## Fifth Session of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Working Group on Permanent Premises, 29 November 2006

## Informal and Unofficial Verbatim Notes from the ASP Working Group on the Permanent Premises, 29 November 2006 (Morning Session)

These notes are not an official transcript of the meetings, but may serve as an informal and general overview of the proceedings. Please do not use these notes for official purposes.

<u>Chair:</u> Good morning. What I propose to do this morning is to adopt the draft resolution and the draft report of the Working Group on Permanent Premises. We did have an informal meeting yesterday afternoon in which the issue of language was put forward. There was a general consensus on that matter.

I wanted to start with operational paragraph 6 as amended as in the document - whether we can accept it as it stands; so let me open the floor to see if there are any comments or questions on this paragraph. [Silence] So there are no questions or comments then we can finalize the draft resolution. [Silence] We have finalized the draft resolution. Thank you.

Let's turn to the draft report of the Working Group on Permanent Premises. I will read the 3 paragraphs:

- 1. The Working Group on Permanent Premises was established by the Assembly at the First Meeting of its 5<sup>th</sup> session, on 23 November 2006. Following consultations with the Bureau, the President of the Assembly appointed Mr. Masud Husain (Canada) to serve as coordinator of the Working Group. The Working Group held 3 meetings on 25, 27 and 29 November 2006.
- 2. The Working Group had before it several reports on the issue of permanent premises and decided to recommend to the Assembly of States Parties the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the annex of this report.
- 3. Most of the discussions of the Working Group focused on operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. Some delegations made the point that a pre-selection process would be required only if a non-integrated approach was followed whereby the selection of the architect would be separate from, and prior to, the tender for construction. As the nature of the architectural design competition was still undecided, it was understood that operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would not prejudge the decision on whether to have an integrated or non-integrated approach to the project.

This is the draft report. I would now like to see if there are any comments or questions on these 3 paragraphs. So I open the floor for that purpose. [Silence] I see there are no comments. Can we adopt the report then? [Silence] It is so adopted with the annexes. Thank you very much for your cooperation and for carrying this through. This will be transmitted to the plenary. If you have any questions about linguistic translations, please refer to the Secretariat. [Applause]

Prepared by the European Law Student's Association (ELSA) and the Council for American Students in International Negotiations (CASIN)