



United Kingdom Mission  
to the United Nations

One Dag Hammarskjold Plaza  
(885 Second Avenue)  
New York, NY 10017

Tel: +1 (212) 745 9200  
Fax: +1 (212) 745 9316

Email: [uk@un.int](mailto:uk@un.int)  
[http://twitter.com/UKUN\\_NewYork](http://twitter.com/UKUN_NewYork)

## UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SIXTH COMMITTEE,  
CONSIDERATION OF PREVENTION OF TRANSBOUNDARY HARM FROM  
HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES AND ALLOCATION OF LOSS IN THE CASE OF  
SUCH HARM (NEW YORK, 22 OCTOBER 2013)

STATEMENT BY MS. RUTH TOMLINSON  
ASSISTANT LEGAL ADVISER  
FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

22 OCTOBER 2013

Check against delivery

Mr. Chairman,

The United Kingdom commented on the form of the articles in 2007 and 2010, and in brief terms we do not consider that there have been any developments in the past three years which would necessitate a change in our position.

The United Kingdom continues to consider that there is no need for a convention on the prevention of transboundary harm or the allocation of loss. These subjects are already covered by a number of binding sector specific and regional instruments.

In the EU context, the EU Environmental Impact and Liability Directives largely reflect the articles and principles on transboundary harm.

Furthermore, the Espoo Convention, to which the UK is a party, obliges Parties to assess the environmental impact of certain activities and notify and consult other States if there is a likelihood of significant adverse transboundary environmental impact.

In the nuclear sector, there is already an extensive regime governing liability for nuclear incidents, namely the Paris Convention on nuclear third party liability and the Brussels Supplementary Convention.

The United Kingdom also queries the benefit of adopting a convention that assumes one-size-fits-all for all categories of transboundary harm. There is an obvious advantage in subject specific initiatives that are tailored to address different activities and potential harms. In the context of substances, for example, different arrangements are in place to control different transboundary harm hazards.

Against that background, the United Kingdom considers that a convention on the aforementioned topics is neither necessary nor desirable and that the articles and principles should remain as non-binding guidance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.