

Statement of the Republic of Estonia 79th Session of the United Nations General Assembly Sixth Committee

Report of the International Law Commission

Cluster III - Chapters: VI (Prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea), VIII (Non-legally binding international agreements) and IX (Succession of States in respect of State responsibility)

30 October 2024

Chairperson,

Today, I start with addressing the topi**potévention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea**. First, I want to expres**g**ratitude to the previous Special Rapporteur MiYacouba Cisseor his work Second J would like to congratulate Mr Louis Savadogo or assuming the posses the new Special Rapporteur

Estonia aligns itself with the statement by the European Union, and adds the following commentain its national capacity.

We take note that Special Rapporteur proposed four new draft articles in his second report and the Drafting Committee provisionally adopted one draft article, namely draft Article 4 on General Obligation between and support the continued workand progres on the draft articles.

Estonia agrees that it is necessary to distinguish between piracy and armed robbery at seatthese crimes mayequiredifferent approachdepending on circumstances. With respect to the provisionally adopted Article 4, we believe that armed robbery at sea poses unique challenges to international cooperation because armed robbery occurs within territorial sea or internal waters, which are subject to national jurisdiction. We did not distinguish between piracy and armed robbery at sea, it would raise concerns whether States are prepared to

has complicated the situation even more Traditionally, piracy has been understood as a crime involving the physical seizure f or attackon ships by armethdividuals for

private ends. However, the use of unmanned sea drones for attacks, such as those increasingly employed by heHouthi rebels in the Red Sea, have blurred the lines of the traditional definition piracy. The definitions of piracy in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the See and in the draft Article 2 provisionally adopted by the C, may not sufficiently cover technologically advanced attacks on ships. We need commonly accepted interpretations in order to accommodate existing rules with technologial developments.

The ILC KDV SUHYLRXVO\ FRQVLGHUHG LQFOXGLQJ greater clarity on the GHILQLWLRQThe new Sector Dogie summanned ships and sea drone, schallenge the traditional notions of what constitutes a ship. As maritime threats evolve, including remotentrolled and autonomous attacks, the absence of an inclusive definition complicates efforts to address these