

Chapter 7

International Organizations

A. GENERAL

Responsibility of International Organizations

On October 27, 2009, Todd Buchwald, Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs, Department of State, addressed the UN General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee on the report of the International Law Commission ("ILC" or "Commission") on its sixty-first session, U.N. Doc. A/64/10, available at <http://untreaty.un.org/ilc/reports/2009/2009report.htm>. Excerpts follow from Mr. Buchwald's statement, addressing the ILC's draft articles concerning the responsibility of international organizations. The full text of Mr. Buchwald's statement is available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/131022.htm>. See also *Digest 2007* at 399-401 and *Digest 2008* at 381-82.

* * * *

With respect to the topic Responsibility of International Organizations, the United States appreciates the Commission's work, and Professor [Giorgio] Gaja's efforts [as Special Rapporteur for the topic] in particular, in generating a common set of articles on the responsibility of international organizations. We remain concerned, however, about the approach that the Commission has taken in this area. Relying too heavily on the articles on State Responsibility risks eliding the differences between states and international organizations, not to mention the wide differences among international organizations. The draft articles include provisions that apply to only a small fraction of all international organizations. For example, as the commentary notes, draft article 20, concerning self defense, is likely to be relevant to the acts only of those international organizations that administer a territory or deploy an armed force. We question the utility of including an article of such limited applicability. The draft articles also include provisions that will rarely, if ever, come into play for the vast majority of international organizations. For example, we question the need for draft article 23, concerning distress.

We welcome the principle that appears to underlie draft article 63, which limits the application of the draft articles in areas that are governed by special rules of international law including the rules of particular international organizations. This principle is an important step in addressing the differences among international organizations. We remain uncertain, however, that it will alleviate our concerns regarding the Commission's basic approach, and intend to review carefully this new article, its consequences for the other draft articles, as well as the other new and revised draft articles. We welcome the Commission's invitation to provide more detailed comments and observations by January 1, 2011.

* * * *

B. UNITED NATIONS

1. UN Reform

a. Security Council

During 2009 the General Assembly continued its considerations of Security Council reform, and the United States, as it had in the past, continued to participate in the discussions. On February 19, 2009, during informal consultations on the issue, Ambassador Susan E. Rice, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, outlined the principles that would guide the United States as the General Assembly began the next phase of its work. Among other things, the United States was “not linking Security Council reform to other aspects of UN reform,” Ambassador Rice noted. “We view both as important and will pursue them in tandem.” See <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/february/127091.htm>. On November 13, 2009, during the General Assembly’s annual debate on Security Council reform and the Council’s annual report to the Assembly, Ambassador Alejandro D. Wolff, Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement elaborating on the themes Ambassador Rice had raised in February. Ambassador Wolff’s statement, excerpted below, is available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/131936.htm>.

* * * *

As we stated during the first three rounds of these negotiations and will continue to elaborate in more detail in those negotiations, the United States supports expansion of the Security Council. Such expansion, however, should neither diminish the Council’s effectiveness nor its efficiency. Let me briefly summarize key elements of my government’s position:

The United States is open in principle to a limited expansion of both permanent and non-permanent members.

In terms of categories of membership, the United States strongly believes that any consideration of an expansion of permanent members must be country-specific in nature.

In determining which countries merit permanent membership, we will take into account the ability of countries to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and other purposes of the United Nations.

As we have previously stated, the United States is not open to an enlargement of the Security Council by a Charter amendment that changes the current veto structure.

To enhance the prospects for success, whatever formula that emerges for an expansion of Council membership should have in mind Charter requirements for ratification.

We remain committed to a serious, deliberate effort, working with other member states, to find a way forward that both adapts the Security Council to current global realities and enhances the ability of the Security Council to carry out its mandate and effectively meet the challenges of the new century.

* * * *

b. System-wide coherence: Improving UN efforts concerning gender equality and women's empowerment

On September 14, 2009, the United States joined consensus when the General Assembly adopted a resolution on "system-wide coherence." U.N. Doc. A/RES/63/311. Most significantly, one section of the resolution focused on ways the United Nations could support gender equality and women's empowerment by strengthening UN institutions. The resolution expressed strong support for a key U.S. objective: the consolidation of four UN offices and divisions addressing women's issues into one composite entity. After the Assembly adopted the resolution, Ambassador Rosemary A. DiCarlo, U.S. Alternate Representative to the United Nations for Special Political Affairs, delivered a statement explaining the U.S. position on the resolution. Excerpts below from Ambassador DiCarlo's statement provide U.S. views on the establishment of a new entity to improve the UN's efforts to assist women. The full text of the U.S. statement is available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/september/129219.htm>. For additional background, see the June 22 statement of John F. Sammis, Deputy U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council, during informal consultations of the General Assembly, available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/125910.htm>.*

* Editor's note: On July 2, 2010, the United States joined consensus when the General Assembly adopted a resolution to merge the four existing UN bodies addressing women's issues into one new entity, UN Women or the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. U.N. Doc. A/RES/64/289. The new consolidated agency is mandated to strengthen gender equality and empower women worldwide, acting both as a secretariat and conducting country-level operational activities. U.S. statements on the General Assembly's action are available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2010/143935.htm> and <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2010/143927.htm>; see also the statement issued by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, available at www.unwomen.org/2010/07/statement-by-the-un-secretary-general-on-the-creation-of-un-women. *Digest 2010* will discuss relevant aspects of the decision.

. . . The broad support for this resolution is heartening. It shows that after several years of intense consultations, member states have come together to take a number of practical decisions to further our shared objective of a more effective and coherent UN development system.

We strongly endorse the resolution's call for consolidating OSAGI [Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women], UN/DAW [Division for Advancement of Women], UNIFEM [UN Development Fund for Women], and INSTRAW [International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women] into a composite entity headed by an Under Secretary-General. Over the past several months, there has been a growing realization that a composite entity offers the best hope for improving how the UN can help women worldwide.

We are confident that this consolidation will improve the situation in the field. Developing nations stand to gain from the changes that the composite entity will effect on the ground—progress necessary to reach the Millennium Development Goals. All nations will benefit from advances the entity will bring about on women's equality, empowerment, and rights. It is essential that the head of agency be an Under Secretary-General. We ask Secretary-General Ban to move expeditiously on appointing an Under Secretary-General with in-depth knowledge, a strong track record on gender issues, and credibility within the women's movement.

Member states still need to decide on many details involving the composite entity, including questions of staffing, funding, governance, and reporting lines. These are important questions, and the United States stands ready to work with our colleagues on these issues. The sooner the Under Secretary-General is in place, the sooner he or she can offer the benefit of his or her views to member states.

In accordance with OP 3 of the resolution, we look forward to seeing comprehensive proposals on the gender entity developed as quickly as possible within the next UN General Assembly, so that intergovernmental deliberations on the entity's parameters can get underway.

* * * *

c. Internal justice system

On December 24, 2008, the United States joined consensus when the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the reform of the UN's system of internal justice. U.N. Doc. A/RES/63/253. On October 5, 2009, during the Sixth Committee's annual debate on "Administration of Justice," Mark A. Simonoff, Counselor, U.S. Mission to the United Nations, discussed U.S. views on the reform effort. Mr. Simonoff's statement, excerpted below, is available at <http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/130295.htm>.

* * * *

On December 24, 2008, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 63/253. This resolution was a landmark achievement for the Administration of Justice at the United Nations, constituting a major milestone in the reform of the United Nations. The resolution, among other things, adopted the statutes of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal and the United Nations Appeals Tribunal. These two new judicial bodies, together with other innovative reforms, will bring staff

dispute resolution at the United Nations into the 21st Century. We are confident that the establishment of the two Tribunals will have a significant positive impact on the transparency, fairness, efficiency, and accountability of the United Nations personnel system.

Article 7, paragraph 1 of the statute of the Dispute Tribunal, and Article 6, paragraph 1 of the statute of the Appeals Tribunal, provided that the rules of procedure of each tribunal shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly. Paragraph 29 of Resolution 63/253 requested the Secretary-General to submit the rules for approval not later than the General Assembly's 64th Session and decided that until then the Tribunals may apply the rules of procedure on a provisional basis. An action item for the Sixth Committee at this session is to review and decide whether to recommend for approval the Rules of Procedure of each Tribunal.

Article 7 of the statute of the Dispute Tribunal and Article 6 of the statute of the Appeals Tribunal mandated that certain provisions be contained in the Rules. As we read them, the Rules of Procedure appear to be consistent with the statute of each Tribunal. We are, of course, interested in the views of other delegations.

The UN Dispute Tribunal and UN Appeals Tribunal, as provided for in Resolution 63/253, only became operational in July of this year. As the General Assembly recognized, the new system needs time before one can make a full assessment of its work. Therefore, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to conduct a review of the new system and report thereon to the General Assembly at its 65th Session, rather than at its 64th Session. Similarly, the General Assembly decided to carry out, at its 65th Session, a review of the statutes of the Tribunals, in light of the experience gained.

The Ad Hoc Committee of the Sixth Committee, which met earlier this year, examined outstanding legal aspects of administration of justice, focusing in particular on the scope of the system. At the Ad Hoc Committee, the United States shared some ideas about a possible approach to alternative remedies for personal service contractors. The Ad Hoc Committee recommended that a working group of the Sixth Committee be established with a view to continuing the discussion of the outstanding legal aspects of the administration of justice, taking into account the deliberations in the Ad Hoc Committee and bearing in mind the decision of the General Assembly to revert to the issue of the scope of the system at its 65th Session. We look forward to participating in further discussions of outstanding legal issues, including scope, at the working group over the next few days. The United States remains interested in exploring feasible alternatives to including non-UN-staff individuals in the formal system, and is interested in the views of other delegations about other alternative approaches to address this issue.

* * * *

d. Criminal accountability of UN officials and experts on mission

On October 13, 2009, Mary McLeod, Legal Adviser, U.S. Mission to the United Nations, addressed the General Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee on promotion of accountability for crimes committed by UN officials and experts on mission, including those individuals serving on peacekeeping missions. Excerpts follow from Ms. McLeod's statement, which is available in full at www.state.gov/s/l/c8183.htm.

* * * *

We welcome the Secretary-General's report on Criminal Accountability of United Nations officials and experts on mission, that includes the information provided by some governments on the extent to which they have domestic jurisdiction over crimes of a serious nature committed by their nationals while serving as UN officials or experts on mission. We also appreciate the information submitted by certain governments concerning their cooperation with the United Nations in the exchange of information and the facilitation of investigation and prosecutions of such individuals. We look forward to learning about efforts undertaken by other governments in that regard.

We commend the United Nations on its efforts to address this important issue, including, in particular, its continued efforts to train UN peacekeepers on proscribed activity for such personnel, with an emphasis on current rules, guidance and procedures relevant to conduct and discipline. We also appreciate the UN's efforts to refer credible allegations against UN officials and experts on mission to the State of the alleged offender's nationality during the July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 reporting period. We urge States to which individuals were repatriated during that period to take appropriate action with regard to those individuals and report to the United Nations on the disposition of the cases. States must play a key role in curbing abuses. All UN Member States stand to benefit from the Secretariat's reporting on efforts taken by States to investigate and prosecute referred cases.

* * * *

Finally, with respect to the outstanding issue of the possible negotiation of a multilateral convention on criminal accountability of UN staff and experts on mission, we continue to question whether negotiation of such a convention would present the most efficient or effective means through which to ensure accountability. A convention that merely closes theoretical gaps in jurisdiction may not significantly contribute to addressing the crimes at issue, particularly if the impediments to accountability lie elsewhere. We urge States to redouble their efforts to develop practical ways to address the underlying causes of such impediments.

* * * *

2. General Assembly Credentials Committee

On September 15, 2009, the UN General Assembly appointed the United States to the Credentials Committee for the General Assembly's sixty-fourth session. Brazil, China, Jamaica, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Spain, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia also were appointed. Under Rule 28 of the General Assembly Rules of Procedure, the Credentials Committee is mandated to examine representatives' credentials and to report to the General Assembly. U.N. Doc. A/520/Rev.17.

At the Credentials Committee's meeting on December 8, 2009, some members expressed concerns about accepting the credentials submitted by the governments of Guinea and Madagascar, given the political

developments in both states. U.N. Doc. A/64/571. See Chapter 16.A.4.b. and 16.A.4.d. for discussion of U.S. measures taken against Guinea and Madagascar in 2009; www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2824.htm for information concerning the December 2008 coup d'état in Guinea and subsequent developments; and www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5460.htm for information concerning the undemocratic transfer of power in Madagascar in March 2009. The United States joined consensus in a Committee decision to accept the Chairperson's proposal to defer the review of the credentials for the two states, on the understanding that both countries' representatives could participate provisionally in the General Assembly session on the same basis as other accredited members until the Committee reviewed the issue and provided a recommendation to the General Assembly. The Committee's report discussed the Chairperson's proposal, the Committee's acceptance of it, and the Committee's agreement to accept member states' credentials for the General Assembly session, subject to the Committee's decision concerning Guinea and Madagascar. U.N. Doc. A/64/571.

On December 16, 2009, the United States joined consensus when the General Assembly adopted a resolution approving the Credentials Committee's report and its recommendations. U.N. Doc. A/RES/64/126.

3. Observer Status at the World Health Organization: Taiwan

In a press statement issued April 29, 2009, Robert Wood, Acting State Department Spokesman, provided U.S. views on the World Health Organization's invitation to Taiwan to attend its 2009 World Health Assembly as an observer. Mr. Wood stated:

The United States welcomes the announcement that the World Health Organization (WHO) has invited Taiwan to attend this year's World Health Assembly (WHA), the supreme governing body of the WHO, as an observer under the name "Chinese Taipei." We have long supported Taiwan's meaningful participation in the WHO, including observer status at the WHA. We look forward to the participation of Taiwan at the WHA and the benefits Taiwan's public health expertise will bring to the international community.

The statement is also available at www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2009/04/122401.htm. The World Health Assembly took place May 18–22, 2009.

C. OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Organization of American States

a. Resolution on Cuba

On June 3, 2009, the United States joined consensus when the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (“OAS”) adopted a resolution on Cuba. See AG/RES.2438 (XXXIX–O/09), available at www.oas.org/en/about/general_assembly.asp. Based on a text that Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton proposed, the resolution resolved that the 1962 resolution of the Eighth Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs acting under the Inter–American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which excluded the Cuban government from participation in the Inter–American system, would no longer be effective in the OAS. It also resolved “[t]hat the participation of the Republic of Cuba in the OAS will be the result of a process of dialogue initiated at the request of the Government of Cuba, and in accordance with the practices, purposes, and principles of the OAS.” Secretary Clinton issued a statement, set forth below, following the OAS action. Secretary Clinton’s statement is also available at www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/06/124305.htm.

The member nations of the OAS showed flexibility and openness today, and as a result we reached a consensus that focuses on the future instead of the past: Cuba can come back into the OAS in the future if the OAS decides that its participation meets the purposes and principles of the organization, including democracy and human rights. Many member countries originally sought to lift the 1962 suspension and allow Cuba to return immediately, without conditions. Others agreed with us that the right approach was to replace the suspension—which has outlived its purpose after nearly half a century—with a process of dialogue and a future decision that will turn on Cuba’s commitment to the organization’s values. I am pleased that everyone came to agree that Cuba cannot simply take its seat and that we must put Cuba’s participation to a determination down the road—if it ever chooses to seek reentry. If and when the day comes to make that determination, the United States will continue to defend the principles of the Inter-American Democratic Charter and other fundamental tenets of the organization. This outcome is in keeping with our forward-looking, principled approach to relations with Cuba and our hemisphere.

We must now build on this success by meeting our goals with actions that move us beyond rhetoric to results, and advance the mission which each of our nations have pledged to pursue: strengthening good governance, democratic institutions, an unwavering commitment to fundamental human rights and freedoms, and the rule of law—the underpinnings of democracy and the founding principles of this organization.

In a press briefing that day, excerpted below, Ambassador Thomas A. Shannon, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, and Dan Restrepo, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for

Western Hemisphere Affairs at the National Security Council, provided additional U.S. views on the OAS's action. The full text of the briefing is available at www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/2009/124309.htm.

* * * *

MR. RESTREPO: . . . Today has been a historic day for the inter-American system. You've seen two things occur in a resolution passed by consensus by the organization, one that leaves without effect the 1962 suspension of the current government of Cuba from participation in the OAS, and second that establishes a path forward that has multiple steps to it, beginning with whether the Cuban Government asks to come back to the organization or not, a question that may be complicated for that government given what it has been saying about the organization in recent weeks and actually throughout the last 40 years, but a process that is clearly enunciated on the face of the resolution that it has to be in accord with the basic principles, purposes, and practices of the OAS, which itself is defined in the resolution to be based on the OAS Charter and other fundamental instruments that defend democracy, self-determination, non-interference, human rights, development, and security.

So what we've seen today is really a testament to the hard work of multilateral diplomacy. A couple of weeks ago, if you had stopped and asked all the countries in the Western Hemisphere what they wanted to do with the 1962 resolution, they would [have] supported a three-line resolution . . . lifting the 1962 resolution and allowing Cuba to automatically return to the OAS. The United States and other countries from various parts in the hemisphere fought, defended, and prevailed in saying that this was not an automatic process, that yes, . . . let's not become prisoners of the past, but let us ensure that we are defending the basic principles of democracy and human rights and non-intervention and non-interference as the path forward to Cuba's return to the organization.

Simply put, for Cuba to return to the organization, the organization has to agree that Cuba is abiding by the same rules that everybody else is abiding by. That is a historic achievement. We think it is an important day that reflects a policy that listens to the concerns of the region with respect to lifting the '62 suspension and defend[s] the core principles of the Americas shared by the United States, all in defense of ensuring that they are shared by and enjoyed by all the people of the hemisphere, including the people of Cuba. So instead of being focused on an argument that is nearly 50 years old that has done little to advance the cause of freedom for the Cuban people, we can return . . . the focus . . . to the realities of today, and to the realities of the issues not just in Cuba but throughout the Americas.

* * * *

ASSISTANT SECRETARY SHANNON: . . . [T]he resolution makes very clear that the process by which Cuba must follow in order to reenter the OAS, requires first that Cuba request permission. Secondly, that it enter into a dialogue with the relevant organs of the OAS, and that that dialogue and the decision rendered by the OAS must be in accord with the practices, purposes, and principles of the OAS. And the resolution makes very clear that the fundamental instruments and documents in the OAS, like the Inter-American Democratic Charter, will be the guiding documents as the OAS engages with Cuba.

. . . [W]e've lifted an historical impediment while facing up to the challenge of today, which is . . . how does the OAS, an organization committed to democracy, relate to a country that is not

democratic? And how does the OAS and the inter-American system, which is characterized by open societies and market-based economies, relate to a country that has a closed society and a closed economy? And in this regard, . . . the OAS has remained true to its core principles and purposes. And this was the result of leadership by the United States and by our partner countries, but especially by Secretary Clinton.

And I'd like to highlight the fact that the resolution that was approved today was based on a resolution presented by Secretary Clinton yesterday, following extensive conversation and negotiation with a broad range of partners. And so it is the product of a collaborative dialogue with key partners around the hemisphere. And it was such a powerful document and such a powerful coalition of countries that those countries that felt uncomfortable with aspects of it, ultimately were not able to change it.

* * * *

. . . [I]t's important to understand also that . . . we were able to . . . get the ALBA [Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas: Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Dominica, Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines] countries to commit to broad instruments . . . like the Inter-American Democratic Charter. But also we were able to strengthen the OAS as an institution, because one of . . . the bigger fears going into this is that a breakdown in talks here was going to provoke divisions in the different sub-regions of the hemisphere, but also within the OAS. And what we have done, I believe, is strengthen the OAS as an institution, and that is an important goal.

* * * *

b. Resolutions on Honduras

On June 28, 2009, after a coup d'état in Honduras that resulted in the removal of the country's democratically elected constitutional leader, President Jose Manuel Zelaya, the United States joined consensus when the Permanent Council of the OAS unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the coup, demanding President Zelaya's reinstatement, and stating that no government arising from the coup would be recognized. See CP/RES. 953 (1700/09), available at www.oas.org/consejo/resolutions/res953.asp. On July 1, 2009, the United States joined consensus when the Thirty-Seventh Special Session of the OAS General Assembly adopted a resolution condemning the coup, reaffirming that President Zelaya was the constitutional President of Honduras, demanding his immediate, safe, and unconditional return to his constitutional functions, and reaffirming that no government arising from the coup would be recognized. The resolution also directed the OAS Secretary General to pursue diplomatic initiatives to secure President Zelaya's reinstatement and the restoration of democracy and the rule of law, and stated that if those efforts did not succeed within 72 hours, the Special General Assembly would suspend Honduras from the OAS. See AG/RES. 1 (XXXVII-E/09) rev. 1, available at www.oas.org/consejo/sp/AG/Documentos/AG04665E04.doc.

On July 4, 2009, the United States joined consensus when the Thirty-Seventh Special Session of the OAS General Assembly adopted a resolution suspending Honduras from the right to participate in the organization. See AG/RES. 2 (XXXVII-E/09) rev. 1, available at www.oas.org/consejo/sp/AG/Documentos/ag04682e07.doc. On July 9, 2009, the U.S. Permanent Mission to the OAS delivered a diplomatic note, enclosing an explanation of the U.S. vote in support of the resolution and requesting that it be included in the official proceedings of the special session. The U.S. explanation of vote is set forth below and is also available, together with the diplomatic note, at www.state.gov/s//c8183.htm. For additional discussion of U.S. statements and actions concerning the coup in Honduras, see Chapters 6.I.2., 10.B.3., and 16.A.4.c.

The United States of America fully supports Resolution AG/RES. 2 (XXXVII-E/09), which suspends the Republic of Honduras from the exercise of its right to participate in the Organization of American States as a result of the interruption of the democratic order of that State. The United States of America regrets the necessity of this measure, and looks forward to its lifting and the resumption by Honduras of its participation as soon as its democratic order is restored.

The United States of America supports the invocation by the Resolution of Articles 20 and 21 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter, and notes that Article 9 of the Charter of the Organization of American States is the source of authority for the suspension of the right of participation of a Member State when its democratically constituted government has been overthrown by force.

2. International Renewable Energy Agency

On June 29, 2009, the United States signed the Statute of the International Renewable Energy Agency (“IRENA”). The IRENA Statute, finalized on January 26, 2009, notes that IRENA will “promote the widespread and increased adoption and the sustainable use of all forms of renewable energy.” To accomplish this objective, IRENA will, among other activities, disseminate best practices and policy and regulatory options for adopting renewable energy technologies. As a signatory to the IRENA Statute, the United States is participating in the development of IRENA as a member of its Preparatory Commission. The IRENA Statute will come into force once 25 countries have ratified, which is anticipated to occur in late 2010 or early 2011. The United States will seek to ensure that IRENA’s work plan and programs are designed to complement, rather than conflict with, ongoing efforts. In a June 29 statement, excerpted below, Secretary of State Clinton explained the importance of U.S. participation in IRENA. The full text of Secretary Clinton’s statement is available at www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/06/125491.htm. For additional background on IRENA, see www.irena.org.

* * * *

IRENA will engage governments around the world in promoting a rapid transition toward the widespread and sustainable use of renewable energy on a global scale. Our government's participation is an important element of the Administration's effort to support clean energy technologies and the development of low carbon economies to address global climate change and to advance our domestic and foreign policy objectives. With more than 130 nations as signatories, IRENA will help ensure that global resources are put to maximum effect, especially in response to the needs of the developing world.

As President Obama has said, the development of clean, renewable sources of energy will be the growth industry of the 21st century. Not only is this an important step toward creating jobs, it will help safeguard the health of our planet and enhance America's future prosperity and security. For these reasons and more, the State Department will continue to make climate change and clean energy priorities of our foreign policy agenda. The Administration will work closely with other signatories, IRENA's leadership, and Members of Congress to ensure that IRENA's work augments and complements other renewable energy efforts around the world.

* * * *

3. International Hydrographic Organization

On June 3, 2009, the United States deposited its instrument of ratification of the Protocol of Amendments to the Convention on the International Hydrographic Organization ("Protocol"), done at Monaco on April 14, 2005. S. Treaty Doc. No. 110-9 (2007). For background, see *Digest 2007* at 407-10 and *Digest 2008* at 397. As of the end of 2009, the Protocol had not yet entered into force.

Cross References

UN peacekeepers' efforts to protect women and girls from sexual exploitation and abuse, Chapter 6.B.2.b.(1) and b.(2)(i)
Immunities of international organizations and their officials, Chapter 10.D.
UN peacekeepers and sexual exploitation and abuse by, Chapter 17.B.2.