



PERMANENT MISSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF
SIERRA LEONE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

STATEMENT

by

MR. ABASS SALIEU KAMARA
Minister Counsellor/Legal Adviser

Resumed Session of the Sixth Committee
of the United Nations General Assembly

Crimes Against Humanity μ
Fourth Cluster: **International measures**
(Articles 13, 14 , and 15 and annex)

Seventy-Eight Session
3/4 April 2023

UNHQ, New York

[Please

Chair,

Co-Facilitators,

1.

warranting the requisite prevention and punishment as appropriate without any reservation, protection, or special treatment of a perpetrator.

4. As enshrined in Article VII of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, it is consistent with the more recent State practice when concluding multilateral treaties addressing specific international and transnational crimes, and therefore its inclusion is indeed crucial to crystallize State practice and consolidate customary international law.

5. On our part, given the implications in relation to our Extradition Act, 1974, and existing treaty obligations, we will continue to study the provisions of this important Article and its impact on implementation, including ensuring consistency. We appreciate the level of detail in Article 13, on the rights, obligations, and procedures applicable to extradition and the guide they will provide to States that may want to rely upon the provisions as a

for Crimes Against Humanity convention. We remain unconvinced that a three-tier model of dispute settlement is desirable in the context of the commission of one of the worst crimes known to international law. We consider the requirement to settle disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the future convention through negotiations in the first paragraph we considered as problematic, to which we had cited the moral gap that may occur when such negotiations involve the State as the perpetrator, thereby clouding the sincerity of such negotiations.

10. Similarly, the opt-in and opt-out system that Article 15 envisages while may be appropriate for truly reciprocal conventions, would also be problematic for the prohibition of crimes against humanity, which like genocide, is driven by more humanitarian compulsions. Experience and practice have already shown crimes. As we noted, it has been seen that in the last seven decades of having a dispute settlement clause for the genocide context, it can be seen that only a relatively small number of single or joint cases based on that dispute settlement clause have been initiated by States. This shows

15. To further provide useful guidance on this, we had previously highlighted some pertinent precedents namely, the Human Rights Committee and the Committee against Torture to enrich an approach to this proposal.

16. We continue to describe that the tenets of such a body should encapsulate the lessons learned and best practices developed by such bodies already in existence to lessen reporting burdens on States. It may be a State-