilman** (Turkey) said that her delegation had supported the draft resolution because it reflected the fundamental aspects of the topic in a constructive, balanced, clear and sufficient manner. It was surprising, however, that the proponent delegation of one proposal had chosen to adopt an accusatory stance in response to legitimate questions and concerns raised by some delegations at various stages of consultations on the draft resolution. It was also disappointing that the proponent delegation had not made any effort to engage with some delegations, as would be expected of any sincere proponent delegation.

45. Turkey believed that matters before the Committee should be approached from an objective and non-political perspective, and had made its own proposal on the draft resolution precisely from that perspective. However, the accusatory statements it had heard during the consultations and again at the current meeting made it wonder whether all delegations were adopting that same approach when introducing or considering proposals.

#### **Agenda item 114: Measures to eliminate international terrorism (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.14)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.14: Measures to eliminate international terrorism*

46. **Ms. Maille** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Bureau, said that the text was essentially a technical update to General Assembly resolution 74/194. In the twentieth preambular paragraph, the Assembly would recall the United Nations High-level Conference of Heads of Counter-Terrorism Agencies of Member States, held in New York on 28 and 29 June 2018, the organization by the Office of Counter-Terrorism of regional high-level conferences in follow-up to that conference, and the Virtual Counter-Terrorism Week, held from 6 to 10 July 2020.

47. The twenty-first preambular paragraph had been added to recall the Assembly's decision 74/556, in which it had decided to postpone to its seventy-fifth session the seventh biennial review of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, having taken into account the unprecedented challenges posed by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, noting the intention of the Secretary-General to organize regional high-level conferences and to convene in 2021 a second Counter-Terrorism Week in New York, including a second United Nations High level Conference of Heads of Counter-Terrorism Agencies of Member States, and encouraging the Secretary-General to consult Member States in that regard.



48. Paragraph 23 had been updated for the Assembly to note the issuance by the Secretariat of the fourth edition of the compendium of international instruments related to the prevention and suppression of international terrorism in Chinese, English, French and Russian and its continuing efforts to issue the publication in all the official languages of the United Nations. In paragraphs 25 and 26, the Assembly would recommend that the Committee establish a working group at its seventy-sixth session, and would encourage Member States to redouble their efforts during the intersessional period to resolve any outstanding issues.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.14 was adopted.*

#### **Agenda item 152: Administration of justice at the United Nations (continued)**

50. **The Chair** said that the Committee had considered the item at its 6th meeting, held on 15 October 2020, as well as during several informal consultations, which had included a short briefing from the Executive Director of the Office of Administration of Justice and a representative of the Internal Justice Council and a question-and-answer segment with a representative of the Office of the United Nations Ombudsman and Mediation Services, representatives of the Office of Legal Affairs, and representatives of other units of the Secretariat.

51. A draft letter from the Chair of the Sixth Committee to the President of the General Assembly had been negotiated during the informal consultations. The draft letter drew attention to issues relating to the legal aspects of the reports discussed and contained a request that it be brought to the attention of the Chair of the Fifth Committee and circulated as a document of the General Assembly. He took it that the Committee wished to authorize him to sign and forward the draft letter to the President of the General Assembly.

52. *It was so decided.*

#### **Agenda item 171: Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.2)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.2: Report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country*

53. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.2 was adopted.*

#### **Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly**

54. **The Chair** recalled that, at its sixty-sixth to seventy-fourth sessions, the General Assembly had

decided to defer to the subsequent session a decision on the request for observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly (General Assembly decisions 66/527, 67/525, 68/528, 69/527, 70/523, 71/524, 72/523, 73/534 and 74/523). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request.

55. *It was so decided.*

#### **Agenda item 173: Observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly**

56. **The Chair** recalled that, at its seventieth to seventy-fourth sessions, the General Assembly had decided to defer to the subsequent session a decision on the request for observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly (General Assembly decisions 70/524, 71/525, 72/524, 73/535 and 74/524). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request.

57. *It was so decided.*

#### **Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly**

58. **The Chair** recalled that, at its seventieth to seventy-fourth sessions, the General Assembly had decided to defer to the subsequent session a decision on the request for observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly (General Assembly decisions 70/525, 71/526, 72/525, 73/536 and 74/525). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request.

59. *It was so decided.*

#### **Agenda item 175: Observer status for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands Secretariat in the General Assembly**

60. **The Chair** recalled that, at its seventy-second, seventy-third and seventy-fourth sessions, the General Assembly had decided to defer to the subsequent session a decision on the request for observer status for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands Secretariat in the General Assembly (General Assembly decisions 72/526, 73/537 and 74/526). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the

General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision.

61. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 176: Observer status for the Global Environment Facility in the General Assembly**

62. **The Chair** recalled that, at its seventy-second, seventy-third and seventy-fourth sessions, the General Assembly had decided to defer to the subsequent session a decision on the request for observer status for the Global Environment Facility in the General Assembly (General Assembly decisions 72/527, 73/538 and 74/527). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request.

63. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 177: Observer status for the International Organization of Employers in the General Assembly**

64. **The Chair** recalled that at its seventy-fourth session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status for the International Organization of Employers in the General Assembly (General Assembly decision 74/528).

65. **Ms. Heusgen** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the sponsors (France, Turkey and her own country), said that the International Organization of Employers, whose expertise was recognized by all, would bring significant added value to the work of the General Assembly. It would ensure that the views of employers and the private sector were taken into account, especially during discussions on topics such as migration and the role of young people in society. The International Organization of Employers was one of the largest private sector networks in the world, representing 50 million businesses in 150 countries. For almost 100 years, it had been representing businesses in social and employment policy debates at the national and international levels and in the Group of Twenty and other emerging forums.

66. The International Organization of Employers was already strongly engaged in supporting the aims of the United Nations. It was one of the three constituents of the International Labour Organization, one of the oldest specialized agencies of the United Nations aimed at promoting full and productive employment and decent work for all as well as the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 8. As the COVID-19 pandemic had hampered discussions and negotiations during the current session, it would be appropriate to resume debate on the request for observer status for

International Organization of Employers at the seventy-sixth session.

67. **The Chair** said if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request for observer status for the International Organization of Employers.

68. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 178: Observer status for the International Trade Union Confederation in the General Assembly**

69. **The Chair** recalled that at its seventy-fourth session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status for the International Trade Union Confederation (General Assembly decision 74/529).

70. **Ms. Dime Labille** (France), speaking on behalf of the sponsors (Germany, Turkey and her own country), said that the International Trade Union Confederation's expertise in the world of work was well known and would bring significant added value to the work of the General Assembly. As an observer, the Confederation would help to mainstream the objectives of sustainable economic growth, solidarity, full employment and decent work throughout the work of the Assembly. It would also ensure that workers' voices were taken more fully into account in matters of fundamental importance.

71. The Confederation was fully committed to the objectives of the United Nations. In particular, it was actively involved in the implementation, promotion and monitoring of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, having made a significant contribution to its elaboration. Moreover, at a time when the United Nations was seeking to expand its partnerships, the Confederation, which was composed of five regional organizations based in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Arab world, was in a position to facilitate dialogue with trade unions at the national, regional and international levels.

72. Given the challenges faced with regard to the Committee's working methods in the current circumstances created by the unprecedented global pandemic, which had made it difficult to pursue negotiations in an effort to find a consensus within the Committee at the current session, it would be appropriate to resume debate on the request for observer status for International Trade Union Confederation at the seventy-sixth session.

73. **The Chair** said if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the

General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request for observer status for the International Trade Union Confederation.

74. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 179: Observer status for the Boao Forum for Asia in the General Assembly**

75. **The Chair** recalled that at its seventy-fourth session, the General Assembly had decided to defer a decision on the request for observer status for the Boao Forum for Asia (General Assembly decision 74/530). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly defer to the seventy-sixth session a decision on the request for observer status for the Boao Forum for Asia.

76. *It was so decided.*

**Agenda item 180: Observer status for the Small Island Developing States Dock (SIDS DOCK) in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.5)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.5: Observer status for the Small Island Developing States Dock (SIDS DOCK) in the General Assembly*

77. **Ms. Ruiz** (Belize), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that they had been joined by Austria, Canada, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Singapore, Spain, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates. As an observer, SIDS DOCK, the only international platform led by small island developing States that addressed energy security in the context of climate change and resilience-building, would help to enhance the work of small island developing States and generate greater support for issues that were crucial to such States.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.5 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 181: Observer status for the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Institute in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.6)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.6: Observer status for the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Institute in the General Assembly*

79. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.6 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 182: Observer status for the Asian Forest Cooperation Organization in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.7)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.7: Observer status for the Asian Forest Cooperation Organization in the General Assembly*

80. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.7 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 183: Observer status for the Global Dryland Alliance in the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.6/75/L.8)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.8: Observer status for the Global Dryland Alliance in the General Assembly*

81. **Ms. Al-Thani** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that they had been joined by Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Iraq, Kiribati, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Palau, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Togo and Uganda.

82. *Draft resolution A/C.6/75/L.8 was adopted.*

**Agenda item 126: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.6/75/L.21)**

*Draft decision A/C.6/75/L.21: Provisional programme of work of the Sixth Committee for the seventy-sixth session*

83. **The Chair** said that the Bureau had prepared a draft provisional programme of work for the Committee for the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly, which had been issued as draft decision A/C.6/75/L.21. It would be adopted on the understanding that the programme would be applied flexibly as required by the circumstances. It had been prepared on the assumption that the meetings of the seventy-sixth session would take place under more normal circumstances than those of the current session.

84. **Mr. Scott-Kemmis** (Australia) said that the current session had demonstrated the efficiency and effectiveness of setting time limits for statements by delegations, which had enhanced the predictability of statement delivery and left more time for informal consultations. In the future, for the consideration of the agenda item on the report of the International Law Commission, 8 minutes could be allotted for national statements and 14 minutes for group statements. Allowing longer written statements to be submitted for uploading would permit delegations to put a complete and comprehensive recitation of their positions on the record.

85. It was critical that statements submitted by delegations at both the current and previous sessions be made available electronically and on an ongoing basis to all delegations. That practice was important for a number of reasons. First, it would allow delegations to better understand their respective positions and achieve common ground. Secondly, statements delivered in the Sixth Committee were of particular value in international law, especially with regard to State practice. Thirdly, it was crucial for the International Law Commission to have access to written statements concerning its work, since it often cited those statements in its reports and other outputs.

86. His delegation commended the Secretariat for including links to statements submitted by delegations in the “Summaries of meeting” section of the Committee’s website at the current session. It urged the Secretariat to continue to implement and refine that practice, in dialogue with States, and to upload the material posted on the PaperSmart portal to the Committee’s websites for previous sessions, mirroring the format it employed for the current session. The work of the Committee would benefit in future from enhanced rotations among coordinators of draft resolutions, with coordinators being rotated at regular intervals, say every three to four years, mirroring the posting of delegates in New York. Such rotation would allow for an even sharing of the workload within the Committee and for the sharing of different perspectives.

87. **Mr. Arrocha Olabuenaga** (Mexico) said that given the unique difficulties encountered during the current session, with the PaperSmart portal not being available, it was difficult to find a place to store written statements submitted by delegations, which were not only useful for the reflection of State practice, but also for the reflection of *opinio juris*. At a session like the current one, where many delegations had to shorten their oral statements because of time, it was even more critical that there be full access to their written statements. Since PaperSmart no longer existed, his delegation would second the proposal that a solution be found to allow States and organizations such as the International Law Commission and the International Court of Justice to access the statements directly and officially.

88. The challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic had showed the need to modify the working methods of the United Nations, in order to ensure that the Organization was able to handle any special circumstances emerging in the twenty-first century. Delegations had encountered untold difficulties working virtually during the current session, and some had been reluctant to participate in substantive consultations

online. It was therefore appropriate for the Committee to start reflecting on how to improve its working methods, including how to adjust the rules of the General Assembly, in order to ensure that the Organization had the tools to operate effectively and efficiently, whatever circumstances it faced.

89. **Ms. Guardia González** (Cuba) said that the written statements of delegations should be made available on a portal similar to PaperSmart. It was her delegation’s understanding that the online working method and time limitations on statement delivery at the current session owing to the pandemic would not set a precedent, and that any such changes in the future would be discussed and a consensus reached before they could be implemented.

90. **Ms. Maille** (Canada) said that the time limitations on statements delivered at the current session had allowed delegations to focus on the most essential points during their oral presentation. However, making the full written statements available would allow delegations to put their full position on display. It was also important for the Committee to reflect on the rules going forward, in order to adapt to the challenges of the twenty-first century.

91. *Draft decision A/C.6/75/L.21 was adopted.*

#### **Agenda item 142: Programme planning**

92. **The Chair** explained that the agenda item had been allocated to all Committees on an annual basis since the sixty-first session of the General Assembly. However, no reports under that item had been allocated to the Sixth Committee at the current session.

#### **Agenda item 5: Election of the officers of the Main Committees (continued)**

93. **The Chair** said that, in accordance with rule 99 (a) of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and rule 103, as amended by General Assembly resolution 58/126, all the Main Committees should, at least three months before the opening of the session, elect a Chair and a full Bureau. Based on the interim arrangement concerning the rotation of Chairs of the Main Committees of the General Assembly, contained in General Assembly resolution 72/313, it was his understanding that the Chair of the Sixth Committee for the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly would be selected by the Asia-Pacific States. He therefore suggested that the regional groups hold consultations at an appropriate time to enable the Committee to elect its next Chair, three Vice-Chairs and Rapporteur in June 2021.

**Completion of the Committee's work**

94. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared that the Sixth Committee had completed its work for the seventy-fifth session.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*