

## **PHILIPPINES**

## **STATEMENT**

Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Philippines to the United Nations

Agenda Item 82: Diplomatic protection

80th Session of the United Nations General Assembly

23 October 2025, Trusteeship Council

UN Headquarters New York

Mr. Chair,

We thank the Secretary-General for his report on diplomatic protection, containing comments and information received from Governments as set out in A/80/100.

The Philippines commends the International Law Commission's important work on this topic and welcomes its continued consideration in this forum. The question of diplomatic protection is of enduring significance in international relations, having existed even before the emergence of modern nation-states. It represents a sovereign prerogative by which a State acts on behalf of its nationals whose rights have been injured abroad.

However, it is a prerogative that must be exercised with prudence and responsibility. The misuse of diplomatic protection in the past - particularly when invoked as a pretext for intervention - reminds us of the delicate balance this matter requires. Diplomatic protection must be exercised through peaceful means, including consular assistance, bilateral negotiation, or other forms of dispute settlement.

Under customary international law, two fundamental conditions must be met: the exhaustion of local remedies and effective and continuous nationality. The Philippines supports the codification of these principles in the International Law Commission's Draft Articles. We stress that exceptions to the rule of exhaustion of local remedies must be interpreted *strictissimi juris* to safeguard judicial independence and uphold the rule of law.

On the question of nationality, the *Nottebohm* case reminds us of the need for a genuine and effective link between the individual and the State exercising protection. For the Philippines, this issue bears special relevance. Our Dual Citizenship Law of 2003 affects nearly ten million Filipinos overseas, many of whom now hold more than one nationality. We therefore attach particular interest to the practical application of the concept of "predominant nationality" under Draft Article 7.

The Philippines also welcomes further elaboration on direct injury to shareholders under Draft Article 12, in order to better define the capacity of the State of nationality to exercise

protection on behalf of juridical persons. Similarly, we value the clarification provided by the late Professor Ian Brownlie on situations where representation or delegation among States may give rise to a right of protection.

## Mr. Chair,

Draft Article 18 is especially significant for the Philippines, as one of the world's largest suppliers of seafarers. We recognize that the flag State may exercise diplomatic protection over them; however, we believe that such a prerogative should be complementary, not exclusive, to that of the seafarer's State of nationality.

We also note that the draft articles do not specify the period within which diplomatic protection may be exercised. To promote legal stability, the Philippines suggests that consideration be given to the principles of prescription, estoppel, or laches, which help ensure predictability in both human and international relations.

## Mr. Chair,

Diplomatic protection remains one of the most rich even if controversial fields for the development of international law.

The Philippines welcomes the International Law Commission's recommendation to elaborate a convention on diplomatic protection on the basis of the 2006 Draft Articles. We also acknowledge the close relationship between these principles and those embodied in the Articles on State Responsibility for Internationally Wrongful Acts, which together strengthen the accountability and stability in international relations. In this regard, we will contribute constructively to efforts towards reaching a broad consensus on this. Thank you. **END.**