



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,  
SEVENTY-FIRST SESSION, AGENDA ITEM 80,  
CONSIDERATION OF PREVENTION OF TRANSBOUNDARY HARM FROM  
HAZARDOUS ACTIVITIES AND ALLOCATION OF LOSS IN THE CASE OF  
SUCH HARM  
(NEW YORK, 20 OCTOBER 2016)

STATEMENT BY MR. CHRISTOPHER STEPHEN  
ASSISTANT LEGAL ADVISER  
FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

20 OCTOBER 2016

Check against delivery

Mr. Chairman,

The United Kingdom wishes to thank the Secretary-General for his report on this agenda item compiling the decisions of international courts, tribunals and others bodies (A/71/98). The United Kingdom has also taken note of the comments and observations made by Governments this year, as reflected in the Secretary-General's reports (A/71/136) and (A/71/136/Add.1).

The United Kingdom previously commented on the form of the respective draft articles and principles in 2007, 2010 and 2013. 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 remains of the view that there is no need for a convention on the prevention of transboundary harm or the allocation of loss in the case of such harm. These subjects are already covered by a number of binding sector-specific and regional instruments, examples of which were provided in the United Kingdom's statements to the Sixth Committee on this subject in 2010 and 2013.

Further, the United Kingdom would query the benefit of adopting a convention that assumes one-size-fits-all for all categories of transboundary harm. In the United Kingdom's view, 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 draft articles and principles should remain as non-binding guidance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.