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question at a later session of the Assembly, with a view to the possible conversion of the articles into a convention, if the Assembly judged such a course to be appropriate, as did many members of the Commission.

63. Thirdly, it did not seem necessary for the Commission to specify when that should occur. In any case, that was a matter for the internal organization of the Sixth Committee, which had a number of other texts before it. But the second stage would involve, in due course, consideration of that question.

64. Fourthly, the articles that, it was to be hoped, the Commission would adopt and the General Assembly note in general terms in its resolution, would not contain machinery for dispute settlement, which was not appropriate for articles as such. That was of course without prejudice to the question of provisions on the relationship between countermeasures and dispute settlement and on the Chinese proposal, in the comments and observations received from Governments (A/CN.4/515 and Add.1–3), should the Drafting Committee find it appropriate in the light of the debate to deal with those issues in the text. To repeat, there would be no provision in the articles for dispute settlement machinery. However, the Commission would draw attention to the desirability of settlement in disputes concerning State responsibility; to the machinery elaborated by the Commission in the draft adopted on first-reading\(^1\) as a possible means of implementation, but also to other possibilities; and would leave it to the Assembly in the second phase to consider whether and what provisions for dispute settlement could be included in an eventual convention.

65. It was thought that a procedure along those lines could contribute to the adoption of the articles by consensus, along with a consensus approach to the question of their future treatment.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

\(^1\) See 2665th meeting, footnote 5.

### Organization of work of the session (continued)*

[Agenda item 1]

1. The CHAIRMAN invited Mr. Hafner, the Chairman of the Planning Group, to announce the final composition of the Group.

2. Mr. HAFNER (Chairman of the Planning Group) said that the Planning Group would be composed of the following members: Mr. Addo, Mr. Baena Soares, Mr. Brownlie, Mr. Galicki, Mr. Idris, Mr. Kamto, Mr. Kusuma-Atmadja, Mr. Pellet, Mr. Rosenstock, Mr. Yamada and Mr. He (ex officio).

The meeting rose at 10.05 a.m.

* Resumed from the 2673rd meeting.

2677th MEETING

Friday, 18 May 2001, at 10.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Peter KABATSI

Present: Mr. Addo, Mr. Al-Baharna, Mr. Baena Soares, Mr. Candioti, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Dugard, Mr. Economides, Mr. Galicki, Mr. Hafner, Mr. He, Mr. Kamto, Mr. Kateka, Mr. Kusuma-Atmadja, Mr. Lukashuk, Mr. Melescanu, Mr. Montaz, Mr. Pambou-Tchivounda, Mr. Pellet, Mr. Sreenivasa Rao, Mr. Rodriguez Cedeño, Mr. Rosenstock, Mr. Simma, Mr. Tomka, Mr. Yamada.

Statement by the Legal Counsel

1. The CHAIRMAN invited Mr. Hans Corell, Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, the Legal Counsel, to brief the Commission on the latest legal developments in the United Nations.

2. Mr. CORELL (Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, the Legal Counsel) said that the report of the Secretary-General, “We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century” (Millennium Report), to the Millennium Summit, held from 6 to 8