



25 October - 3 November 2021

Cluster III

Succession of States in respect of State responsibility

Madam Chair,

like to thank Special Rapporteur Pavel Sturma for his fourth report.

It is well researched, well written and has a significant value.

Today, we would like to share some of our views about the draft articles.

First, regarding draft Article 7 bis, we believe that the difference between composite acts and continuous violations is not sufficiently clear.

In addition, we see that the report aims to maintain consistency with the Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts. However, we should also bear in mind that those articles might still be considered as open to discussion, specifically as regards whether and to what extent they reflect customary international law.

Therefore, we believe it would be better if the Commission discussed draft Article 7 bis in more detail in its future work.

With respect to paragraph 2 of draft article 16, we would like to indicate that Turkey supports the view that the successor State does not have an obligation to make restitution in lieu of the predecessor State.

Furthermore, regarding paragraph 2 of draft article 17, as mentioned in the

