

DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



**TOPIC ONE: INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRADE****Introduction:**

Drug trafficking is defined as “a global illicit trade involving the cultivation, manufacture, distribution and sale of substances which are subject to drug prohibition laws,” by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (UNODC, n. d.) Drug trafficking involves the movement of many drugs including cannabis, opiates, cocaine, amphetamines, and ecstasy. Altogether, the drug trade is valued at between \$426 billion to \$652 billion annually (May, 2017). This trade supplies around 200 million drug users worldwide. (UNODC, 2010)

Global drug production is concentrated in three regions: Latin America, Afghanistan, and Southeast Asia. In Latin America, countries such as Mexico and Colombia are infamous for being the home of cartels which distribute drugs into North America and Europe. These cartels compete for transportation routes from cultivation land to the market. In South America, approximately 158,800 hectares of land are dedicated to the cultivation of coca, the basis of cocaine (UNODC, 2010). Afghanistan is central to the production of opium, with around 123,000 hectares of land devoted to its production (UNODC, 2010). The opium is then trafficked through Russia and the Balkans, where it reaches the European market. Afghanistan is also the world’s leading producer of hashish, a marijuana derivative. Between 10,000 and 24,000 hectares of cannabis is grown in Afghanistan, with a yield of around 145 kilograms per hectare (UNODC, 2010). Opium is also produced in Southeast Asia, notably Myanmar and Laos. This opium is also trafficked to Europe as well as neighbouring countries such as China.

Effects of Drug Trafficking:

Drug trafficking negatively effects all countries involved in the supply chain. The trade of narcotics is marred by extreme violence, with countries such as Honduras and El Salvador having the highest homicide rates in the world at 63.75 and 108.64 homicides per 100,000 people, respectively. The violence is primarily caused by gangs involved in the shipment of drugs from South America to North America. (CFR, 2016) These gangs compete for a limited number of supply routes from South America to North America and use violence to keep their goods moving and to push other competitors out.

The International Opium Convention, signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912 during the First International Opium Conference, was the first international drug control treaty. The convention provided that "the contracting powers shall use their best endeavours to control, or to cause to be controlled, all persons manufacturing, importing, selling, distributing, and exporting morphine, cocaine, and their respective salts, as well as the buildings in which these persons carry such an industry or trade" (League of Nations Treaty Series, 1922).



Up until the 1960s, the most trafficked drugs were opioids, namely heroin and morphine. However, advances in pharmacology and society led to the development and widespread use of new drugs, such as psychedelics, stimulants and other synthetic substances that posed additional threats to individuals and the society. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime's World Drug Report 2005 estimates the size of the global illicit drug market at US \$321.6 billion in 2003 (UNODC, 2010). With a world GDP of US \$36 trillion in the same year, the illegal drug trade may be estimated as nearly 1% of total global trade, and growing.

The United Nations:

A higher level of international attention became focused on the illicit drug trade after the United States became determined to end global drug trafficking, encouraging the UN to adopt several anti-drug resolutions. Major milestones in this campaign include the introduction of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs in 1961, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances in 1971 and the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. However, as the UN cannot legally enforce these resolutions, it depends upon individual states to act.

Bodies of the UN involved with crime related to drug use are The Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). The CND was established by Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolution 9(I) in 1946, to assist the ECOSOC in supervising the application of the international drug control treaties. In 1991, the General Assembly (GA) expanded the mandate of the CND to enable it to function as the governing body of the UNODC. UNODC is a global leader in the fight against illicit drugs and international crime. It was established in 1997 through a merger between the United Nations Drug Control Programme and the Centre for International Crime Prevention, UNODC operates in all regions of the world through an extensive network of field offices. The UNODC has a separate funding channel for it to continue its operations against drug trafficking. The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) is an independent, judicial body established by the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961. The INCB has 13 members, each elected by the Economic and Social Council for a period of five years, and has led to a considerable influence on the drug laws of countries.

Case Studies:

Drug use is very prevalent in the US. 23.5 million persons aged 12 or older needed treatment for an illicit drug or alcohol abuse problem in 2009. Prisons are overflowing with drug-related offenders, as 330,000 prison inmates in 2012 were incarcerated for drug offenses. Over 30 percent of all offenses in 2013 were related to drug trafficking (NIDA, 2017). The Harrison Narcotics Tax Act of 1914 was a significant step to combat opioid use. However, it was with the establishment of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in 1973 that the laws surrounding drug use and trafficking gained their current form.



The Nixon administration declared a “war on drugs” in 1971, and combatting the production and trafficking of narcotics has been an American policy priority ever since. Drugs are both trafficked internally and internationally, with the drugs themselves being made in clandestine laboratories across the US or smuggled across borders, particularly the US-Mexico border.

The President of the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, has taken a hardline stance against drug trafficking, using lethal force against many involved in drug production, movement, and consumption. This tactic was highly controversial, with groups such as Amnesty International condemning the killings for being extrajudicial and targeting the poor (Amnesty International, 2017). The Filipino government claims that under 4,000 drug users were killed in official police operations though more than 2,000 more may have killed in other drug related circumstances (Holmes, 2017).

Role of the internet in drug trafficking:

Recently, with the advent of technology, drug markets have shifted from the physical to the virtual marketplace. There are numerous ways to find and order illicit drugs online and even have them delivered by mail to your doorstep. Most common, perhaps, are synthetic and designer drugs that often contain legal and unregulated chemicals. The most popular among these designer drugs are synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic cathinones (Speiser, 2015).

Synthetic cannabinoids, called “Spice,” “K2,” and “fake weed,” contain high levels of tetrahydrocannabinol, or THC, the active ingredient in marijuana. The THC in these dangerous designer drugs is often up to 100 times more potent than what you might find in traditional pot. Spice is sold as “incense” or “potpourri” in local head shops, gas stations, and on the Internet, often escaping regulation due to labeling that markets the plant-based material sprayed with synthetic drugs as “not intended for human consumption.” Synthetic cathinone’s, called “bath salts,” are hallucinogenic drugs that may mimic LSD or ecstasy, and they are sold as “jewelry cleaner” or “plant food.” Narcotics are traded too, marking their presence online.

As the trafficking of narcotics is based largely around cross-border movement, how can sovereign states cooperate with one another to ensure drugs and gangs are unable to move from state-to-state? How can governments productively combat the influence of gangs and maintain their authority in countries overwhelmed by drug-related conflict?

Guiding Questions:

1. What is the best way of combatting illegal drug trafficking on an international scale?



2. How can the UN act to close legal loopholes exploited by drug dealers?
3. How can sovereign states combat the movement of drugs across international borders?
4. How can we effectively seek out drug traffickers without interfering with the rights of individuals?
5. What can states do to undermine and reduce the influence and authority of cartels and gangs? Is a “war on drugs” a viable solution?
6. What are some ways to reduce or soften the impacts of drug enforcement policies on communities that rely on drugs? Should the impacts be softened at all?
7. Should enforcement/punishment be equal to all individuals? Should an international standard of punishment be adopted?

References

Amnesty International. (2017, January 31). *Philippines: The police's murderous war on the poor*. Retrieved from

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/01/philippines-the-police-murderous-war-on-the-poor/>

Council on Foreign Relations. (2016, January 19). *Central America's Violent Northern Triangle*. Retrieved from <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/central-americas-violent-northern-triangle>

Holmes, O. (2017, October 12). *Rodrigo Duterte pulls Philippine police out of brutal war on drugs*. The Guardian. Retrieved from

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/oct/12/philippines-rodrigo-duterte-police-war-drugs>

League of Nations. (n.d.). *League of Nations Treaty Series*. vol. 8 (pp. 188-239).

May, C. (2017, March 17). *Transnational Crime and the Developing World*. Global Financial Integrity. Retrieved from

<http://www.gfintegrity.org/report/transnational-crime-and-the-developing-world/>

National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2017, April). *Trends and Statistics*. National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Retrieved from <https://www.drugabuse.gov/related-topics/trends-statistics#supplemental-references-for-economic-costs>



Random House. (2007). *Drug / Define Drug at Dictionary.com*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.com>.

Speiser, Matthew. (2015). *A handful of dangerous new legal drugs has public health experts worried*. Business Insider. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/new-synthetic-drugs-2015-8>

United Nations. (2012). *Thematic Debate of the 66th session of the United Nations General Assembly on Drugs and Crime as a threat to Development*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Issues/drugs/drugs-crime.shtml>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). *Afghanistan leads in hashish production*. Retrieved from <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/frontpage/2010/March/afghanistan-leads-in-hashish-production-says-unodc.html>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (n. d.) *Drug trafficking*. Retrieved from <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/drug-trafficking/index.html>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). *World Drug Report*. Retrieved from [https://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr/WDR_2010/World Drug Report 2010 lo-res.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr/WDR_2010/World_Drug_Report_2010_lo-res.pdf)

United States Sentencing Commission. (2015). *Quick Facts Drug Trafficking Offenses 2003 Through 2013*.

TOPIC TWO: NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

Introduction:

Regulating and controlling nuclear weaponry is as imperative today as it was at the height of the Cold War. In international treaties, nuclear non-proliferation is enacted in two ways: the prevention of new nations from obtaining nuclear weaponry, and the disarming of existing nuclear weapons. Non-proliferation efforts distinguish nuclear power from nuclear weapons, as the peaceful use of nuclear power has long been permitted by the international society. A country's usage of nuclear power plants does not necessarily correlate to its ability or intention to possess nuclear weapons.

Existing framework:

Realizing the uniquely devastating capability of nuclear weapons, the international community has taken significant action to combat this imminent threat. There are two major non-proliferation frameworks currently in place. The first is the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which came into force in 1970. The NPT initially



recognized the United States, Russia, China, Great Britain, and France as nuclear states, though China and France did not join until 1992. The Treaty set out a commitment for the five recognized nuclear states to neither sell nor provide nuclear weapons technology and to agree to negotiate “in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.” In return for the forbearance of the non-nuclear states, the treaty affirms their right to use nuclear energy for peaceful civilian purposes so long as they abide by safeguard protocols prescribed and administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (Bergner, 2012). This treaty, although an important step, is not without its flaws. Not all states are signatories of the NPT, and four non-signatory states (India, Pakistan, Israel, and North Korea) are widely thought to possess nuclear weaponry.

The second framework is the International Atomic Energy Agency, which implements a system of safeguard agreements to help prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. These safeguards are a set of standards by which the IAEA verifies that a state is living up to its international obligations to not use nuclear energy programs for the development of weapons of mass destruction. Most safeguard agreements are with states that have committed themselves to non-proliferation through the NPT, for which the IAEA is the verification authority. To date, 178 States have entered into safeguard agreements with the IAEA, submitting their nuclear programs to the scrutiny of IAEA inspectors (IAEA, 2016). However, the IAEA requires consent to operate within a sovereign state, limiting its enforcement capabilities.

Rogue Nuclear States:

Despite the efforts that have been made towards nonproliferation, North Korea has continued to circumvent international norms and agreements. Beginning in 2006, North Korea has conducted regular nuclear tests over the past decade, culminating in a missile being flown over Japan in 2017. Given the Kim regime’s low transparency and lack of cooperation with the international community, it is difficult to determine the size of DPRK’s nuclear arsenal. North Korea maintains that it possesses both atomic and hydrogen weapons, a claim which the international community has accepted with an increasing level of credibility. North Korea was formerly a signatory of the NPT, and, under that treaty, allowed IAEA to inspect its nuclear sites; however, it withdrew from the NPT in 2003. Since North Korea’s declaration of possession of nuclear capability, neighbouring countries have taken on hostile positions and policies towards the Kim regime. North Korea’s continuation of its development program behind the facade of negotiations led neighbouring countries to perceive North Korea as an untrustworthy negotiator (Son, 2017). The nuclear powers have taken divergent stances regarding the DPRK’s nuclear weapon programme. The United States, and the Trump Presidency specifically, have strongly condemned North Korea and threatened a military response should DPRK continue to expand its nuclear arsenal. Conversely, Russia and China have refrained from such declarations of policy.



In 2015, a precedent was set when Iran was given permission to develop a peaceful nuclear programme for research and clean power initiatives within its own borders. With Russia, France, the U.S.A., the UK, France, China and Germany in support of the agreement, Iran was permitted to move forward with nuclear research under strict guidelines. Restrictions on materials to be used, its storage and total capacity at any given time, methods of procedure are all regulated and documented by oversight committees jointly operated by some of the signatory nations (BBC, 2017). The Iran Nuclear Deal is extremely controversial, with some arguing that it concedes too much to Iran's nuclear programme and others arguing it violates Iranian sovereignty. In stark contrast to the DPRK, Iran is following all international regulations and permitting such oversight in belief that it will lead to a safer future. Does such diplomacy signal an era of peace or of strict governance and oversight by nuclear powers who do not practice the same disarmament ideals they preach to the world?

Guiding Questions:

1. Should states in control of nuclear weapons be permitted to control the nuclear programs of other, independent nations?
2. Is your country currently in possession of nuclear weapons? If not, would it be useful if it were?
3. Has your country signed the NPT? What are its reasons for signing/not signing it?
4. Does every state have a right to possess nuclear weapons?
5. What are the potential benefits that can be gained from owning nuclear weapons? What are the disadvantages?
6. Does the presence of weapons of mass destruction make the world a safer place?
7. Is the existing international framework enough?

References

Abramson, A. (2017). *Here's how many nuclear weapons the U.S. has*. Time Magazine. Retrieved from <http://time.com/4893175/united-states-nuclear-weapons/>

BBC News. (2017). *Iran Nuclear Deal: Key Details*. BBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-33521655>

Bergner, J. D. (2012). Going nuclear: Does the non-proliferation treaty matter? *Comparative Strategy*, 31(1), 84-102.



IAEA. (2016). *Basics of IAEA Safeguards*. Retrieved from <https://www.iaea.org/topics/basics-of-iaea-safeguards>

Son, H. J. (2017). Nuclear Dilemma of North Korea: Coexistence of Fear and Ambition – North Korea’s Strategic Culture and its Development of Nuclear Capability. *The Korean Journal of Defence Analysis*, 29(2), 195-211.

TOPIC THREE: INTER-STATE COOPERATION IN THE WAR ON TERROR

Introduction:

In the UN General Assembly Resolution 49/60 terrorism was described as “criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them” (UNGA, 1994). However, the lack of international agreement on a definition allows for “loopholes and safe havens for those criminals,” as stressed on by the delegate of Malaysia in a General Assembly meeting in 2005 (UNGA, 2005).

As defined by Britannica, the War on Terror is a term used “to describe the American-led global counterterrorism campaign launched in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001” (Jackson, 2017). In an effort to curb terrorist activity, the American government launched military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and developed new security legislation, most notably the PATRIOT Act. Following the American lead, many other governments developed domestic policies to ensure terrorism would be prevented within their states. The War on Terror operates differently than a traditional conflict; it lacks the boundaries of a conventional war, and efforts are primarily directed against non-state actors. The War on Terror has required patience and continuous action to ensure terror is unable to grow and spread (Global Policy Forum, n.d.).

Derek Reveron, author of “Old Allies and New Friends: Intelligence-Sharing in the War on Terror,” states that “the war on terror requires high levels of intelligence to identify a threat relative to the amount of force required to neutralize it” (Gray & McGill, 2012). Intelligence gathering and sharing has been viewed as crucial to curbing potential terrorist plots and attacks. Intelligence cooperation refers to intelligence services of different countries working with each other and sharing information gathered. It can be achieved through sharing information with foreign counterparts, conducting joint operation with foreign partners, training foreign counterparts, or sending intelligence to support work of foreign intelligence (Wills, n.d.).

On September 8 2006, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which is reviewed every two years. This strategy is comprised



of four pillars: addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism, taking measures to prevent and combat terrorism, enacting measures to build states' capacity to prevent and combat terrorism and to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in that regard, and finally taking measures to ensure respect for human rights for all and the rule of law as the fundamental basis for the fight against terrorism (UNCTITF).

On June 15, 2017, the United Nations General Assembly established the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism. The office has five primary functions:

1. *Provide leadership in the General Assembly counter-terrorism mandates entrusted to the Secretary-General from across the United Nations system*
2. *Enhance coordination and coherence across the 38 Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force entities to ensure the balanced implementation of the four pillars of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*
3. *Strengthen the delivery of United Nations counter-terrorism capacity-building assistance to Member States*
4. *Improve visibility, advocacy, and resource mobilization for United Nations counter-terrorism efforts*
5. *Ensure that due priority is given to counter-terrorism across the United Nations system and that the important work in preventing violent extremism is firmly rooted in the strategy (United Nations Office of Counter Terrorism, n.d. para.4).*

The United Nations has put forth several resolutions and committees to help combat terrorism. In 2005, the United Nations counter terrorism chief, Javier Rupérez called for cooperation of intelligence agencies to prevent terrorist acts; this is because "intelligence services have the capacity to observe the evolution of the terrorist phenomenon, to prevent its actions and to alert governments to its threat and new modalities" (United Nations News Centre, 2005). The perpetrators of the 2015 Paris Attack were familiar to the Belgian and Dutch police; they had previously been arrested, but were released due to the lack of information on them in their national system. With intelligence sharing, some analysts argue, these sort of terrorist attacks could potentially be avoided (Bureš, 2016).

Jean-Paul Laborde, Executive Director of Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate stated that "terrorism was an international threat requiring a global response" (UNSC, 2016). In 2016, the Security Council adopted resolution 2322, which aimed to enhance judicial cooperation to help combat terrorism. Within this resolution, the Security Council called upon participating states to share information, such as biometric and biographic information, about members of terrorist organizations. They also stressed the importance of this information and intelligence sharing. This included urging the states to share their



national information with the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) I-24/7 police (UNSC, 2016).

However, intelligence sharing among different nations poses many problems. The UN special Rapporteur on Counter-terrorism stated that the lack of laws and regulations has left it open for the intelligence agencies to enter agreements beyond supervision of authorities. Wills et al in “Understanding Intelligence Oversight” highlighted four main problems with intelligence sharing, namely the significant risk to human rights, the inability of states to know exactly how information was obtained, such as by means of torture or breaching human rights, the possibility that some intelligence services only want to cooperate to avoid legal problems with their authorities, and the risk of interfering with state’s foreign policy and reputation (Gray & McGill, 2012; McGruddy, 2016).

The 2017 briefing to National Intelligence Oversight on the Human Rights Implication of Intelligence Sharing stated that intelligence interfering with privacy is equivalent to that of direct state surveillance and should be transparent. A balance needs to be found between intelligence sharing and human rights protection. In 2014, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights states in its report, “The Right of Privacy in Digital Age,” that “surveillance on the grounds of national security or for the prevention of terrorism or other crime may be a legitimate aim” however the “degree of interference must ... be assessed against the necessity of the measure to achieve that aim and the actual benefit it yields towards such a purpose” (UNGA, 2014, p. 8). To address this in the general comment No. 27 on article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Human Rights Committee states that it is not sufficient for the interference to just achieve the purpose it must also serve to protect (UNGA, 2014).

The UN Human Rights Committee states that reviewing intelligence practices must be done and ensure that they are compliant with article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which serves to protect the rights of privacy. The Privacy International suggests that governments pass legislation that allows for legally binding agreements between Intelligence services that are governed, transparency and clarity as to what circumstances will require exchanging information, and the sharing of the responsibility of the information shared and received by the countries and agencies involved (Privacy International, 2017).

Conclusions:

Overall, terrorism remains a pressing global issue. However, many counterterrorism efforts are causing harm to the population by exploiting basic human rights, such as privacy and freedom of expression. The UN stresses on the importance of this issue and protecting human rights and continues to emphasize on the benefits of intelligence sharing between Member states and across borders.

**Guiding Questions:**

1. Is the UN doing enough to combat terrorism? Is it overstepping its jurisdiction?
2. How can the UN factor sovereignty vs. security into its current counter-terrorism efforts?
3. Where, if at all, can a state trespass on the rights of the individual when it is justified for the security of the state as a whole?
4. Should the UN facilitate intergovernmental efforts against the War on Terrorism, and through what methods?
5. How can states share intelligence without violating the privacy of their citizens?

References

Bureš, O. (2016). Intelligence sharing and the fight against terrorism in the EU: lessons learned from Europol. *European View*, 15(1), 57–66.

European Council. (2017). EU Counterterrorism strategy. Retrieved from <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/fight-against-terrorism/eu-strategy/>

Global Policy Reform. (n.d.). War on terrorism. Retrieved from <https://www.globalpolicy.org/war-on-terrorism.html>

Gray, D. & McGill, C. (2012). Challenges to international counterterrorism intelligence sharing. *Global Security Studies*, pp. 76-86.

Government of Netherland. (2016, February 3). *Counterterrorism*. Retrieved from <https://www.government.nl/topics/counterterrorism-and-national-security/counterterrorism>

Jackson, R. (2017). War on terrorism. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/war-on-terrorism>

McGrddy, J. (2013). Multilateral intelligence collaboration and international oversight. *Journal of Strategic Security*. 6(3), 214-220.

Privacy International. (2017). Human rights implication of intelligence sharing. Retrieved from https://www.privacyinternational.org/sites/default/files/PI%20Briefing%20to%20National%20Intelligence%20Oversight%20Bodies_12_Sept.pdf



Seeker. (2015, October 14). How Invasive Is China's Mass Surveillance? Retrieved by <https://www.seeker.com/how-invasive-is-chinas-mass-surveillance-1792717559.html>

United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. (n.d.). UN Global Counterterrorism Strategy. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/en/un-global-counter-terrorism-strategy>

United Nations General Assembly. (1994, December 9). A/RES/49/60 Measures to eliminate international terrorism.

United Nations General Assembly. (2005, October 7). Agreed definition of term 'terrorism' said to be needed for consensus on completing comprehensive convention against it. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/press/en/2005/gal3276.doc.htm>

United Nations General Assembly. (2014, June 30). A/HRC/27/37 The right to privacy in the digital age.

United Nations Office of Counter-terrorism. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/counterterrorism/>

United Nations News Centre. (2005, March 1). Strong intelligence sharing key to preventing terrorist acts, top UN counter-terrorism expert says. Retrieved by <https://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=13496&Cr=terror&Cr1=#.WgPDfjtl-a>

United Nation Security Council. (2016, December 12). In Fight against Terrorism, Security Council Adopts Resolution 2322 (2016), Aiming to Strengthen International Judicial Cooperation. Retrieved by <https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/sc12620.doc.htm>

Wills, A. (n.d). Understanding Intelligence Oversight. Retrieved from http://www.dcaf.ch/sites/default/files/publications/documents/IntelligenceOversight_en.pdf