Editorial

No evaluation of the Rome Statute, however brief and preliminary, can afford to overlook the dissatisfaction of some states related to role of the International Criminal Court (ICC) on the fight against impunity. Despite commendable progress on activation of Statute amendment widening the subject matter of jurisdiction of the ICC, recent intense debate in African Union (AU) on withdrawal from ICC appears a cause of concern on its legitimacy and public support. These recent two vital simultaneous events at the ICC received mixed emotion both pain and pleasure at the same times. Also there has been consistent advocacy for the detailed study of legal aspects of novel “principle of complementarity” recognized as an important component of Rome Statute of ICC.

Earlier in 2014 the AU adopted a Protocol to give its regional court authority to prosecute grave crimes, while granting immunity for sitting heads of states and other senior government officials. That Protocol, which needs 15 ratifications before coming into force, has yet to be ratified by any country. Of greater importance, in January 2016, the AU decided to mandate its Open-Ended Committee on ICC to develop a “comprehensive strategy” that includes withdrawal from the ICC. The Committee met on April 11, 2016 and identified three conditions to avoid calling for withdrawal. The three conditions for remaining in the ICC are: Immunity under the ICC’s Rome Statute for sitting heads of state and heads of government and senior government officials; Intervention of the ICC in cases involving African states only after those cases have been submitted to the AU or AU judicial institutions; and reduction in the powers of the ICC prosecutor. Again, Crimea incident as “an international armed conflict between Ukraine and the Russian Federation” may provoke Russia to withdraw its signature from founding Rome Statute that established ICC.

Currently, 124 countries have ratified the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. 139 States have signed the Rome Statute. Of those states, 34 are African states (comprising 30 percent of the court’s membership), 28 States are Latin American and Caribbean States, 19 are Asia-Pacific States, 18 are Eastern European states and 25 are from Western Europe and other States. But the USA, China, India and the Russian Federation for example have not ratified the Rome Statute. Some of these countries have avoided joining the ICC out of concern for protecting its leaders from prosecution. The absence of three permanent members of the Security Council is particularly damaging to the Court’s effectiveness and credibility as those states have the power to block or refer situations that might be heard by the Court.

South Africa, Gambia and Burundi expressed their dissatisfaction with the Court. The leaders of many African Union member states have challenged the ICC on the basis that it has “targeted” Africa. This dissatisfaction has increased over the years, centering first upon the Prosecutor’s decision to issue an arrest warrant directed to Sudanese President Omar al Bashir, which resulted in efforts to get the Security Council to use Article 16 to defer the proceedings against him as well as a proposal to extend the possibility of deferral (for ongoing cases) to the General Assembly. Subsequently, with the election of ICC indictees Uhuru Kenyatta and William Ruto as President and Deputy President of Kenya respectively, the ICC Assembly of States Parties yielded to political pressure and amended the ICC’s Rules of Procedure and Evidence to permit them to be absent from their trials (subject to judicial approval) to perform “extraordinary public duties.”

In fact, six out of the nine African situations under ICC investigation came about as a result of requests or grants of jurisdictions by African governments – Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Mali, Uganda, and two requests from the Central African Republic.

Answer to the question why the ICC is only proceeding in situations in Africa can be attributed to various factors. However, William Schabas explanation deserve to be mentioned “…the prosecutor is nervous about going outside Africa because the Court bumps into permanent members of the Security Council, the Court bumps into powerful states, and Court’s taken a position of avoiding that kind of confrontation.”

Dr. E. M. Sudarsana Natchiappan
RECENT ACTIVITIES

Training Workshop on “Intellectual Property Rights and WTO Accountability-Scope of Patenting” for Indian Forest Officers

Two-day Training Workshop on Intellectual Property Right and WTO Accountability – Scope of Patenting for Indian Forest Service Officers sponsored by the Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change has been conducted by the ISIL on 14 and 15 July 2016. ISIL undertook following themes for discussion in the Programme: 1. International and National Patent Laws; 2. India-Scope of Patent; 3. Forest, TRIPS, Convention on Biological Diversity and Traditional Knowledge; and 4. Procedure of Patent. There were lectures and presentations on the above mentioned themes. The faculty of the training course consisted of eminent international law scholars. 21 IFS Officers participated in the Training Workshop.

A Special Lecture on “Legal Implications of the South China Sea Arbitration Award”

ISIL organized a Special Lecture on “Legal Implications of the South China Sea Arbitration Award” on 27 July 2016. The lecture was delivered by Prof. James Kraska, Howard S. Levie Professor of International Law, Stockton and Centre for the Study of International Law, United States Naval War College. Dr. E. M. S. Natchiappan, President, ISIL welcomed the speaker and Prof. S. K. Verma, Secretary General, ISIL gave the vote of thanks. Historic rights and historic title in law of the sea has been the focus of interaction. The lecture witnessed lively interactions and discussion by the participants.

Convocation and Inauguration of the P. G. Diploma Courses

ISIL organized the Convocation for awarding of Post Graduate Diploma Certificates on 1 September 2016. The ceremony was also marked to inaugurate the Post Graduate Diploma Courses academic session 2016-17 conducted by the Indian
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Academy of International Law and Diplomacy, a teaching wing of the Indian Society of International Law. Prof. S. K. Verma, Secretary General, ISIL welcomed and introduced the chief guest Hon’ble Justice J. R. Midha, Judge, Delhi High Court to deliver the inaugural and convocation address. Ms. Shivani Mishra received V. K. Krishna Menon Memorial Prize for securing the highest marks in the Post Graduate Diploma Course in International Law and Diplomacy; Dr. Gautam Kumar Pandey received K. Krishna Rao Memorial Prize for securing the highest marks in the Post Graduate Diploma Course in International Trade and Business Law; Ms. Pramanshi received Judge Nagendra Singh Memorial Prize for securing the highest marks in the Post Graduate Diploma Course in Human Rights, International Humanitarian and Refugee Law; Ms. Avani Kaushal received M. K. Nawaz Memorial Prize in the Post Graduate Diploma Course on Intellectual Property Rights Law; and Ravin Dubey topped in the P G Diploma Course on International Environmental Law.

**Induction Level Training Programme for the Grade IV Officers of the Indian Economic Service (IES)**

An Induction Level Training Programme for Indian Economic Services on *International and National Economic Law* sponsored by the Ministry of Finance, Government of India has been conducted by the ISIL at its premises from 12 September – 17 September 2016.

20 IES Officers participated in the course. There were lectures and presentations on a variety of themes of international and national economic law. The faculty of the orientation course consisted of eminent international law scholars. Prof. B. S. Chimni, Professor of International Law, JNU, New Delhi and Editor-in-Chief, IJIL gave the valedictory address and distributed certificates to officers.

**16th Henry Dunant Memorial Moot Court Competition (India National Round)**

16th Henry Dunant Memorial Moot Court Competition 2015 was held on 22-25 September 2016 at the ISIL. The Competition was inaugurated by Hon’ble Justice Madan B. Lokur, Judge, Supreme Court of India. 53 teams participated in the Competition. The Competition was conducted in three stages, quarter-final, semi-final and final rounds. The participants were judged on the basis of written memorials, appreciation of facts and law, advocacy skills, use of authorities and citations, general impression and court manners. Eminent professors, legal officers, Army personnel and international law scholars judged the teams in preliminary, quarter-final and semi-final rounds. H. E. Dr. Kennedy Gastra, Secretary General, AALCO, New Delhi, Prof. Bharat Desai, Professor, JNU, New Delhi and Prof. B. T. Kaul, Chairperson, Delhi Judicial Academy, Delhi were the final round judges. UILS, Punjab University, Chandigarh and NLSIU, Bangalore were the winner and runner up of the Competition respectively. Mr. Raghav Genodia, Government Law College, Mumbai was adjudged the Best Advocate; jointly Ms. Karnika Vallabh, USLLS, GGSIP University of Law, Chandigarh and Sonesh Jain, NIRM University, Ahmedabad won the Best Researcher award, and Maharashtra National Law School, Mumbai won Best Memorial award in this Competition. H. E. Dr. Kennedy gave the valedictory address on the occasion.

**Monthly Discussion Forum**

“Intricacies of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and the Non-Proliferation Regime: An Indian Perspective”, by Shri A. Vinod Kumar, Associate Fellow, IDSA, New Delhi on 8 July 2016.

“The Permanent Court of Arbitration Award on the South China Sea-Law and Politics”, by Dr. Nehginpao Kipgen, Associate Professor, Jindal School of International Affairs, O. P. Jindal Global University, Sonipat on 5 August 2016.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

UN Agrees to Appoint Human Rights Expert on Protection of LGBT

The UN Human Rights Council, on 1 July 2016, has voted to appoint an independent expert on protection from violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) people. The UN Human Rights Council debated the issue for nearly four hours before adopting a resolution to create the new post. Twenty-three Council members voted for the new position, 18 members against, and six abstained. After appointment of the experts, work on this issue will be effectively institutionalized at the Human Rights Council and there will regular reporting on these issues through the Council and the General Assembly. The expert, to be appointed in September for an initial 3-year term, will carry out country visits, take up individual allegations with Governments and work to support and protect human rights defenders. The position will look at issues related to people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender, but not intersex.

International Organization for Migration Joined UN System as a Related Organization

On 1 July 2016, China’s joined the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Earlier on 30 June 2016, IOM member states decided to join the United Nations system as a related organization. It is expected that IOM have a seat and a voice at the UN table and it could be seen that the UN will soon have a dedicated migration agency.

Subsequently, the United Nations General Assembly, on 25 July 2016, unanimously adopted a resolution approving an agreement to make the International Organization for Migration (IOM) part of the UN system as a related organization. A relationship agreement will not only formalizes this partnership, but also sets out an even closer cooperation between the two organizations while preserving the mandates and responsibilities of other UN organizations and sub-sidiary organs and agencies in the field of migration. IOM, which assisted an estimated 20 million migrants in 2015, is an intergovernmental organization with more than 9,500 staff and 450 offices worldwide. Founded in the wake of the World War II to resettle refugees from Europe, the organization celebrated its 65th anniversary in December 2015. IOM was granted Permanent Observer status to the UN General Assembly in 1992, and a cooperation agreement between IOM and the UN was signed in 1996.

UNCTAD : Nairobi Consensus

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), on 22 July 2016, wrapped up its fourteenth quadrennial conference, with delegations in Nairobi, Kenya reaching agreement on a framework that will guide the body’s work over the next four years, largely focussing on ensuring broad achievement of the new UN Sustainable Development Agenda. Known as the ‘Nairobi consensus, the outcome document culminated UNCTAD 14, which opened on 17 July 2016 and discussed the theme From Decisions to Actions, with the aim of contributing to the efforts to achieve the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Prepared under the responsibility of the Kenyan Government, the political declaration, known by its Swahili translation, the Azimio, represents a broad expression of the social and economic state of the world. More than 5,000 delegates from 149 countries also attended the UNCTAD Conference.

France’s Court Ruled to Suspend Seaside ban on Burkini

On 26 August 2016, The Council of State, the French Highest Court issued a ruling suspending the ban on the full-body burkini bathing suits designed for Muslim women in the town of Villeneuve-Loubet. On 25 August 2016, France’s Human Rights League had filed an appeal on the ban that was imposed by the authorities of Villeneuve-Loubet at French Riviera resort. Currently about 30 French towns prohibit burkinis.

State Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions Agree for Clearance of Cluster Bombs by 2030

An annual meeting of State Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions pact banning cluster bombs ended, on 7 September 2016, in Geneva, with an agreement on a target to complete by 2030...
clearance of these explosive remnants of war that kill large numbers of civilians. Cluster munitions, or unexploded ordnance, kill and injure large numbers of civilians and cause long lasting socio-economic problems. The Convention, which prohibits all use, production, transfer and stockpiling of these devices, entered into force on 1 August 2010, just two years after it opened for signature in the Norwegian capital, Oslo. To date, 119 states have joined the Convention. At the First Review Conference of the Convention held in Dubrovnik, Croatia, in September 2015, the State Parties adopted the Dubrovnik Action Plan, which lists concrete steps to implement the Convention in the period from 2015 to 2020. The Plan seeks to increase adherence to the treaty, assist State Parties to develop resourced plans for destroying stocks, clearing contaminated lands, providing risk-reduction education and strengthening national capacity for victim assistance, among other core work.

**ICC Finds Malian Extremist Guilty of War Crime in Destroying Historic Sites in Timbuktu**

The International Criminal Court (ICC), on 27 September 2016, found a Malian Islamist accused of destroying historical and religious monuments in the fabled city of Timbuktu guilty in the first-ever prosecution of the destruction of cultural heritage as a war crime. The judges sentenced Ahmad Al-Faqi Al-Mahdi, a member of a jihadist group linked to Al Qaeda, to nine years in prison for committing a war crime by deliberately destroying in 2012 nine mausoleums and the secret gate of the Sidi Yahia mosque in the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage site of Timbuktu in Mali. Earlier Mr. Al-Mahdi pleaded guilty to the charges, which consisted in attacking 10 historic and religious monuments in Timbuktu between around 30 June 2012 and 11 July 2012. All sites but one are on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

**Iran Institutes Proceedings Against the United States with regard to a Dispute concerning Alleged Violations of the 1955 Treaty of Amity**

The Islamic Republic of Iran (hereinafter “Iran”) instituted Proceedings, on 14 June 2016, against the United States of America before the International Court of Justice (ICJ), with regard to a dispute concerning “violations by the Government of the United States of America of the Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights between Iran and the United States of America which was signed in Tehran on 15 August 1955 and entered into force on 16 June 1957” (hereinafter “the 1955 Treaty”). The Applicant explains that the United States, having for many years taken “the position that Iran may be designated a State sponsoring terrorism (a designation which Iran strongly contests)”, has adopted a number of legislative and executive acts that have the practical effect of subjecting the assets and interests of Iran and Iranian entities, including those of the Central Bank of Iran (also known as “Bank Markazi”), to enforcement proceedings in the United States, even where such assets or interests “are found to be held by separate juridical entities . . . that are not party to the judgment on liability in respect of which enforcement is sought” and/or “are held by Iran or Iranian entities . . . and benefit from immunities from enforcement proceedings as a matter of international law, and as required by the [1955] Treaty”. Iran further argues that, as a consequence of these acts, “a wide series of claims have been determined, or are underway, against Iran and Iranian entities” and that United States courts “have repeatedly dismissed attempts by Bank Markazi to rely on the immunities to which such property is entitled” under United States law and the 1955 Treaty. It further maintains that “the assets of Iranian financial institutions and other Iranian companies have already been seized, or are in the process of being seized and transferred, or at risk of being seized and transferred, in a number of proceedings” and explains that, as of the date of its Application, United States courts “have awarded total damages of over US$ 56 billion . . . against Iran in respect
of its alleged involvement in various terrorist acts mainly outside the USA”.

The Applicant claims that the above-mentioned enactments and decisions “breach a number of provisions of the [1955] Treaty”. Iran thus “respectfully requests the Court to adjudge, order and declare as follows: That by its acts, including the acts referred to above and in particular its (a) failure to recognize the separate juridical status (including the separate legal personality) of all Iranian companies including Bank Markazi, and unfair and discriminatory treatment of such entities, and their property, which impairs the legally acquired rights and interests of such entities including enforcement of their contractual rights. It amounts to expropriation of the property of such entities; That the USA shall ensure that no steps shall be taken based on the executive, legislative and judicial acts (as referred to above) at issue in this case which are, to the extent determined by the Court, inconsistent with the obligations of the USA to Iran under the Treaty of Amity; That the USA is under an obligation to make full reparations to Iran for the violation of its international legal obligations in an amount to be determined by the Court at a subsequent stage of the proceedings. Iran reserves the right to introduce and present to the Court in due course a precise evaluation of the reparations owed by the USA.

**Ukraine’s UNCLOS Arbitration Claim against Russia**

On September 14, 2016 Ukraine instituted arbitration proceedings against the Russian Federation under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (“UNCLOS”). Ukraine asks the arbitral tribunal to enforce its maritime rights by ordering the Russian Federation to cease its internationally wrongful actions in the relevant waters, to provide Ukraine with appropriate guarantees that it will respect Ukraine’s rights under UNCLOS, and to make full reparation to Ukraine for the injuries the Russian Federation has caused.

The new case is a maritime claim filed under Annex VII of the UNCLOS Convention and relates to potentially oil-rich waters in the Black Sea, the Adjacent Sea of Azov, and the narrow Kerch Strait that links the two seas. This part has been annexed by Russia in March 2014, and Ukraine is now bringing claims stating that Russia’s illegal acts have “usurped and interfered” with Ukraine’s maritime rights. Ukraine and Russia agreed to settle the disputes through binding arbitration and not by ICJ or ITLOS. Importantly, Russia and Ukraine under Article 298 made a declaration excludes jurisdiction relating to sea boundary delimitations.

Earlier in 2015 Ukraine had filed series of investment cases against Russia for instances *Ukrenfta v. Russia* and *PJSC Ukreenafta v. Russia* at the PCA.


On 9 September 2016, India requested consultations with the United States regarding certain measures of the United States relating to domestic content requirements and subsidies instituted by the governments of the states of Washington, California, Montana, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Michigan, Delaware and Minnesota, in the energy sector. India claimed that the measures appear to be inconsistent with: Articles III:4, XVI:1 and XVI:4 of the GATT 1994; Article 2.1 of the TRIMS Agreement; and Articles 3.1(b), 3.2, 5(a), 5(c), 6.3(a), 6.3(c) and 25 of the SCM Agreement.

**UNCITRAL Works in Period of July-September 2016**

The Model Law on Secured Transactions was adopted by UNCITRAL on 1 July 2016. The Model Law 2016 deals with security interests in all types of tangible and intangible movable property, such as goods, receivables, bank accounts, negotiable instruments, negotiable documents, non-intermediated securities and intellectual property with few exceptions, such as intermediated securities.

The UNCITRAL adopted Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (2016) (“ODR”) at its meeting in New York on 5 July 2016. This is explanatory text. UNCITRAL’s work
on ODR is a response to the sharp increase in online cross-border transactions, and the consequent need for a mechanism for resolving disputes that arise from such transactions. ODR is designed to assist buyers and sellers in resolving their disputes in a simple, fast, flexible and secure manner, without the need for physical presence at a meeting or hearing. The Technical Notes on ODR are descriptive and non-binding.

The UNCITRAL adopted the second edition of the UNCITRAL Notes on Organizing Arbitral Proceedings (the “Notes”) at its meeting in New York yesterday, 7 July 2016. This is explanatory text. The Notes are a key resource for parties to arbitration and arbitration practitioners. They list and describe the typical matters for consideration in the organization of an arbitral proceeding and cover a broad range of situations. The Notes were originally finalized by UNCITRAL in 1996 and, in light of evolving practice, the Commission started to work on updating them in 2014.

Human Rights Council at its 33rd Regular Session Adopts six Resolutions, Appoints Special Procedures Mandate Holders

The Human Rights Council, on 30 September 2016, adopted six resolutions, appointed five Special Procedures mandate holders and seven members of its Advisory Committee, and then closed its thirty-third session. The Council adopted texts on the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the mandate of the Working Group on arbitrary detention; the mandates of the Independent Experts on Sudan, and on the Central African Republic; the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and enhancement of technical cooperation in the field of human rights. By virtue of the adopted texts, the Council decided to amend the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples to provide the Council with expertise and advice on the rights of indigenous peoples as set out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and ask it to prepare an annual study on the status of the rights of indigenous peoples worldwide in the achievement of the ends of the Declaration. The Council also extended the mandate of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention for a further period of three years.

Taking action on texts under the agenda item on technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights, the Council renewed the mandate of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Sudan for a period of one year and requested him to present a report on the implementation of the mandate, including recommendations on technical assistance and capacity building, for the Council’s consideration at its thirty-sixth session. It also renewed, for a period of one year, the mandate of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic. It requested the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to prepare a report on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo during the electoral context, and present it during an enhanced interactive dialogue during the Human Rights Council’s thirty-sixth session.

The Council also decided that the theme for the annual thematic panel discussion on technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights that would be held during its thirty-fifth session would be “A decade of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the Human Rights Council: challenges and the way forward”, and requested the Office of the High Commissioner to prepare a report on the progress and challenges in the main activities to enhance technical cooperation and capacity-building undertaken since the establishment of the Human Rights Council.

During this last meeting of its thirty-third regular session, the Council decided to appoint as members of its Advisory Committee: Lazhari Bouzid (Algeria) and Mona Omar (Egypt) for the vacant seats from the African States; Xinsheng Liu (China) and Kaoru Obata (Japan) for the vacant seats from the Asia-Pacific States; Mikhail Aleksandrovich Lebedev (Russia) for the vacant seat from the Eastern European States; Carla Hanania De Varela (El Salvador) for the vacant seat from the Latin American and Caribbean States; and Jean Ziegler (Switzerland) for the vacant seat from the Western European and other States.

The Council also decided to appoint Ms. Cecilia Jimenez-Damary from
the Philippines as the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons; Mr. Nils Melzer from Switzerland as the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; Ms. Asma Jahangir from Pakistan as the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran; Ms. Elina Steinerte from Latvia as member from Eastern European States for the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; and Mr. Vitit Muntarbhorn from Thailand as the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The thirty-fourth regular session of the Human Rights Council will be held from 27 February to 24 March 2017.

In a resolution adopted by a vote of 34 in favour, two against and 11 abstentions, the Council, on 29 September 2016 appointed for a period of three years a Special Rapporteur on the right to development to, inter alia, contribute to the work of the Working Group on the Right to Development and to the promotion, protection and fulfilment of the right to development in the context of the coherent and integrated implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

**New Members of Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)**

Djibouti deposited its instrument of accession to the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands, the depositary of the Convention, on 17 February 2016. It thereby became a Member State of the PCA, effective 17 April 2016. Djibouti is the 119th Member State of the PCA.

Earlier at its meetings on 9 and 14 March 2016, the PCA Administrative Council discussed the status of the State of Palestine in relation to the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. By a vote of 54 in favour and 25 abstentions, the Council concluded its consideration by taking note that the State of Palestine is a Contracting Party to the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, and a Member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in accordance with the letter of the depositary of the Convention, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands, dated 13 November 2015. Palestine has thereby become the 118th Member State of the PCA on 29 December 2015.

The Commonwealth of The Bahamas deposited its instrument of accession to the 1907 Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands, the depositary of the Convention, on 14 April 2016. It thereby became a Member State of the PCA, effective 13 June 2016. The Bahamas is the 120th Member State of the PCA.

At its meeting on 13 June 2016, the PCA Administrative Council considered its 4 January 2016 decision to keep the adherence of Kosovo to the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of 1907 under review. By a vote of 41 in favour, 24 against, and 13 abstentions, the Council decided to withdraw in its entirety its decision of 4 January 2016. As a result, Kosovo is considered to have become a Member State of the PCA on 5 January 2016. This brings the total number of PCA Member States to 121.

### Forthcoming Events

- **Two-day Workshop on Corporate Law: International and National Perspective**, 15 - 16 October 2016
- **Two-day Training Programme for Awareness/Sensitization on IPR for MSMEs**, 4 - 5 November 2016
- **A Special Lecture on “Contribution of Space Law and Policy to Space Governance and Space Security in the 21st Century” by Mr. Niklas Hedman, Chief of the Committee, Policy and Legal Affairs Section of the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), 17 November 2016**
- **Round Table Discussion in Memory of Judge Nagendra Singh, 25 November 2016**
- **Sixth Winter Course on Settlement of Disputes in International Law, 26 - 30 December 2016**
- **One Day Training Programme for Awareness/Sensitization on IPRs for MSMEs, 4 March 2017**
- **Human Rights Day Seminar, 9 December 2016**