Intervention on final provisions (GQs 41-46)

Chair, in general we have based our proposed language for the final provisions in UNTOC. We see most of this as fairly standard language and little need to deviate from it.

On question 41, as we’ve said in previous interventions, we believe it is essential that this treaty aligns with existing mechanisms that already work. We think it is prudent to keep the need for an express provision to define the relationship of this convention with other treaties under review, until we are clearer on the substantive content of our treaty.

Similarly, on additional protocols, and question 42, we are supportive in principle of a provision which provides for additional protocols but think we may need to return to this matter later on. If provisions for additional protocols are included in the convention, we believe these should set out how additional protocols would be negotiated and this should reflect the modalities of the parent process. As a principle, we consider that protocols will be supplementary to the core convention and a party to the convention will not be bound by the protocol unless it becomes a party to the protocol itself. Furthermore, we support the comments made by other delegations on the importance of technology neutral language within this treaty to ensure it is future proof as much as possible.

On question 43, we believe the matter of reservations is inherently linked to the scope of the convention. Therefore whilst that is still under discussion, the need for reservations should remain under review. We support the remarks made by others that reservations must not undermine the object and purpose of the treaty, in line with the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

With regard to the remaining questions, we have suggested language from UNTOC on the settlement of disputes, entry into force and amendment. The only change we have made is to set the required number of ratifications at fifty, in line with a proposal made last October by Mexico in its written submission ahead of the first session of our AHC. We believe this to be consistent with our goal of an inclusive and universal convention, but we are open to considering the proposal made by Singapore for a higher threshold.

Thank you Chair.