



# General Assembly

Seventieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
9 November 2015

Original: English

---

## Sixth Committee

### Summary record of the 11th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 19 October 2015, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Charles . . . . . (Trinidad and Tobago)

## Contents

Agenda item 168: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 169: Observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly

Agenda item 170: Observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly

Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Civil Defence Organization in the General Assembly

Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Indian Ocean Rim Association in the General Assembly

Agenda item 173: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly

Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Union for the Mediterranean 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](mailto: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/>).

15-18049 (E)



Please recycle The recycling symbol, consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



*The meeting was called to order at 3.00 p.m.*

**Agenda item 168: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly** (*continued*) (A/66/141; A/C.6/70/L.4)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.4: Observer status for the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States in the General Assembly*

1. **Ms. Zeytinoğlu Özkan** (Turkey) said that, in an age of globalization, solidarity and cooperation were essential. The Cooperation Council provided an effective means of promoting regional bilateral cooperation in many areas of common interest to its members, including transport, science, education, energy, communications, the media and economic development. In so doing, it enhanced stability and prosperity and strengthened peace and mutual trust in the region. The Council did not limit its concerns to its member States but stood ready to cooperate with other neighbouring States. Its activities were in line with the aims and purposes set out in the Charter of the United Nations and it was seeking to expand them, in accordance with its mandate, by developing partnerships with United Nations bodies. In the past year, during the Turkish co-chairmanship of the Council, the Secretary-General of the Council had visited New York and presented its activities to the Member States of the Organization; consultations and discussions had continued with a view to arriving at a consensus on the request for observer status. She expressed the hope that such a consensus would be achieved during the current session.

2. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan) said that the Cooperation Council was an intergovernmental organization that served as a platform for fostering cooperation in the Eurasian continent. Its objectives, as enshrined in its statutory documents, were consistent with those of the United Nations. It had already launched a number of important regional initiatives for cooperation in the areas of education, information and communication technology and transport and had the potential to further cooperation on many aspects of socioeconomic advancement, in keeping with United Nations priorities. Cooperation with the United Nations would be mutually beneficial to both institutions. Moreover, the request for observer status showed the Council's commitment to working with the Organization in pursuit of the Sustainable

Development Goals. She urged Member States to support and adopt by consensus the draft resolution.

3. **Mr. Niyazaliev** (Kyrgyzstan) said that the Cooperation Council fully met the two criteria for the granting of observer status set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. He recalled that, in 2012, when Kyrgyzstan, as Chair of the Council, had submitted the same draft resolution, it had been decided to defer a decision on the request in view of questions raised. Full information had now been provided on the growing activities of the Council, which currently included cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Tourism Organization, among others. Given the increasing role of intergovernmental organizations in the implementation of the post-2015 agenda, the Cooperation Council could be expected to make a significant contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able this time to support the request by consensus.

4. **Ms. Krasa** (Cyprus) said that, while the Cooperation Council of the Turkic-Speaking States included in its sphere of activity a number of international issues of interest to the General Assembly, her delegation continued to have concerns about its pronouncements on one specific issue, namely, Cyprus. The summit declaration it had adopted at Astana in 2015, like all its previous yearly summit declarations, contained problematic references to "two peoples", notwithstanding the existence of only one people in Cyprus, the Cypriot people, composed of two communities, the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot communities. Moreover, Security Council resolutions 716 (1991) and 774 (1992) referred to two politically equal communities not to "two politically equal peoples" and offered a framework for the solution to the Cyprus problem in the form of a bizonal, bicomunal federation, as agreed by the two communities and endorsed most recently by the Security Council in its resolution 2114 (2013). An organization that was seeking observer status in the General Assembly should operate in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations organs, which it should uphold in its declarations. Her delegation stood ready to continue to engage with the sponsors of the draft resolution in the hope of allaying that specific concern and achieving a positive outcome on the item in the future.

5. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia) said that the concerns repeatedly expressed by a number of delegations, including his own, since the Cooperation Council had first submitted its request for observer status had still not been satisfactorily addressed. While there had been exchanges of views with the sponsoring delegations, there had been no sustained progress in that regard. The Council's activities continued to fall short of the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. His delegation continued to have serious concerns about the Council's operations, which extended 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 and the statements of some of its members and senior officials did not properly reflect the principles of international law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, such as respect for equality, the right to self-determination and sovereignty. Yet again, his delegation could not support the request and, in the absence of a consensus, recommended that the sponsors should consider withdrawing it.

**Agenda item 169: Observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly (A/70/141; A/C.6/70/L.2)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.2: Observer status for the Eurasian Economic Union in the General Assembly*

6. **Mr. Dapkunas** (Belarus), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/70/L.2](#) on behalf of Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian Federation and his own country, drew the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/70/141](#). The Treaty on the Eurasian Economic Union had been signed in May 2014 by the Presidents of Belarus, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation and had entered into force on 1 January 2015. Its current membership consisted of those three countries with the addition of Armenia and Kyrgyzstan. The establishment of the Union had marked the transition to the next stage of economic integration among its member States, following the formation of a customs union and a single economic space.

7. The Union was an international organization for regional economic integration possessing international legal personality. The Treaty establishing it confirmed the commitment of its member States to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including the sovereign rights and territorial integrity

of States, and to other universally recognized principles and norms of international law. The Union was open to accession by any State that shared its purposes and principles, under conditions agreed upon by its member States. Furthermore, any interested State could be granted observer status in the Union. The main organs of the Union were: the Supreme Eurasian Economic Council, the Eurasian Intergovernmental Council, the Eurasian Economic Commission and the Court of the Union. In addition to the Treaty, the body of laws of the Union included international treaties within the Union, international treaties between the Union and third parties and decisions adopted by its organs.

8. The member States of the Union were seeking to strengthen their economies, achieve harmonious development and ensure the sustainable growth of trade activities on the basis of fair competition. The aims of the Union were accordingly to create the conditions for stable economic development in the member States in order to raise the standard of living; establish a single market for goods, services, capital and labour within the Union; and further modernize and coordinate their national economies and increase their competitiveness in the global economy. The purposes and principles of the Union were consistent with the key issues addressed by the General Assembly in respect of sustainable development, international trade and the environment and therefore fulfilled the requirement set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. The granting of observer status to the Union would enable it to cooperate more effectively with the United Nations, in the interests of both institutions and of their member States. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to support and adopt by consensus the draft resolution.

9. **Mr. Aldahhak** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

10. **Ms. Kanchaveli** (Georgia) said that her delegation remained concerned that a founding member of the Eurasian Economic Union, the Russian Federation, continued to flout its international obligations by occupying and annexing the territories of its neighbour States. As a permanent member of the Security Council, the Russian Federation should be a custodian of peace and security; however, as an aggressor and occupying Power, it remained in blatant violation of the fundamental principles enshrined in the

Charter. Georgia called on Member States, particularly those that were also members of the Eurasian Economic Union, to do their utmost to ensure that the Russian Federation did not use the Organization for purposes contrary to the principles and norms of the Charter, particularly the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. In the event of a consensus decision to grant observer status to the Eurasian Economic Union, Georgia would disassociate itself from such a decision.

11. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan) said that, while the Eurasian Economic Union was indeed an intergovernmental organization, its activities and impact appeared limited. Further information was therefore needed to ascertain that its activities covered issues of interest to the General Assembly. Furthermore, her delegation firmly believed that member States of an intergovernmental organization seeking observer status must comply with the purposes and principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations, with particular regard to respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Armenia, a member of the Eurasian Economic Union, continued illegally to occupy territory belonging to Azerbaijan in contravention of the Charter and relevant Security Council resolutions. Her delegation therefore had serious reservations about the request.

12. **Ms. Zeytinoglu Özkan** (Turkey) said that her delegation, having carefully considered the request and the various statements on the subject, wished to stress the importance of achieving a consensus in that regard through a constructive approach that would reflect the consensual nature of the work of the Committee.

13. **Mr. Zagaynov** (Russian Federation) said that the discussion on the draft resolution had been coloured by political considerations that his delegation did not consider relevant. He expressed the hope that the request would have nevertheless a favourable outcome.

14. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia) said that, through regional economic integration and coordinated policies, member States could achieve economic and social progress and sustainable development. The aims of the Eurasian Economic Union as set out in its founding document and in the explanatory memorandum were thus clearly consistent with the purposes of the United Nations in the area of economic and social cooperation. Through allegations against his country that were false and devoid of legal merit, the

delegation of Azerbaijan was seeking to side-track the discussion. Any attempt to politicize the deliberations of the Committee should be condemned.

15. **Mr. Abdrakhmanov** (Kazakhstan) said that recent decisions by the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the Eurasian Economic Union clearly demonstrated their commitment to the aims and purposes of the United Nations. The members of the Union were studying the experience of similar organizations in other parts of the world, including Africa. The Union's active cooperation with the Economic Community of West African States and other regional structures was helping it to understand, through the sharing of practices and knowledge, that economic integration was a sound basis for development.

16. Kazakhstan and its brother country Kyrgyzstan were both members of the two organizations — the Cooperation Council of Turkic-speaking States and the Eurasian Economic Union — whose requests for observer status in the General Assembly were the subject of reservations on the part of some delegations. They, together with the other co-founders, believed it possible to avoid turning the Committee into a politicized forum and were ready to discuss informally issues of mutual concern in a constructive and open manner; they hoped that the objecting delegations would be able to do likewise.

17. **Mr. Niyazaliev** (Kyrgyzstan) stressed that the Eurasian Economic Union was primarily an economic organization. It possessed legal personality. The Treaty establishing it explicitly referred to the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; any State sharing those principles and purposes could join its membership. Its activities covered issues of interest to the General Assembly, in particular sustainable development and the environment. Regional organizations could play a major role in implementing the Sustainable Development Goals and, as such, could usefully be strengthened. He therefore hoped that the Committee would support the Union's request for observer status.

18. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan) wished to remind the representative of Armenia that Armenia's occupation of territory belonging to Azerbaijan was illegal and had been condemned by the Security Council in its resolutions 822 (1993), 853 (1993), 874 (1993) and 884 (1993). The Security Council had

called for the complete withdrawal of all occupying forces from the territory in 1993 but no action had yet been taken to that effect. Those were the facts; no amount of finger-pointing would change them.

19. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was well documented by the international community that Azerbaijan had started the war against Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. Azerbaijan continued not to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions and threatened to use force against Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. What the delegation of Azerbaijan referred to as an occupied territory was the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh whose peaceful demand for self-determination Azerbaijan had responded to with war and mass atrocities and whose courageous people had risen up, fought against aggression and created a free and democratic State.

20. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that certain delegations, especially that of Armenia, continued to cling to a distorted view of reality. The Security Council resolutions in question recognized Nagorno-Karabakh to be an integral part of Azerbaijan. How could one speak about Nagorno-Karabakh without mentioning the other seven districts of Azerbaijan? She wondered how often a country could exercise its right to self-determination. Armenia had already exercised that right.

**Agenda item 170: Observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly (A/70/142; A/C.6/70/L.7)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.7: Observer status for the Community of Democracies in the General Assembly*

21. **Mr. Zamora Rivas** (El Salvador), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/70/L.7](#) on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Canada, Estonia, Finland, Hungary and Norway and that further sponsors were expected in the coming days. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/70/142](#). The Community of Democracies had been founded 15 years earlier at its first biennial Ministerial Conference, at which 106 States Members of the United Nations had signed its founding document, known as the Warsaw Declaration and entitled "Towards a Community of Democracies". The

signatories had thereby pledged to uphold democratic principles and had expressed their common adherence to the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the period between the successive Ministerial Conferences, the work of the Community was conducted by a Governing Council, currently composed of 28 States, each represented by the Minister for Foreign Affairs or a senior official. The Governing Council was assisted by a Permanent Secretariat based in Warsaw under a host country agreement which recognized the status of the Community as an international organization. He expressed the hope that the Committee would give its support to the request and allow the Community of Democracies to join the United Nations family as an observer in the General Assembly.

22. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba), said that the criteria for granting observer status were clearly laid down in General Assembly decision 49/426. Such status should be granted only to intergovernmental organizations whose activities covered matters of interest to the General Assembly. In the absence of the founding document of the Community of Democracies, it was not possible to determine or confirm its intergovernmental character. That document needed therefore to be produced before the Committee.

23. Her delegation also wondered whether an organization could be truly intergovernmental when, by its own account, its membership included the private sector, civil society and youth organizations. It was generally agreed in the Committee that all supporting documents were required for such requests. Moreover, the contribution of the Community of Democracies to matters of interest to the General Assembly seemed doubtful in view of its many politically motivated actions against sovereign States Members of the United Nations. Observer status should not be granted to an organization that sought to impose models of democracy in violation of international law and United Nations norms. The draft resolution should therefore be withdrawn.

24. Ms. Argüello González (Nicaragua), Mr. Arancibia Fernández (Plurinational State of Bolivia), Mr. Medina Mejías (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), Mr. Fornell (Ecuador) and Mr. Spresov (Belarus) agreed that the requirements for observer status set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 must be met and that it was impossible to determine whether the Community of Democracies was an

intergovernmental organization without an opportunity to examine its founding document.

25. **Ms. Badea** (Romania) recalled that the granting of observer status in the General Assembly was governed solely by the relevant practice and decisions of that organ. The request for observer status for the Community of Democracies was in line with previous General Assembly practice and with its decision 49/426. The Community's objectives were consistent with those of the United Nations, as required by that decision: they rested on the central pillars of its mandate, namely, peace and security, the promotion of human rights and development. The existing cooperation between the two organizations was reflected in a variety of initiatives and projects. The granting of such status to the Community of Democracies would accordingly be a natural next step in the relationship between the United Nations and the Community and would foster a mutually beneficial dialogue between the two institutions. She again referred the Committee to the explanatory memorandum annexed to document [A/70/142](#), which clearly showed the intergovernmental nature and functioning of the Community and its commitment to 19 core democratic principles and practices. Participating States ensured wider support for the Community's activities through working groups and assigned to it specific tasks, together with a structure enabling it to carry them out.

26. She recalled the reasoning of the International Court of Justice in its 1949 advisory opinion on *Reparation for injuries suffered in the service of the United Nations* that, when nature and status were to be assessed, the needs of the community and the requirements of international life should be borne in mind. She further recalled that the practice of the General Assembly in granting observer status to the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe and to the Developing Eight Countries for Economic Cooperation, for example, reflected a recognition that, in an increasingly fluid and interconnected world, intergovernmental cooperation was assuming less institutionalized and more flexible organized forms. It would accordingly be in line with that practice to grant such status to the Community of Democracies.

27. **Mr. Kravik** (Norway) said that the Community of Democracies promoted human rights, development and security by assisting States in developing and strengthening their democratic institutions and values;

helping States to identify and respond to threats to democracy; and supporting civil societies, thereby giving voice to those working peacefully for democracy. It had long been recognized by the United Nations that democracy and respect for human rights were preconditions for securing peace and stability. Both the United Nations and the Community of Democracies advocated a holistic concept of democracy not confined to any single model. The Community recognized that democracy meant different things to different people and sought to assist States in developing their own democratic model based on inclusive, transparent institutions guided by respect for human rights and the rule of law.

28. It was indisputable that the Community met the two criteria for the granting of observer status: it dealt with matters of interest to the General Assembly and it was an organization of an intergovernmental nature. His delegation therefore recommended that the Committee should approve the request.

29. **Ms. Nilsson** (Sweden) said that the Community of Democracies met the two criteria for the granting of observer status identified in General Assembly decision 49/426. It was a global intergovernmental coalition of States Members of the United Nations dedicated to the goal of supporting democratic rule and strengthening democratic norms and institutions around the world. By promoting human rights, development, peace and security, it contributed greatly to the activities of the United Nations. The core structure of the Community of Democracies comprised Ministerial Conferences, the Presidency, the Governing Council and the Secretary-General. An agreement with the Government of Poland regulated the legal capacity of its Permanent Secretariat in Warsaw and the inviolability of its premises and archives. The privileges and immunities of its staff were regulated as appropriate by the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic relations and the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

30. **Mr. Gorostegui Obanoz** (Chile) said that the promotion of democracy and the rule of law were pillars of the foreign policy of Chile and a hallmark of Chilean society. Gender mainstreaming, the right of women to participate in political and economic life, the recognition and participation of indigenous peoples and a rights-based approach to child protection were all essential features of democratic progress and required the active involvement of all stakeholders.

31. Chile was one of the founding members of the Community of Democracies and joined the call for it to be granted observer status in the General Assembly. The Community, by sharing with the United Nations the goals of human rights promotion, development, peace and security, largely contributed to its activities. Upon its being granted such status, it would not only help to further develop its mutually beneficial institutional dialogue with the United Nations but also acquire greater visibility and be able more easily to interact with other States in the international community.

32. **Mr. Aldahhak** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation, like many that had already taken the floor, could not support the draft resolution since the Community of Democracies did not meet the requirements laid down in General Assembly decision 49/426. It discriminated among States Members of the United Nations, had no legal basis and was not in conformity with the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Many also considered that it did not take into account the cultural and social specificities of certain Member States.

33. **Mr. van den Bogaard** (Netherlands) said that General Assembly decision 49/426, which had been invoked repeatedly, was very short. It referred simply to intergovernmental organizations and did not specify how their intergovernmental status was to be determined or call for the submission of a founding document. In its 1949 advisory opinion on reparations, the International Court of Justice had applied the implied powers doctrine, finding that what existed on paper did not count as much as the intention of the founders. It was clear that in the past 15 years, the Permanent Secretariat of the Community of Democracies had discharged the functions and duties that the founders had intended to give to it. Moreover, and in view of the obvious value added of the Community for the United Nations, it was puzzling that those who claimed that the intergovernmental character of the Community could not be established without a founding document were nevertheless able to determine without such a document that the request would not qualify. The Warsaw Declaration plainly attested that it was an intergovernmental organization whose work was of interest to the United Nations; his delegation therefore continued to support the request.

34. **Mr. Li Yongsheng** (China) referred in turn to the requirements of General Assembly decision 49/426 and

said that, since the composition of the Community included, in addition to governmental bodies, civil society, the private sector, parliamentarians, young people and academia, it could not be defined as an intergovernmental organization. Furthermore, it treated the Taiwan province of China as a country and maintained official relations with it. It thereby violated not only the principle of one China and General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI), as well as the purposes and principles of the Charter, but also the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. He recalled that the Community had gone so far as to invite the head of external relations of Taiwan in July 2015 to attend a ministerial meeting in the capacity of Minister for Foreign Affairs of Taiwan. The concerns of China had been expressed to the sponsors of the draft resolution, but to no avail. His delegation therefore considered that the Community of Democracies did not meet the criteria for observer status so long as the aforementioned matters had not been resolved and that it should not be granted observer status.

35. **Ms. Morris-Sharma** (Singapore) said that her delegation shared the concerns that had been expressed in regard to the Community of Democracies and looked forward to working with interested delegations in seeking a consensus on the request in the light of full information. It would be desirable, in particular, to ascertain that the Permanent Secretariat was of an international character and that it exercised its functions and rights not as a coalition but as an international organization.

36. **Mr. Mendonça** (Cabo Verde) said that his delegation could readily accept the intergovernmental character of the Community of Democracies and recognized that its goals were complementary to those of the United Nations. It would be mutually beneficial to both organizations to grant observer status to it. The question of value was of paramount importance. He recalled that, 40 years earlier, when Cabo Verde had become independent, it had been considered a non-viable country; no one today questioned its viability, notwithstanding the challenges still facing it. Cabo Verde owed its success to a system of government that allowed all citizens to participate in its achievements. His country had for that reason supported the Community since its inception; it was a signatory of the Warsaw Declaration and a member of

its Governing Council. He therefore expressed support for the draft resolution.

**Agenda item 171: Observer status for the International Civil Defence Organization in the General Assembly (A/70/191; A/C.6/70/L.6)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.6: Observer status for the International Civil Defence Organization in the General Assembly*

37. **Mr. Kononuchenko** (Russian Federation), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/70/L.6](#), said that China, Kyrgyzstan and the Syrian Arab Republic had become sponsors. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/70/191](#). The International Civil Defence Organization was an intergovernmental organization with 54 member States and 19 observers; its activities were also supported by 30 associate members, including intergovernmental organizations. The organization operated on the basis of its Constitution, an international agreement adopted on 17 October 1966. Its core functions were to promote the development of governmental bodies and mechanisms for the protection of people, property and the environment in the event of natural and man-made disasters and to bring together national civil defence services and develop cooperation, exchanges and coordination among them, providing technical and advisory support and developing and implementing relevant training programmes.

38. The General Assembly and the International Civil Defence Organization had complementary aims with regard to the formulation and implementation of effective measures to protect and ensure human security in times of threat. The organization's participation as an observer in the activities of the United Nations would contribute to improving the humanitarian response in emergency situations. It would also allow a larger number of interested stakeholders to attend International Civil Defence Organization events, which could thus serve as a forum for exchanges of experience and innovative practice on issues relating to the protection of civilians. He called on all Member States to support the adoption of the draft resolution.

39. **Ms. Dieguez La O** (Cuba) said that her delegation supported the request for the International Civil Defence Organization to be granted observer

status in the General Assembly since it was clearly an intergovernmental organization and met the requirements set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. It had submitted its founding document and its activities were relevant to the work of the Assembly.

40. **Mr. Aldahhak** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation supported the request for the International Civil Defence Organization to be granted observer status in the General Assembly, given its important role in capacity-building and in civil protection in the event of natural and man-made disasters.

41. **Mr. Medina Mejías** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation supported granting the International Civil Defence Organization observer status in the General Assembly, particularly bearing in mind its valuable environmental protection and civil defence work. The organization fully met the requirements set out in Assembly decision 49/426 for the granting of observer status.

**Agenda item 172: Observer status for the Indian Ocean Rim Association in the General Assembly (A/70/192; A/C.6/70/L.8)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.8: Observer status for the Indian Ocean Rim Association in the General Assembly*

42. **Ms. Bird** (Australia), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/70/L.8](#), said that Italy and Oman had become sponsors. She wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/70/192](#), which set out the rationale for granting observer status to the Indian Ocean Rim Association. The Charter and rules of procedure of the Association were available on the Committee's website.

43. The Association was an independent intergovernmental organization that could make a strong contribution to the Assembly's work. Created as a vehicle for fostering economic cooperation in the Indian Ocean, it comprised 20 independent and self-governing States in the Indian Ocean region. It also had six dialogue partners and two observers. At the forthcoming Council of Ministers meeting to be held on 23 October 2015, Somalia would join the Association as a member and Germany would become its seventh dialogue partner. The Association held an annual meeting of foreign ministers and regular meetings of senior officials across a range of priority



areas identified in its Charter. Its various activities advanced in a practical manner many of the objectives and purposes of the United Nations, with a particular focus on those relating to economic growth; its work also aligned strongly with many of the recently adopted Sustainable Development Goals. The Association had an important role to play in ensuring the security, prosperity and stability of the Indian Ocean region, as well as in coordinating and implementing regional responses to United Nations priorities.

44. As the outgoing Chair of the Indian Ocean Rim Association, Australia pledged to further consolidate and expand the mutually beneficial ties between the Association and the United Nations. The Indian Ocean region — and the Association as the only ministerial-level forum spanning that region — had an important role to play in implementing the new sustainable development agenda. On behalf of the members of the Association, her delegation requested the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

45. **Ms. Thanarat** (Thailand) said that her delegation supported granting the Indian Ocean Rim Association observer status in the General Assembly. Bearing in mind that the Association was an intergovernmental organization established with the goal of fostering economic cooperation in the Indian Ocean region, and that its six main priority areas, namely maritime safety and security, trade and investment facilitation, fisheries management, disaster risk management, academic and science and technology cooperation, and tourism and cultural exchanges, covered matters of interest to the Assembly, it clearly satisfied the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. Moreover, at the current stage of development of international law, especially with regard to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction, and bearing in mind that approximately two-thirds of the total surface area of the Indian Ocean was part of the high seas, cooperation among Indian Ocean coastal States, as well as dialogue between those States and other partners, was more relevant than ever before.

46. **Ms. Muthukumarana** (Sri Lanka) said that Sri Lanka remained committed to strengthening regional cooperation, peace and security in the Indian Ocean through bodies such as the Indian Ocean Rim Association, of which it was a member. The Association had particular significance in enhancing

cooperation in maritime safety and security; it was also a potential mechanism for cooperation in combating transnational crimes such as human trafficking and the trafficking of drugs and wildlife, which were of direct concern to the General Assembly. In 1971, Sri Lanka had put forward the proposal to establish the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. It remained committed to that process and recognized the positive impact that the Association could have in revitalizing the concept.

47. **Mr. Gharibi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, based on the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426, his delegation supported granting observer status in the Assembly to the Indian Ocean Rim Association, particularly in view of its work in promoting social and economic development and enhancing trade cooperation among Member States. Closer ties between the Association and the United Nations would also contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

48. **Mr. Joyini** (South Africa) said that South Africa was a member of the Indian Ocean Rim Association and participated actively in its work. The Association was an intergovernmental organization dealing with matters of interest to the General Assembly; thus, it fulfilled the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. His delegation supported the request to grant observer status for the Association in the General Assembly and urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution.

49. **Mr. Waweru** (Kenya) said that, as the only economic cooperation organization in the Indian Ocean, the Association, of which Kenya was a member, would make a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations, particularly in connection with ongoing initiatives relating to the law of the sea. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

50. **Mr. Medina Mejías** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that the Indian Ocean Rim Association fully met the requirements set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. His delegation therefore supported granting the Association observer status in the Assembly.

**Agenda item 173: Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly (A/70/194; A/C.6/70/L.3)**

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.3; Observer status for the International Conference of Asian Political Parties in the General Assembly*

51. **Mr. Tuy** (Cambodia), introducing draft resolution [A/C.6/70/L.3](#), said that Azerbaijan and Indonesia had become sponsors. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document [A/70/194](#). The International Conference of Asian Political Parties (ICAPP) had been established in 2000 to promote political cooperation and to build networks of mutual benefit among mainstream political parties in Asia, both ruling parties and those in opposition. As of June 2015, its membership had stood at more than 360 eligible political parties in 52 States and one territory in Asia; it had also established linkages with the Permanent Conference of Political Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean and was reaching out to political parties in other regions. In July 2013, the Governments of several Asian countries had concluded an intergovernmental memorandum of understanding to provide support for the activities of ICAPP; other Governments were in the process of completing their domestic procedures to sign the memorandum.

52. It should be recalled that the outcome document of the United Nations summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda, contained in General Assembly resolution 70/1, acknowledged the essential role of national parliaments for the success of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development through their enactment of legislation and adoption of budgets to help align national development strategies with the Sustainable Development Goals. Furthermore, Goal 17 specifically called on the international community to strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development. Given that parliaments were composed of political parties, enhanced awareness and increased participation of political parties would translate into effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda. As an extensive network of Asian political parties, which maintained close cooperative relationships with parties in other regions, ICAPP was well suited to contribute to that task.

53. ICAPP had been active in promoting various themes that corresponded to the Organization's objectives and were crucial for the success of the 2030 Agenda, including by holding conferences and workshops on strengthening State capacity, easing mass poverty, fostering green development and promoting women's leadership. Granting observer status to ICAPP would enable the institution to play a more active role in global efforts to achieve United Nations objectives, and would also expand the support base for United Nations activities among political parties, and, through them, Governments and peoples.

54. **Mr. Hahn** Choonghee (Republic of Korea) said that as a network of political parties, ICAPP could be characterized as a quasi-intergovernmental organization, since the ruling parties participating in the network were responsible for forming the Governments in their respective countries and, as such, were virtually identified with those Governments, while the situation was also comparable, from a long-term perspective, in the case of opposition parties, since they had the possibility of holding power in the future. There was also increasing international recognition that ICAPP was intergovernmental in nature, as reflected in the signature by a number of Asian Governments of an intergovernmental memorandum of understanding on cooperation to support ICAPP activities. That memorandum, which was open to all Asian political parties, served as a structural platform for the organization's future development, as well as indicating the official recognition of and systematic support for ICAPP by an ever-growing number of Governments.

55. The Charter of ICAPP clearly referred in its preamble to the need to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and its foundational principles. ICAPP also actively engaged in activities to further international peace and security, human rights and development; held conferences and workshops on key global issues of interest to the General Assembly; and, through its annual Assemblies, brought together the continent's most prominent political leaders to seek ways of coexisting in a more peaceful, democratic and prosperous Asia. Furthermore, the work of political parties constituting parliaments would help translate the voices of multiple stakeholders into effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. His delegation considered that ICAPP fulfilled the criteria for the granting of observer status

in the General Assembly. It called on the Committee to consider the request for observer status favourably, from a broad and forward-looking perspective, and to adopt the draft resolution.

56. **Ms. Natividad** (Philippines) said that ICAPP could be an effective channel between the General Assembly and Governments in the region. ICAPP and its members were playing an important role in promoting and consolidating emerging democracies, and ICAPP members had also been working closely together in such areas as environmental protection, natural disasters and poverty alleviation. Furthermore, ICAPP could contribute to the overall work of the General Assembly in the areas of peace and security, human rights and development in the region. It fulfilled the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426; in particular, it could be characterized as intergovernmental in nature given that its members were government officials, members of parliament or cabinet ministers belonging to different political parties. Observer status in the General Assembly would allow ICAPP to forge closer cooperation between the United Nations and Asian political parties, thus cultivating and sustaining international consensus on the most important United Nations activities.

57. **Mr. Medina Mejías** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, while his delegation recognized the organization's importance in the international political community, ICAPP did not meet the criteria set out in General Assembly decision 49/426 as it was not an intergovernmental organization. Its request for observer status in the General Assembly must therefore be rejected.

58. **Ms. Millicay** (Argentina) said that her delegation recognized the valuable contribution that ICAPP could make to achieving the objectives of the United Nations and agreed that political parties should participate in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. However, notwithstanding the signature of an intergovernmental memorandum of understanding on cooperation to support its activities, the legal status of ICAPP had not changed in the years since the Committee had last considered its request for observer status, and it still did not meet the requirements set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. Consequently, her delegation had reservations about the request and urged ICAPP to apply for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, through which organizations that were not intergovernmental in nature

could participate fully in the process of implementing the 2030 Agenda.

59. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan) said that her delegation appreciated the role of ICAPP in enhancing mutual understanding and dialogue. In view of its achievements, and the fact that the intergovernmental memorandum of understanding concluded by the Governments of several countries in the region had strengthened its international legal status, the time was right to grant ICAPP observer status in the General Assembly. Her delegation invited Member States to support the draft resolution.

60. **Ms. Samarasinghe** (Sri Lanka) said that ICAPP was a staunch supporter of the United Nations and its activities. The Colombo Declaration, unanimously adopted at the eighth session of the ICAPP General Assembly held in Sri Lanka in September 2014, was aimed at promoting regional security, economic integration and mutual trust in a spirit of positive engagement with the whole United Nations community. Moreover, the essential role of national parliaments in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, and therefore the importance of the political parties that made up those parliaments, could not be overemphasized.

61. Her Government, as a signatory to the intergovernmental memorandum of understanding to provide support for the activities of ICAPP, remained committed to the goals and values of that organization, as well as the values and goals of the United Nations. She urged Member States to support the draft resolution.

62. **Mr. van den Bogaard** (Netherlands) said that, given the involvement of political parties in drafting legislation, it was hard not to see them as part of Governments. For that reason, and also because it was a staunch supporter of democratic interaction, his delegation supported granting observer status for ICAPP in the General Assembly.

63. **Mr. Sawada** (Japan) said that his delegation greatly appreciated the role played by ICAPP in enhancing mutual understanding and promoting regional cooperation in Asia. Observer status in the General Assembly would allow ICAPP to contribute to the Assembly's work. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution.

**Agenda item 174: Observer status for the Union for the Mediterranean in the General Assembly**  
(A/70/232; A/C.6/70/L.5)

*Draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.5; Observer status for the Union for the Mediterranean in the General Assembly*

64. **Mr. Al-Moumani** (Jordan), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/70/L.5, said that Albania, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Malta and Portugal had become sponsors. He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the explanatory memorandum contained in annex I to document A/70/232. The Union for the Mediterranean, whose goals were in line with international law and the objectives of the United Nations, was an intergovernmental organization that met the legal requirements set out in General Assembly decision 49/426. It sought to strengthen cooperation and integration among Euro-Mediterranean countries in order to work towards the creation of an area of peace, democracy and prosperity, and encouraged regional cooperation projects aimed at tackling economic and social challenges in the Mediterranean region by establishing employment opportunities, strengthening competition and promoting sustainable development. A memorandum had been signed on the sidelines of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, to strengthen cooperation between the Union for the Mediterranean, the Arab League and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. He invited all Member States to join the sponsors in supporting the draft resolution.

65. **Ms. Millicay** (Argentina) said that, whenever the Secretariat received a request for observer status in the General Assembly, it should require the organization in question to submit its founding document, since it was very difficult for the Committee to carry out its task of examining requests for observer status from a legal perspective without being able to consult the founding documents. While the statutes of the secretariat of the Union for the Mediterranean were available on the Union's website, the delegation of Jordan should also obtain the statutes of the Union itself.

66. **The Chair** recalled that, at an information session held in September 2015, he had called on delegations sponsoring requests for observer status to provide the founding documents for the organizations concerned.

67. **Ms. Morris-Sharma** (Singapore) said that her delegation would welcome further information so that

it could verify the status of the Union for the Mediterranean as an intergovernmental organization. In particular, it would like to know whether there was a distinction between the legal powers of the Union and those of its member States and whether the Union could exercise its powers in its own right at the international level. Her delegation stood ready to work with other States to further analyse the request for observer status.

68. **Mr. Medina Mejías** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation fully supported granting observer status in the General Assembly to the Union for the Mediterranean, once it had provided the requested information. As an intergovernmental organization that fostered cooperation and contributed to peace and security in the Mediterranean region, it fulfilled the requirements for observer status.

69. **Mr. Atlasi** (Morocco) said that the Union for the Mediterranean was working to promote peace and cooperation; accordingly, his delegation supported the draft resolution.

70. **Mr. de Rancourt** (France) said that, while the Committee was required to respect the provisions of General Assembly decision 49/426, those criteria were not absolute; the objectives and structure of the organization must also be studied carefully. His delegation supported the draft resolution and was willing to examine in greater detail the question of the Union's exact legal status.

71. **Mr. Koliopoulos** (Greece) said that the Union for the Mediterranean deserved to be granted observer status in the General Assembly. Its activities in such areas as regional cooperation, economic development and sustainable development were clearly of interest to the United Nations. Furthermore, the headquarters agreement signed between the secretariat of the Union and the Government of Spain provided for the secretariat to enjoy the privileges and immunities granted to other international organizations under Spanish law. As a sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation was ready to provide other delegations with the additional information and documentation required.

72. **Mr. Al-Moumani** (Jordan) said that his delegation stood ready to provide all additional information that had been requested.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*