SLOVENIA

" #\$ %& ' (&)%

!

Mr Chairman,

At the outset, allow me to congratulate you on yellerction as Chairman of this year's Sixth Committee session. Let me also pay tributehter Chairman of the \$5\$ session of the

do, in fact, wait 12 months for the reservation beoestablished before they treat the author of a reservation as a contracting State to the treatyuers tion.

With your permission, Mr Chairman, in addition tesservations to treaties, we would also like to address some other chapters of the Respince my delegation will deliver only one statement under this agenda item.

Mr Chairman,

Allow me to briefly turn to the topic of the Proteon of persons in the event of disasters (Chapter VI of the Report). Slovenia has addressissatopic regularly in previous sessions of the 6th Committee and again, we would like to commented impressive progress made by Special Rapporteur Mr. Eduardo Valencia-Ospina and the Cissision. We believe that this is one of the most topical and acute themes under the scrutirtheoflLC, dealing with an important area of international law and practice which has not year be odified in a comprehensive manner at international level. The eighteen draft articles pared so far accord with the main aim of the Commission's endeavour. The latter is based or publication of disaster victims, their lives and basic human rights, while at the same time remainingful of the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention. Continuing to maintain the slicate balance is of extreme importance if draft articles are to succeed and gain global ataoes in the future.

In commenting on this year's Sixth report of the Sipil Rapporteur and the prepared drafts of articles 5 ter and 16, we welcome that that the ILC has dealt with aspects of prevention in the context of this topic, including saster risk reduction. This corresponds to numerous current activities of the internationarhorounity in this field

Close cooperation is of paramount importance in messluction endeavours. We therefore support the explicit mention of this aspect of thus to cooperate in extended draft Article 5. We also believe that each individual State has to the trisk of disasters by certain appropriate measures (draft Article 16). This destipased on the contemporary understanding of State sovereignty, encompassing not only rights, about the duties of States towards their

citizens, and providing that the affected persomosulad not suffer unnecessarily for the sake of sovereignty. The duty to reduce the risk of dispassing also in accord with States' obligation to respect, protect, and fulfil human rights, in partiar the right to life, which is the most fundamental human right. The contemporary underdisting of the right to life places an obligation on States to ensure respect for this tridg individuals within their territory and within their prerogatives Inter alia, this implies an obligation of States to take vactime as ures and necessary steps to ensure the right to life aneir datasic human rights, also in the aftermath of natural disasters. Specifically, "taking all necesses steps" means that a State has a duty to prevent disasters, to prepare for disasters with iterritory, to take direct measures to minimise suffering immediately after a disaster and, abdicate request international humanitarian relief when national efforts are insufficient to protein tives of victims of natural disasters. In this regard, we would like to underline that Slovenia, acknowledged by the ILC, has already adopted national legislation with the aim of implementing global strategies to reduce risk.

Mr Chairman,

As regards Chapter VII: Formation and evidencecoofstomary international law, we would like to commend Special Rapporteur Sir Midhlaheod for his first report on the topic, which provides an excellent basis for our futurer kwo We would also like to thank the Secretariat for drafting the Memorandum, with an overview of the xisting findings of the Commission that could be particularly relevant to the topic. We accentinced the Memorandum will serve as a helpful reference document in future discussions beftopic.

The approach suggested by the Special Rapportegarding the scope and possible outcome of the topic has our support. While it been widely accepted that the existence of a rule of customary international law requires threatre be 'a settled practice' together withinio juris, it is much less clear how such a rule is to been tidled in practice. In consequence, the proposed approach to the topic, focusing on them action and evidence of customary international law, should fill in some of the lacture in understanding and the application of customary international law, particularly on the toget non-international lawyers. It is also with

Let me now address Chapter VI<u>II: Provisional Applion of Treaties</u>. We would like to congratulate Special Rapporteur Mr. Gómez-Robledohiss First Reporton the provisional application of treaties, in which he outlined the main elements of thischaenism and the issues to be discussed in the Commission. We also find nthe memorandum of the Secretariat on the travaux préparatoires with respect to Article 25 of the Vienna Convention the Law of Treaties (VCLT) very useful.

In our view, the objective of the Commission showled analyse as comprehensively as possible the mechanism of provisional application is legal implications, so that States will be able to understand it better, both when they confectureaties and agree to the mechanism and when they implement those treaties. As to the prossiut come of the consideration of this topic, we feel that it is perhaps too early to decide one three guidelines, model clauses or some other form of outcome would be the most appropriate, esithes will depend on the future work on the topic.

We would like to propose that the Special Rapporteounsiders another aspect of provisional application. The Vienna Convention of the tSuccession of States in relation to Treaties, concluded after the VCLT, contains articl

as the Special Rapporteur himself recognised, degal concept with its accompanying international consequences. In this regard, it who useful to include in the analysis the recent arbitral practice in the context of the Energy CheaTreaty.

Second, we are reluctant to ascribe great significate the change in terminology from "provisional entry into force" to "provisional appear from the travaux préparatoires with regard to the VCLT, in particular when comparthat on the draft article concerningacta sunt servanda and that on Article 25, from which it is possible to conclude that the acta sunt servanda rule applies to both concepts, which would meathuin that, from the perspective of this rule at lease, two concepts are identical.

Third, although we agree that the main focus of Othermission's work on the provisional application should be on its analysis from the precisive of international law, we also believe that the decisions of States to use provisional caption are often very closely related to their constitutional rules and procedures. This is apptatine the discussions of Article 25 at the Vienna Conference for the adoption of the VCLT, atnice our speculation that this is likely to emerge also from the results of the questionnair withich States should reply by the end of January next year. Thus, the Commission will probative ed either to expressly exclude this internal legal aspect from its considerations at the tast of decide how to include it. In the latter case, and in order to avoid an analysis of the rinate aw of States, which the Special Rapporteur correctly emphasised as not being the task of the riving is sion, the Commission could, for example, analyse the practice and implication she finternal legal "limitation clauses" in treaties which have been drafted in different variations awdiereby provisional application is