

Islamic Republic of I R A N

Permanent Mission to the United Nations

Statement by
Ali Nasimfar
Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran
Before
The Sixth Committee of the
74st Session of the United Nations General Assembly
on
"Diplomatic Protection"
(Agenda item 80)

New York, 15 October 2019

My delegation takes note of the report of Secretary-General on this item contained in document A/74/143, and would like to make the following comments on this topic.

Diplomatic protection remains a complex and multifaceted issue since it involves both the rights of individuals and the rights of States. Any legal regime on diplomatic protection should be based on a thorough understanding of these two elements and a proper balance between rights of individuals and those of the States. It is doubtful that the present set of Draft Articles as proposed by the ILC and reflected in resolution A/62/67 could satisfy these concerns.

We are of the view that some of the draft articles on diplomatic protection could not be deemed as reflective of customary international law. For instance, the draft Article relating to diplomatic protection of stateless persons (Article 8), or the one relating to individuals with multiple nationality (Article 7), do not feature a representative practice of states accepted as law. These Articles have been formulated either on the basis of the case-law of some regional tribunals or on the basis of the case-law of some *sui generis* tribunals; these case-laws could hardly reflect existing general international law.

We took note of the commentary of Article 7 in which explanations are given about the use of term predominant instead of dominant or effective nationality to convey element of relativity. However, it would be difficult to define a decisive and harmonized criterion to establish predominance of a nationality over another nationality. Moreover, any interpretation of this term will be subjective interpretation based on wide range of undetermined elements which make the way open for abusive processes. Therefore, in our view this provision does not create a normative

solution; rather, it increases uncertainty and ambiguity. It also goes contrary to the constitution of those countries which do not accept dual nationality or do not recognize its legal effects arising from secondary nationality of their citizens. In these cases, the exercise of diplomatic protection by one State of nationality against another State of nationality would create uncertainty and ambiguity in obligations of states. Furthermore, draft Article 15 (b) and (d) either looks vague or is hypothetical far from realities on the ground.

It is worth noting that ILC has pointed out in its commentary that the draft articles are not going to deal with primary rules. However, in some provisions, we see contrary to this expression. For instance, it is for each State to decide in accordance with its laws and regulations, who its national are. In this context, the final phrase in draft article 4 which stresses that the acquisition of nationality must not be inconsistent with international law and the example mentioned therein is not so clear.

In the end, we note that Member States have different views on the future form of these draft Articles. This is indicative of the fact that States still need more time to further consider the content of the Draft Articles. My delegation believes that time is still not ripe to elaborate the Draft Articles into a legally binding instrument until and unless certain concerns of Member States are duly met.