Intervention on mechanism of implementation (GQs 38-40)

Madam Chair,

It makes sense to look to UNCAC and UNTOC, as the existing UN criminal justice conventions, as a useful starting point. The UNTOC and UNCAC implementation fora facilitate knowledge sharing and regular review of how the conventions are being implemented. As such, looking at Q39, we support option (a), which would establish a Conference of Parties for this convention.

That said, the mechanisms established under UNCAC and UNTOC are of course not perfect. We should take the opportunity to ensure that we learn the lessons from those processes. We look forward to the comparative analysis on existing mechanisms and thank Director Brandolino for his presentation this morning.

For the UK, three main principles should underpin the implementation mechanism in this convention: efficiency, transparency and inclusivity.

On efficiency - we would be wary of accidentally establishing an onerous and paper-heavy process which becomes another burden for member states.

Speaking of efficiency, we do not recognize the need to establish a new, separate body in charge of the review of the implementation of the convention as set out in option (c). It is unclear what this body would actually do, over and above the Conference of States Parties. As the distinguished delegate from Singapore set out, we do not believe the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space model would be easily transferred to this convention.

Meanwhile, we are open to considering innovative options, including option (b), which would designate the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ), as proposed by the United States – and we thank them for the detail set out this morning, we will give it further thought.

Central to all of this for the UK is the principle of transparency. What is the point of a country undergoing a rigorous review if the report is placed on a shelf never to be read or its findings used? Any reports on
implementation should be publically available on the UN website, allowing for a better assessment of progress against recommendations, as well as providing critically important and detailed information about implementation to all interested stakeholders.

As many others have now said, we should seek to enshrine our approach to multi-stakeholders. Three sessions into this negotiation, member states can all appreciate how valuable the input of colleagues in the gallery are to those of us negotiating treaty.

We consider it essential that the AHC stakeholders who are already approved to support states are included in the implementation mechanism. We meanwhile recognize that the list will need to be refreshed overtime and we note that have a very efficient model enshrined within this process for agreeing the list. We think the approach set out in resolution 75/282 is a beacon of efficiency and inclusion in deciding which stakeholders should inform member state positions.

Those of us who are familiar with the alternative models across the UNTOC COP and UNCAC COPS know that the AHC is by far the best approach. It preserves the ability for states to object while facilitating a decision by the full membership on inclusion, which does not hold up the important work we are trying to do together.

Thank you Madam Chair