

Provisional

For participants only

12 July 2024

Original: English

International Law Commission
Seventy-fifth session (first part)

Provisional summary record of the 3672nd meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 28 May 2024, at 10 a.m.

Contents

Prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea (*continued*)

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

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within two weeks of the date of the present document* to the English Translation Section (trad_sec_eng@un.org).



Present:

Chair: Mr. Vázquez-Bermúdez

Members: Mr. Akande
Mr. Asada
Mr. Cissé
Mr. Fathalla
Mr. Fife
Mr. Forteau
Mr. Galindo
Ms. Galvão Teles
Mr. Grossman Guiloff
Mr. Huang
Mr. Laraba
Mr. Lee
Ms. Mangklatanakul
Mr. Mavroyiannis
Mr. Nesi
Mr. Nguyen
Ms. Okowa
Ms. Oral
Ms. Orosan
Mr. Ouazzani Chahdi
Mr. Oyarzábal
Mr. Paparinskis
Mr. Patel
Mr. Reinisch
Ms. Ridings
Mr. Ruda Santolaria
Mr. Sall
Mr. Savadogo
Mr. Zagaynov

Secretariat:

Mr. Llewellyn Secretary to the Commission

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea (agenda item 7)
(continued) (A/CN.4/770)

Ms. Oral said that the Special Rapporteur had, in his clear, informative second report on the topic “Prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea” (A/CN.4/770), provided a rich overview of regional cooperation agreements relating to piracy and armed robbery at sea. His first report (A/CN.4/758) had been limited to an examination of State legislative and judicial practice in the various regions of the world. The purpose of the second report had been to describe and analyse regional approaches to the prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea. As other members had noted, the content of a report should lay the foundation for the draft articles proposed in it. Rather than delving into the details of the draft articles, which other members had already done, she would focus her remarks on how, in her view, the second report did indeed lay the foundation for elements of the draft articles proposed by the Special Rapporteur.

The starting point for the second report was article 100 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the duty to cooperate in the prevention and repression of piracy. As the Special Rapporteur had correctly observed, article 100 did not provide any substantive content or specify the means of fulfilling that duty. The report included ample evidence of the many instruments, including General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, aimed at the implementation of the duty of cooperation with respect to the prevention and repression of both piracy and armed robbery at sea. Strong emphasis was placed on the crucial role of international cooperation at the global, regional, subregional and bilateral levels. As she understood it, the references to General Assembly and Security Council resolutions were not meant to suggest that those resolutions should serve as the normative basis for the Commission’s work, but rather to illustrate both the need for States to fulfil the duty to cooperate under article 100 and specific means by which they should do so.

For example, paragraph 21 of the report stated that, in its resolutions, the Security Council had stressed the need to advance cooperation at the regional level in prosecuting and detaining those suspected of having committed acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea. Such prosecution and detention were elements of the duty to cooperate under article 100. Furthermore, in its resolution 2018 (2011), the Security Council called upon the States members of certain regional organizations, in conjunction with flag States and States of nationality of victims or of perpetrators, to cooperate in the prosecution of alleged perpetrators. In paragraph 24, the Special Rapporteur highlighted the Security Council’s call for all States to ensure that pirates handed over to judicial authorities were subject to a judicial process; that was also an important element of the implementation of the duty to cooperate under article 100. In relation to the criminal nature of piracy and armed robbery at sea, the Special Rapporteur had correctly drawn attention to the principle of *nullum crimen, nulla poena sine lege* and the calls by the Security Council for States to criminalize piracy and armed robbery at sea under their domestic laws, to investigate and prosecute or extradite perpetrators of such crimes and to provide for procedures for the preservation of evidence that could be used in criminal proceedings to ensure its admissibility.

The second report contained a brief mention of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Code of Practice for the Investigation of Crimes of Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships, which was intended to provide States with a recommended framework for the investigation of those criminal acts. For example, it was recommended in the Code that States should take such measures as might be necessary to establish their jurisdiction over the offences of piracy and armed robbery against ships, including adjustment of their legislation, if necessary, to enable them to apprehend and prosecute persons committing such offences. The Code addressed armed robbery against ships and piracy in separate paragraphs, but both were linked to article 100 of the 1982 Convention. In paragraph 3.4.1, concerning armed robbery, coastal States were encouraged to cooperate to the fullest possible extent in the investigation of incidents and attempts, together with other interested States such as the flag State, and, where appropriate, to enter into appropriate

bilateral or multilateral agreements to facilitate such investigations and the prosecution of the perpetrators; paragraph 3.4.2 used almost identical language in relation to piracy.

The second report contained a rich overview of regional arrangements in Africa and Asia, which had been particularly affected by acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea. One of the core cooperation obligations under both the Charter on Maritime Security and Safety and Development in Africa (Lomé Charter) and the Code of Conduct concerning the Repression of Piracy, Armed Robbery against Ships and Illicit Maritime Activity in West and Central Africa (Yaoundé Code of Conduct) was maritime information-sharing. Such cooperation in information-sharing was directed towards, for example, the arrest and detention of individuals preparing to or committing unlawful acts at sea and the seizure or confiscation of ships and equipment used in the commission of such acts.

The report also contained a useful overview of the Code of Conduct concerning the Repression of Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in the Western Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden (Djibouti Code of Conduct) and the Jeddah Amendment to the Djibouti Code of Conduct, which represented an important regional arrangement and addressed cooperation with respect to piracy, robbery at sea and other maritime crimes. For example, article 5 of the amended Code included a requirement for States to cooperate in arresting, investigating and prosecuting persons who had committed or were reasonably suspected of having committed piracy. The Code also covered issues such as interdiction and seizure of ships and property, the rescue of ships, persons and property subjected to piracy and armed robbery and the facilitation of proper care, treatment and repatriation of victims of those acts, especially those who had been subjected to violence.

In addition, the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia required the parties to take measures to suppress acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships through information-sharing and mutual legal assistance. Through the European Maritime Safety Agency, the European Union also played a key role in the sharing of information to combat piracy.

By giving multiple examples of regional arrangements for the prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea, which also constituted evidence of State practice, the Special Rapporteur had provided a foundation for a set of draft articles on the implementation of the duty to cooperate under article 100 of the 1982 Convention with respect to both piracy and armed robbery at sea, which were nearly always referred to in tandem in international and regional instruments. Elements of such cooperation included the adoption and strengthening of national laws, the enactment of laws providing for jurisdiction and prosecution, the introduction of judicial and extradition processes, the preservation of evidence and information-sharing. As the second report had highlighted the key elements for the construction of a normative framework for the implementation of the article 100 duty to cooperate, she did not share the view expressed by other members that the report was disconnected from or failed to provide a basis for the four draft articles proposed by the Special Rapporteur. While she agreed that the draft articles required redrafting and contained errors, as pointed out by Mr. Oyarzábal and others, those were drafting issues that should be addressed by the Drafting Committee. She therefore supported the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee, which could refine their content.

Mr. Ouazzani Chahdi said that the Special Rapporteur's high-quality, well-written second report contained a wealth of information, particularly on regional and subregional practices to combat piracy and armed robbery at sea, and an interesting analysis of the practice of international organizations involved in the fight against piracy.

The report drew attention to the connection between piracy and terrorism through references both to the concept of the "safety of navigation" – which, in his view, should have been discussed in much greater detail in the report – and to the use of the proceeds of piracy for the financing of terrorism. In paragraph 12, the Special Rapporteur noted only that the General Assembly had expanded the scope of the concept of safety of navigation by including piracy and armed robbery in the expression "maritime safety and security", thereby also expanding it to encompass terrorist acts at sea. In paragraph 6 of the report, the Special Rapporteur himself seemed to suggest that the concept needed to be clarified further in the light of new technologies, noting that the recent attacks by Houthi rebels on United States

ships in the Red Sea, which had been carried out using drones rather than ships, had revived the debate on the issue of the safety of navigation. With respect to the financing of terrorism, the Special Rapporteur recalled in paragraph 20 of the report – another paragraph where the terms used should have been explained further – that the Security Council, in resolution 2383 (2017), had identified terrorism as one of the phenomena fuelled by piracy, noting that piracy had exacerbated instability in Somalia by introducing large amounts of illicit cash that fuelled additional crime, corruption, and terrorism.

The central issue examined in the second report was that of cooperation in the prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea. That issue could usefully have been addressed in a separate chapter, which could have covered, for example, the content, means of implementation and scope of the duty to cooperate. He agreed with the Special Rapporteur's assertion in paragraph 5 that article 100 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea set out the principle of the duty to cooperate without, however, providing any substantive content or specifying the means of fulfilling that duty. According to the Special Rapporteur, that task seemed to fall to States, within the framework of regional and subregional commitments, and to the United Nations, through the General Assembly, the Security Council and IMO. The Special Rapporteur reiterated that observation elsewhere in the report, including in paragraphs 22 and 37, but without specifying how States could work together.

As other members had noted, the 2023 Institute of International Law resolution on piracy could serve as an excellent source of inspiration for analysing the content of the duty to cooperate and the means of fulfilling it. A related issue raised by Ms. Mangklatanakul was whether that duty constituted a binding obligation. As Mr. Mavroyiannis and Mr. Lee had noted, the phrase “to the fullest possible extent” in article 100 of the 1982 Convention should be further elucidated. Answers to those questions could perhaps be found in the *travaux préparatoires* of that convention and of the 1958 Convention on the High Seas, article 14 of which employed the same expression.

The duty to cooperate was referred to in certain international instruments of a scientific nature that related to the 1982 Convention. For example, the Preparatory Committee established by General Assembly resolution 69/292: Development of an international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction had, in the report on the work of its fourth session ([A/AC.287/2017/PC.4/2](#)), recommended that the instrument should set out the obligation of States to cooperate for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction and elaborate on the content and modalities of that obligation. The Commission should consider whether that meant that the duty to cooperate under the 1982 Convention extended only to scientific matters.

With respect to the implementation of the duty to cooperate in practice, the Special Rapporteur noted in paragraph 16 of the report that the Security Council had, in the context of the exceptional authorization that it had granted to States cooperating with Somalia, been careful to underscore that none of its resolutions on piracy in Somalia should be considered as establishing customary international law and that the measures taken pursuant thereto should be consistent with international humanitarian and human rights law. The report should have elaborated on the humanitarian aspect of the measures taken pursuant to the relevant Security Council resolutions. In resolution 1816 (2008), the Security Council had, in addition, emphasized respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and unity of Somalia. It should also be noted that article 4 of the 2000 United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, which was referred to in the report, also required States parties to carry out their obligations under that convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

The right of hot pursuit should have been explained more clearly in the report. That right related primarily to the repression of armed robbery at sea and was not relevant to piracy. As noted in paragraph 129 of the memorandum on the topic prepared by the secretariat for the Commission's seventy-fourth session ([A/CN.4/757](#)), the right of hot pursuit concerned the conditions under which a coastal State could pursue a foreign ship beyond the

territorial sea into areas beyond its jurisdiction, when the latter had committed within the territorial sea an act that was unlawful under the national law of the coastal State. Furthermore, under article 111 of the 1982 Convention, such pursuit must be commenced when the foreign ship or one of its boats was within the internal waters, the archipelagic waters, the territorial sea or the contiguous zone of the pursuing State and could only be continued outside the territorial sea or the contiguous zone if the pursuit had not been interrupted.

Other members had already commented eloquently on the draft articles, and he would not repeat their suggestions. He did not see the need for separate draft articles on piracy and armed robbery at sea, as the draft articles were not a study of the offences themselves but rather focused generally on the duty to cooperate in the prevention and repression of the two forms of crime. He was, however, in favour of addressing the duty to cooperate in a separate draft article. The 2023 Institute of International Law resolution could provide inspiration in that regard. The draft articles were in need of a general restructuring, and the Special Rapporteur and other members of the Drafting Committee could determine how best to achieve that. He supported the referral of the proposed draft articles to the Drafting Committee.

Mr. Cissé (Special Rapporteur), summing up the debate on his second report on prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea, said that the plenary debate had been rich and stimulating on a topic that was, as a number of members had recognized, highly technical and very sensitive. He wished to thank Mr. Oyarzábal, who had opened the debate with highly pertinent comments that had, *inter alia*, drawn attention to multilateral instruments other than the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea that could be of relevance to the Commission's work, including the 1979 International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, the 1988 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the 2000 United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. Like other members, Mr. Oyarzábal had not seen the need for the reference to armed conflict in draft article 4 (2). It should be noted that the Special Rapporteur had included that reference not by analogy with the Commission's draft articles on prevention and punishment of crimes against humanity but simply for the purpose of situating the issue in a broader perspective and highlighting the idea that the legal qualification of piracy was the same both in time of armed conflict and in time of peace.

With respect to the comments made regarding draft article 5, he wished to note that he had decided to devote a draft article to prevention because the obligation of prevention followed naturally from the duty to cooperate within the meaning of article 100 of the 1982 Convention. As that obligation was not referred to in article 100, its inclusion in the draft articles would represent progressive development and not codification. Moreover, the 2023 report of the Institute of International Law entitled "Piracy, present problems" noted that "repression" could well include "prevention" and that there was no need to distinguish between the two. In any event, a provision on repression would be included in his next report.

The instruments to which Mr. Savadogo had referred in his statement, including the work of the Institute of International Law on piracy, could prove very useful for the commentary to the draft articles. Mr. Savadogo had also made the point that article 100 of the 1982 Convention should be read in conjunction with article 300, on good faith. With respect to Mr. Savadogo's comment on the Djibouti Code of Conduct, he wished to specify that the Code had not been repealed by the Jeddah Amendment but continued to exist alongside it. Mr. Fathalla had stressed the need to distinguish between piracy and armed robbery at sea in the draft articles, had made very useful drafting suggestions and had drawn an important distinction as to the nature of cooperation in respect of the two forms of crime.

In response to Mr. Forteau's comments regarding the need to clarify the overall direction of the draft articles and the question of whether their aim was the codification or the progressive development of international law, he wished to note that, as he had stated in the conclusion to his first report on the topic (A/CN.4/758), State practice was neither uniform nor consistent, and, since codification thus could not be considered, the path forward was one of progressive development in those areas where there were lacunae or shortcomings in the 1982 Convention, including in article 100. The aim was to advance the law on the fight against piracy without changing it fundamentally.

With respect to Mr. Forteau's question regarding the Special Rapporteur's references to the harmonization of national laws, he wished to note that he was not suggesting that all States around the world should adopt the same laws on piracy, but rather that, in each region or subregion, the penalties and prevention measures provided for under the various national laws would be more effective in combating piracy if they were roughly comparable. Moreover, the Security Council, the General Assembly and IMO had identified the harmonization of laws as a condition for success in the fight against piracy. Mr. Forteau's pertinent observations on the draft articles could potentially be discussed in a working group or in the Drafting Committee. He wished to assure Mr. Forteau that he did not intend to apply the same regime to both piracy and armed robbery at sea in the draft articles; that would be made clear by the titles that would be given to the draft articles by the Drafting Committee. Lastly, Mr. Forteau had suggested, as one of three possible options, that a working group should be established to define the future direction of the Commission's work on the topic. Mr. Forteau had not, however, opposed the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee.

Mr. Nguyen had stressed the importance of distinguishing between armed robbery at sea and piracy in the light of the differences between them in terms of the location of the crime, the applicable law, the relevant jurisdiction and the appropriate form of cooperation and had pointed out several regional initiatives in Asia that should be considered in the future work on the topic. Mr. Asada's pertinent comments that the draft articles must distinguish between the two offences, which could not be governed by a single legal regime, that the draft articles were not based on State practice, that the relationship between articles 101 and 103 of the 1982 Convention should be clarified and that a distinction should be made between prevention and repression should be examined by the Drafting Committee. Mr. Asada had supported the referral of draft articles 4 and 5, but not draft articles 6 and 7, to the Drafting Committee. Mr. Grossman Guiloff had expressed the view that the criminal aspects of piracy and armed robbery should be examined more thoroughly, including in the context of the Djibouti Code of Conduct, that some of the terminology used in the report was problematic and should be clarified and that the role of private companies, the confiscation of property and issues relating to the loss of a vessel's nationality should be studied further.

Ms. Mangklatanakul had stressed the importance of emerging issues that were relevant to the topic and were not yet addressed under international law, including those related to technological advances and the use of artificial intelligence in the commission of offences, and had highlighted the various aspects of cooperation that the Commission would need to address. In response to her question about why he had indicated in draft article 6 (6) that no statute of limitations should apply to the offences referred to in the rest of that draft article, he wished to explain that, since piracy was considered a crime under the law of nations and pirates were considered *hostis humani generis*, or enemies of humanity, he had concluded that an analogy could be drawn between piracy and crimes against humanity, which were not subject to any statute of limitations. However, the reference to a statute of limitations did not need to be retained; if it was retained, it could be explained in the commentary. Regarding Ms. Mangklatanakul's question as to whether there would be a separate draft article on the obligation of repression, he wished to note that he had already prepared such a draft article but had refrained from including it so as not to put forward too many draft articles in his second report.

Like Ms. Mangklatanakul, Mr. Patel and Mr. Fife had indicated that, in keeping with States' views, the Commission's work should not duplicate existing frameworks, but rather aim at identifying issues of common concern. In response to Mr. Patel's comments regarding the reference in the second report to the activities of Houthi rebels in the Red Sea, he wished to note that his intention had been not to reopen the definition of piracy but rather to highlight the role of new technologies, particularly drones, and artificial intelligence in the commission of offences at sea, an issue that had been raised at the Commission's seventy-fourth session.

Like other members, Ms. Ridings had stressed the importance of considering IMO instruments and the Djibouti Code of Conduct and the Jeddah Amendment thereto in the Commission's work. Regarding her concern about whether there was a sufficient connection between the report and the proposed draft articles, he wished to note that he had, in his introductory statement, shown that there was such a connection and that it was based on

article 100 of the 1982 Convention and the forms of regional cooperation outlined in the report. Ms. Oral had also referred to that connection in her statement. Like the majority of members, Ms. Ridings did not support the inclusion of a reference to armed conflict in draft article 4 (2); he could accept its deletion. Contrary to what Ms. Ridings had expressed, however, his view was that, while armed robbery was defined under national criminal codes, armed robbery at sea, as defined by IMO in language that had been reproduced word for word in certain national laws, could be considered a crime under international law. Overall, Ms. Ridings's observations could serve as a basis for the Drafting Committee's forthcoming deliberations.

Mr. Zagaynov had noted the usefulness of the study of regional practice in the report and had understood the references to relevant Security Council resolutions as a reminder that the provisions of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea should not be undermined. Mr. Zagaynov had also noted the relevance of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages as potential sources of inspiration for the Commission's work, had stated that the inclusion of a clause on warships should be considered, had welcomed the Special Rapporteur's plans for the future work on the topic and had stressed the importance of information-sharing.

Mr. Paparinskis had said that he found the research undertaken on the topic to be impressively thorough, had stressed the importance of considering additional international instruments, particularly the resolution on piracy adopted in 2023 by the Institute of International Law and its 2009 Naples Declaration on Piracy, had made some noteworthy drafting suggestions, had expressed his support for the proposed future work on the topic and had expressed no objection to the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee. Mr. Sall had advocated the consideration of regions from a functional rather than geographical viewpoint, using the involvement of the European Union in anti-piracy efforts in Africa to support his argument, and had stressed the need to distinguish between piracy and armed robbery at sea. Mr. Galindo had noted the absence in the report of specific guidance or detailed strategies that could offer actionable recommendations for the future and the lack of a connection between the report and the proposed draft articles. Mr. Mavroyiannis had expressed the same view and had emphasized that article 100 of the 1982 Convention should be the starting point for the Commission's analysis; he had also made pertinent remarks regarding universal jurisdiction, which would be the subject of draft provisions in the third report. Mr. Akande had pointed to the question of whether the Commission was engaged in an exercise of codification or progressive development. He had already answered that question in his comments on Mr. Forteau's remarks.

Mr. Huang had said that the report provided a solid foundation and contained pertinent analyses but also that it had room for improvement. Mr. Huang had noted the report's focus on the strengthening of cooperation, had proposed that case studies should be carried out *inter alia* on the experience of China in implementing IMO guidance and had argued that the issues raised by the presence of armed guards on board ships should be explored further, given that 23 States had adopted laws on the matter; that last point would, in fact, be addressed in the Special Rapporteur's third report. Mr. Huang had said that there was no need to revisit issues on which consensus had already been reached, had made pertinent drafting suggestions and had noted the need to promote the harmonization of national legislation with international law.

Mr. Lee, who had found the report excellent, had drawn attention to the evolution of piracy over the course of the twentieth century, had suggested that reference should be made to the 2023 Institute of International Law resolution on piracy in interpreting the 1982 Convention and had made very pertinent drafting suggestions in that regard. Mr. Reinisch had noted that the report provided a good overview of the work of international organizations in combating piracy and, while finding that there were insufficient explanations in support of the draft articles, had made specific drafting suggestions.

Mr. Nesi had expressed the view that the obligations of States in relation to piracy should be distinguished from those in relation to armed robbery at sea and that there could be no common legal framework for the two offences, while also rightly noting the use that

could be made of the work of the Institute of International Law in clarifying certain points in the report. Mr. Fife had recognized the importance of taking both a global and a regional approach and the usefulness of formulating provisions on the subject. Mr. Fife had suggested that reference should be made to General Assembly resolution 78/69 on oceans and the law of the sea, the third edition of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) publication *Maritime Crime: A Manual for Criminal Justice Practitioners* and relevant European Union initiatives, particularly those relating to information-sharing. Mr. Jalloh had focused on the possibility of establishing a working group to orient the direction of the Commission's work on the topic.

Ms. Oral, after forcefully and persuasively demonstrating the relevance of the approach taken by the Special Rapporteur, had reached the logical conclusion that there was no disconnect between the body of the report and the draft articles and had recommended the referral of the four draft articles to the Drafting Committee, where the necessary corrections could be made. Mr. Ouazzani Chahdi had made highly pertinent substantive observations on the duty to cooperate and had, like Ms. Oral, supported the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee.

While a number of members had taken no express stance on the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee, others had expressed support for the referral of either some or all of them. Several members had said that they would welcome the opportunity to continue the discussions in the Drafting Committee.

He wished to thank the members who had expressed their views on the topic. Their valuable contributions would help to advance the Commission's work. He would welcome the referral of the draft articles to the Drafting Committee and was willing to discuss the future direction of the topic in that context.

Mr. Savadogo, responding to the Special Rapporteur's comment that the Djibouti Code of Conduct remained in effect, said he wished to clarify that the revised Code contained in the Jeddah Amendment superseded the Djibouti Code, as provided in article 20 of the Amendment.

The Chair said he took it that the Commission wished to refer draft articles 4, 5, 6 and 7 to the Drafting Committee, taking into account the views expressed during the debate and on the understanding that the Committee would first hold a general discussion on the topic as a whole and its future direction.

It was so decided.

Organization of the work of the session (agenda item 1) (*continued*)

Ms. Okowa (Chair of the Drafting Committee) said that, for the topic "Prevention and repression of piracy and armed robbery at sea", the Drafting Committee was composed of Mr. Akande, Mr. Asada, Mr. Grossman Guiloff, Mr. Huang, Mr. Lee, Ms. Mangklatanakul, Mr. Mavroyiannis, Mr. Nesi, Ms. Oral, Ms. Orosan, Mr. Oyarzábal, Mr. Paparinskis, Mr. Patel, Mr. Ruda Santolaria and Mr. Savadogo, together with Mr. Cissé (Special Rapporteur) and Ms. Ridings (Rapporteur), *ex officio*.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.