

United Nations General Assembly | Sixth Committee Report of the International Law Commission (Agenda item 79)

CLUSTER III

29 October 2024

(check against delivery)

Mr./Madam Chair,

All protocol observed,

Regarding chapter VRI WKH, QWHUQDWLRQDrQ / DZ & FRQ VP/rks/MeIntiton and repression of piracy and armed robberga at se Brazil emphasizethe centrality of the United Convention on the Law of the Sea.

7KH &RPPLVVLRQ¶V ZRUN RQ WKLV WRSLF 'Convention.

We also recalthe recent evolution of the conseW RI ³ UHV FRPPX of under the Agreement on the Conservation and Sinustrale Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction.

The BBNJ Agreements governed by the principle of the common heritage of humankind.

This principle should also be considered to regard to activities in areas beyond national jurisdiction, such as the high seas.

It is important to distinguish between piracy and armed robbery at sea, as they fall under different legal regimes.

Brazil also echoes concerns about the proposal to establish universal

its limited and localized membership, under Chapter II, on the practice of international organizations, on an edpoating with the United Nations and the International Maritime Organization.

It would be more appropriate to consider\$ 7 2 \(\text{Practice under} \)
Chapter III, on regional and surbgional approaches

Furthermore regarding regional cooperation, Brazil urges the Commission to consider the role of ZOPACAS, a group dedicated to promoting cooperation and peace in the South Atlantic.

: H UHJUHW WKDW = 23 \$ & \$ 6 ZDV QRW PHQWL report, despite being established by a General Assembly resolution.

The General Assembly, in resolution 41/11, declared the Atlantic 2FHDQ EHWZHHQ \$IULFD DQG 6RXWK \$PHULF &RRSHUDWLRQ RI WKH 6RXWK \$WODQWLF '

Furthermore, ZOPACAS included an iD025 430.13 Tm 0 g 0 G [()] TJ E

Brazil expects that theew Special Rapporteur and the Commission

Therefore, an act inconsistent with a rlegally binding agreement does not entail international responsibility of cannot give rise to the so-called countermeasures.

At the same time, it is worth noting that current international practice has shown that provisions from the law of treaties can be useful in the drafting, conclusion, and implementation of **ratin**ding agreements, providing guidance and ssistance in a narrescriptive manner.

The essential criteria for determining then bing nature of an instrument are both the intentof the parties as reflected in the language of the agreemeath the form of the instrument.

There should be consistency between the form of the agreement and the intent to assume or not assume obligations. This would allow clear identification of nonbinding instruments.

Brazil sees merit in including intenstitutional agreements within the scope of the product to be developed by the Commission, as we believe this inclusion would hold practical relevance for States.

We take note of the RPPLVVLRQ¶V LQWHQWLRQ WR the topic in its next session.

I thank you