



Our first observations concerns the organization of individual draft articles in various Parts. While the overall orientation of the draft articles as envisaged by the Special Rapporteur has been clearly explained, the draft articles, as they are emerging from his reports, are for be time hains musecuted in one simple you without being aleanly examined in various Dante with appropriate\_titles\_This may create a risk of confusion as further articles have to be expected. Should some sort of guidance be seen in Vienna conventions of 1978 and 1983, then draft articles 1 on Scope, draft article 2 on Use of terms, draft article 5 on Cases of succession of States covered by the present draft articles, and paragraph 1 of draft article 6

incorporated another State). We agree with its content as reformulated by the Drafting Committee. Concerning the notion of "attribution", we are puzzled by the debate which took place in the Drafting Committee, as referred to in the Provisional report of its Chairman. We consider exercise and at the same time indicates that this general rule will be further specified in the provisions to follow. Such provisions - and here I refer to our remarks from the last year should more substantively revolve around specific forms of reparation, i.e. restitution, nampenention and esticiantion instead of summerity addressing "responsibility" in general

Finally, one additional comment on paragraph 4 of draft article 6: we consider it important to include an "umbrella" provision of this kind which reflects the philosophy guiding the present

	jannamite annamed These :		1 1 1 1 6		
	The same of the sa	and a land of the second of th		readem or loves and	
us,					
* C					
` <u>\</u>					
V-					
) To		`			
<u>as                                     </u>					
-					
हरू के, के <u>रिक</u>					
<u>.                                      </u>					
	<b>-</b> , ·				
A					
1					
<b>W</b> *	<u>L</u>				
r					
•					
1					
1					
1					
18					